

H.R. 4038. A bill for the relief of Francisca Ocampo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4039. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Orlando; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4040. A bill for the relief of Esperanza Sindol; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DELANEY (by request):

H.R. 4041. A bill for the relief of Luigi Gambino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAYS:

H.R. 4042. A bill for the relief of John A. Martinkosky; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts:

H.R. 4043. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ana Maria de Lima Sousa Raposo and her two children, Paulo and Carlos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HORTON:

H.R. 4044. A bill for the relief of Dr. Ming Derek Chan, his wife, Belle Chan, and their two daughters, Evelyn and Jeannie; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4045. A bill for the relief of Mario DiBattisto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4046. A bill for the relief of Joseph P. Mahady; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4047. A bill for the relief of Domenico Stalteri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4048. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Alfonso Vancheri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEITH:

H.R. 4049. A bill for the relief of Vitorino da Costa Cabral; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4050. A bill for the relief of Maria Manuela da Jesus Gambino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4051. A bill for the relief of Argentina Garcia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4052. A bill for the relief of Carlota Gujmares; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4053. A bill for the relief of Dr. Raghuram Pothapu Reddy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LENT:

H.R. 4054. A bill for the relief of Josephine Palazzolo and Michele Palazzolo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. METCALFE:

H.R. 4055. A bill for the relief of Sjoufjan Awal; wife, Sofie Awal; and son, Leksin Awal; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOLLOHAN:

H.R. 4056. A bill for the relief of Anna Veltri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOSS:

H.R. 4057. A bill for the relief of Peter Heinrich Joehnsen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4058. A bill for the relief of Agripino Erano Tenchavez, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURPHY of New York:

H.R. 4059. A bill for the relief of Gianiale and Anna Russo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL:

H.R. 4060. A bill for the relief of Harvard Specialty Manufacturing Corp.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.R. 4061. A bill for the relief of Julian G. Carr; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4062. A bill for the relief of William H. Evans; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4063. A bill for the relief of Edward M. Fleming Construction Co., Inc., a corporation in the process of liquidation represented by its surviving board of directors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4064. A bill for the relief of William H. Nickerson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4065. A bill for the relief of World Mart, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PEYSER:

H.R. 4066. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Vita Oranza Praino and her children, Salvatore, Michele, and Marcello; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. PODELL:

H.R. 4067. A bill for the relief of Calogero Mendola; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4068. A bill for the relief of Antonio Monticciolo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REES:

H.R. 4069. A bill for the relief of Philemon M. Hou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4070. A bill for the relief of Mr. and

Mrs. Katse C. Semanya; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RHODES:

H.R. 4071. A bill for the relief of Sein Lin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 4072. A bill for the relief of Emanuele Catanzariti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4073. A bill for the relief of Herbert Chan, Szeto Wing Ha Chan, and son, Frank Chan and twin daughters, Martha and May Chan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4074. A bill for the relief of Dr. Kai-Loo Huang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4075. A bill for the relief of Andonios Merkouris; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4076. A bill for the relief of Marina Merkouris; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4077. A bill for the relief of Serafina Patti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4078. A bill for the relief of Dr. Angelo Zosa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of California:

H.R. 4079. A bill for the relief of David Anthony Burch, born as Shigenori Ishihara; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TALCOTT:

H.R. 4080. A bill for the relief of Mr. Duc Mau Nguyen and his wife Hien Thi Ngo Nguyen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOB WILSON:

H.R. 4081. A bill for the relief of Lauro Eduardo Damerval; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4082. A bill for the relief of Arthur W. Feldman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4083. A bill for the relief of Thomas William Greene and Jill A. Greene; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 4 of rule XXII,

23. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the Board of Commissioners, Tarpon Springs, Fla., relative to Federal-State revenue sharing; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

DOUBLING OF PAY SCALES FOR FIRST-TERM MILITARY PERSONNEL RECOMMENDED

HON. WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 8, 1971

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, when the Gates Commission was established to investigate the feasibility of creating a volunteer military force, it recommended, among other things, that pay scales for first-term personnel be raised to double their present levels. The Commission found that pay for soldiers with over 2 years of service had risen by 111 percent since 1948, but by only 60 percent for those with less than 2 years. Their report found that a volunteer force or, in other terms, a zero draft level could be achieved by correcting this unfair treatment of first-term servicemen. I agree wholeheartedly with that appraisal, and I recently cosponsored

legislation to see that it was put into effect.

The Gates Commission refuted every claim made against a largely volunteer service. They reported that it would cause only a small budget increase, most of the costs being absorbed by increased efficiency and professionalism. Volunteers would serve longer terms, a higher fraction would reenlist, and they would have a higher average level of skill. The armed services would waste fewer man-hours in training and being trained. Because manpower is cheap to the military, it now tends to waste it, using enlisted men for tasks badly suited to their abilities or for tasks that could be performed by civilians or machines. Better pay to volunteers, at the same time, would decrease the veteran's benefits we pay out annually. These now cost \$6 billion a year or one-third as much as current payroll costs for the active Armed Forces.

The Gates Commission reported further that a volunteer military could be achieved without impairing the Nation's ability to meet existing and anticipated

troop level requirements. Pay scales could be doubled for enlisted men and increased by 25 percent for officers—without, as we have pointed out, putting a severe burden on the Federal budget.

The argument that a volunteer professional Army would develop into a threat to our civilian institutions was likewise refuted by the Gates study. Such a threat would come from the officer corps rather than the enlisted personnel, and officers currently are, and always have been, recruited voluntarily. Moreover, our tradition of civilian control of the military has always been sufficiently strong to minimize any possibility of a military takeover.

With these considerations in mind I believe we can move toward an all-volunteer force. The first step must be the reduction of the draft call to a zero level; then, with the weight of evidence on our side, we may begin the long process of repealing the draft law. I am confident, Mr. Speaker, that my bill will give us evidence—conclusive evidence—that an all-volunteer Army can work.

SCIENCE AND POLITICS

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1971

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, in a few minutes, God willing, the crew of Apollo 14 will return safely to earth from the third American lunar exploration. Much has been written about the sense of wonder engendered by this, the most spectacular achievement of human technology. Little, however, has been written which seriously attempts to understand the ultimate significance of this human adventure—little has been said about what it offers a world torn by hatred, poverty, and war.

No one can deny the paradox of the precision and expertise of human science and technology and the imprecision and occasional stupidity of human affairs. We can place three men on the surface of the moon, but are we equally adept at creating a job, or providing shelter, or feeding a hungry child? Obviously, we are not.

This was the thesis an excellent column by the distinguished journalist, James Reston, in the New York Times of Sunday, February 9, 1971. I am inserting it in the RECORD and calling it to the attention of my colleagues, for I believe it well worth their reading:

SCIENCE AND POLITICS

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, February 6.—Watching our fellow countrymen on the moon from the capital of the United States, one question is unavoidable: How can the scientific mind produce such precision, and the political mind produce such confusion—both centered on this same majestic city?

What explains the spectacular success of the scientific process and the staggering failures and frustrations of the political process? The easy answer is that the scientists are dealing with measurable and controllable factors and the politicians are not. The scientists have the power of decision: to determine their ends and means, and insist on their best men; and the politicians do not.

And it is just as well. For if we carried the comparison too far, we could easily reach the conclusion that the totalitarians were right, and that the state should have the authority to define the ends and the means and pick the most "efficient" men and discard the rest. And yet surely there is something in between, something in the scientific process that might be applied to the political process without imposing the authority of the fascist or Communist state.

At least, thoughtful men have yearned for some middle ground between the precision of the men of action and the confusion of the men of politics for many years. As long ago as the First World War, H. G. Wells was living in the two worlds of science fiction and politics, and wondering about the difference between the two.

"Are there no men," he asked, "to think as earnestly as one climbs a mountain, and to write with their uttermost pride? Are there no men to face truth as those boys at Mons faced shrapnel, and to stick for the honor of the mind and for the truth and beauty as those lads stuck to their trenches?"

Wells hated authority, but longed for clarity, and wondered how to get the latter without the former, and he fell back in the end on the hope that there was something in the scientific process that might help produce some unity of purpose and common control of human affairs or at least avoid disaster.

It is easy to argue about the cost of the space program, and whether it took money from more urgent human problems here at home; but there are some aspects of its scientific process which may be relevant to the political process in America.

"Science is a great many things," Jacob Bronowski wrote in a remarkable little book called "The Common Sense of Science," "but in the end they all return to this: science is the acceptance of what works and the rejection of what does not. . . ."

"This is how society has lost touch with science: because it has hesitated to judge itself by the same impersonal code of what works and what does not. . . . We must learn to act on that understanding in the world as well as in the laboratory. . . ."

Again, this is slippery and even dangerous ground, for "what works" for an industry may not work for its community, and "what works" for the Soviets in Czechoslovakia or the United States in Cambodia and Laos may not work for the decency and order of the world.

Yet there are some things in the space program and the scientific process which would obviously help the political process in Washington. Science does concentrate on the future. It does take a critical attitude toward its own assumptions and habits of thought. It does question abstractions and assume that wrong assumptions will produce wrong results. And it does insist that ignorant, incompetent or even half-trained men, no matter how amiable, are not good enough to go to the moon.

This is what troubles Washington when it watches the lift-off from Cape Kennedy, sees the struggle between power and control in the rocket, listens to all the intricate measurement exchanged between Houston and the men in space, hears on top of all this the catch in the throat about the beauty of the universe, and then wonders about all this being sent across the greatest gap of all, from the moon to earth, on television and in color into the circle of our families.

The question is almost trite but cannot be evaded. Why, if Washington can organize all this intricate information, reduce all this mathematical diversity to identity in a single rocket—big as a forty-story building—and send it on bullseye target to the moon, why then can we not apply some of the principle of the scientific process to the political process?

Even the politicians are troubled by the question, and it has not escaped the Administration and the White House. Something very interesting is going on here now. Even the men around the President, as is clear in the latest State of the Union Message and in the budget, are beginning to ask the scientist's question: "What works?"

"This is the message of science," said Bronowski, "our ideas must be realistic, flexible, unbigoted. They must create their own authority. If any ideas have a claim to be called creative, because they have liberated that creative impulse, it is the ideas of science."

Very slowly, very subtly, this idea is beginning to spread from the scientific world of Washington to the political world. The explanation of the President's switch on economic and social policy is that the old arguments have "not worked," so he is adjusting to the realities and moving into a different political orbit.

ABORTION, FEDERAL JUDGES, AND CATHOLIC BISHOPS

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 8, 1971

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, socialized abortion—murder of the unborn at taxpayers' expense—was given a boost by U.S. District Court Judge Joseph C. Waddy, who ruled this past week that the Washington Hospital Center in our Nation's Capital must permit free therapeutic abortion in the case of an unmarried pregnant woman.

The judge further ruled that an abortion could be legally obtained without consent of a parent or guardian by any 18-year-old or older resident of the District of Columbia. The decision ignored any premise as to what legal duty existed for society to be made to pay for the operation if society was without the power to prevent the abortion.

This recent ruling was the most significant step in dignifying abortion at will since District Judge Gerhard A. Gessell struck down Washington's antiabortion law passed by Congress in 1901. Possibly murder of "unwants" has become stylish after 70 years.

The judge apparently rationalized that since the mother makes decisions affecting the baby after it has left the womb, she may likewise make decisions affecting the baby before it has left the womb, including disposing of the unborn child. According to this brand of logic, the mother has the right to do anything to her child after its birth, including murdering it.

This is the strange double standard of those who feel society has no right to prevent death of an innocent unborn child, yet with tears in their eyes, clamor against society having any right to demand capital punishment of even those convicted of the savagery of first degree murder.

In sharp contrast to the decisions of District Judges Gessell and Waddy is the statement on abortion by the National Conference of Catholic Bishops. The Bishops strongly oppose the liberalization of abortion laws, basing their defense of human life on the Commandment of God in the Holy Bible: "Thou shalt not kill."

The following excerpt from their statement should be read, studied, and meditated on by lawmakers, the President, judges, and all other citizens who believe in God:

We remain convinced that human life is a priceless gift, and our pastoral duty prompts us to reaffirm that "God, the Lord of life, has conferred on men the surpassing ministry of safeguarding life, a ministry which must be fulfilled in a manner which is worthy of man. Therefore from the moment of conception life must be guarded with the greatest care, while abortion and infanticide are unspeakable crimes." (Pastoral Constitution on the Church in the Modern World, No. 51)

The bishops rely on the word of God; the Federal judges, on myth and populist fad.

My earlier statement on abortion which appeared in the American Legion magazine of June 1970, follows:

Homicide is the taking of human life. Abortion is a homicide of an unborn child, justified in many jurisdictions because of overwhelming public interest in preserving the life of the mother, preventing the birth of what is termed in medical parlance a monster, or for some other reason regarded as pressing enough to justify the taking of human life. In all civilized jurisdictions, the law forbids murder or other criminal homicides.

A review of the social revolution indicates a well-publicized attack is being carried on against all abortion restrictions. Appealing arguments dealing with the so-called rights of women to bear or not to bear a particular child can be dangerously misleading. Entirely apart from religious, moral or ethical sanctions against such conduct, there exists a real pitfall.

In this situation we are dealing with life itself. The essence of abortion is the termination of a life. If we accept the unrestricted termination of a life at the will of another, we have opened a Pandora's box.

When abortion of the unwanted is permitted, at the sole option of the unwilling mother, we must face squarely the question of euthanasia or other "mercy" killings—the efficient disposition of such other unwanted as the aged, ill, infirm, insane or mentally deficient—or even the unproductive.

It doesn't require much of an extension of these principles to justify the drastic reduction of the welfare rolls, the permanent solution to growing problems of illegitimates—or even the efficient dispatch of troublesome dissenters and losing politicians.

Those who urge the propriety of such action should never forget that under the progressive euthanasia laws of the Third Reich, many of the killings which appalled the civilized world were entirely lawful under German law at that time.

Those who advocate abortion as a population control measure would better serve humanity by assisting in the restoration of the tried and proven methods of reducing illegitimate conceptions.

My state of Louisiana has recognized that the unborn child—the human being in the womb—has rights protected by the Constitution and can even recover damages for prenatal injuries. This recognition and protection of the person of the most helpless of humans is genuine progress in human rights.

The unrestricted killing of such an innocent, tolerated by society, is a regression to barbarism.

A newsclipping and the "Statement of Abortion" of the National Conference of Catholic Bishops follow my remarks.

ABORTION RULES EASED BY JUDGE

(By Sanford J. Ungar)

Any woman 18 or older who is a resident of the District of Columbia may legally obtain an abortion without the consent of a parent or guardian, a federal judge ruled yesterday.

In a decision that makes Washington's abortion laws among the most liberal in the country, U.S. District Court Judge Joseph C. Waddy ordered the Washington Hospital Center to permit a therapeutic abortion at 8 a.m. today in the case of an unmarried pregnant woman who will be 19 next week.

The hospital, which opened the area's first out-patient abortion clinic last month, had balked at performing the operation, invoking

its rule that anyone under 21 needs the permission of a parent or guardian.

But Waddy cited a section of the D.C. Code that says "a natural guardianship or an appointive guardianship of the person of an infant ceases . . . in the case of a female infant when she becomes 18 years of age or marries."

Parents are legally defined as natural guardians.

The judge refused to appoint a guardian for Barbara Boe, the fictitious name assumed by the woman, and said she is "entitled to consent to herself."

She "does not have and cannot have any guardian of her person," Waddy wrote in a ruling that went well beyond what was sought by her attorney, Charles Herz of the Covington and Burling law firm.

Waddy's ruling also applies to married women under 18.

Because of the unusual legal procedure involved—a probate case filed with the register of wills rather than the clerk of the District Court—Waddy's decision is final and not subject to appeal.

Legal sources called it the most important step in revision of abortion law here since a November, 1969, ruling by District Judge Gerhard A. Gesell striking down Washington's 1901 antiabortion statute.

That decision, still pending before the U.S. Supreme Court, said that any "competent licensed practitioner of medicine" may perform an abortion for reasons satisfactory to himself and his patient.

Last November, the D.C. City Council went on record in favor of liberalized abortion regulations for the city, but postponed a final vote pending the Supreme Court ruling.

The number of abortions here has remained relatively small, compared, for example, to New York City, primarily because of the rules of various hospitals, where most of the operations are performed.

An attorney for the Hospital Center, John Arness, insisted yesterday that its requirement of a guardian's consent will remain in effect.

"Another girl" in the same situation as Miss Boe, he said, "would still have to go to court, we will require it every time."

But the register of wills, Peter J. McLaughlin, who handles many such cases, took sharp exception with that view.

In the future, McLaughlin said, "we will advise anyone who is 18 that she does not need permission even if she has living parents."

GROUND RULES

Sources close to the case agreed that the Hospital Center as a private institution is legally entitled to formulate its own ground rules, but suggested that it will eventually yield to Waddy's view once it has been reiterated in other cases.

The judge made his ruling after a half-hour closed hearing in his chambers yesterday morning. In order to protect Miss Boe's identity and the nature of her testimony, he ordered the transcript of the hearing sealed.

It was clear from the public documents, however, that Waddy relied heavily on the report of Elizabeth Guhring, whom he appointed as Miss Boe's temporary guardian Monday for the purposes of the court proceeding only.

Mrs. Guhring, a lawyer, wrote that Miss Boe was "fully emancipated," having been abandoned by her parents at the age of five months to the custody of a great-aunt and uncle.

The uncle died in 1963 and his wife last June.

"ON HER OWN"

"One takes the impression, in talking with her," Mrs. Guhring wrote of Miss Boe, "that

her world crashed in and she was truly on her own and along with the death of her aunt," when she dropped out of her senior year in high school to work to support herself.

Miss Boe "very much wants to finish high school . . . She knows she cannot probably do this with a child, but more important to her . . . is a firm resolve that she would not want her child to be subject to being parceled out here and there as has been the case with the children of her family," the temporary guardian said.

Mrs. Guhring also pointed out that D.C. law permits an 18-year-old woman to commit herself to a mental hospital, write her own will, vote, marry and choose her own employment.

"The determinations and decisions affecting the baby when it has left the womb are made by the baby's mother," she said, and law dictates that "she and she alone" may make decisions "affecting the baby before it has left the womb."

Dr. Jaye Grollman, who will perform Miss Boe's abortion today, said it will be paid for by the city through Medicaid. Since she is already 16 to 18 weeks pregnant, he said today is the deadline for the operation.

STATEMENT ON ABORTION

(National Conference of Catholic Bishops)

Last year, we stated our strong opposition to ongoing efforts to strike down laws prohibiting abortion. Our defense of human life is rooted in the biblical prohibition, "thou shalt not kill." Regrettably, there has been a radical turn of events during this past year, and a new effort has been directed to the total repeal of all such laws. At the same time, an effort has been mounted in the courts to have such laws declared unconstitutional.

Therefore we speak again on this important issue of public policy, addressing ourselves to the Catholic community and to all our fellow citizens. For the question of abortion is a moral problem transcending any particular sectarian approach. Our opposition to abortion derives from our conviction that whatever is opposed to life is a violation of man's inherent rights, a position that has a strong basis in the history of American Law. The U.S. Bill of Rights guarantees the right of life to every American, and the U.N. Declaration on the Rights of the Child, which our nation endorses, affirms that the child, because of his dependent status, should be accorded a special protection under the law before as well as after birth. (U.N. General Assembly, November 20, 1959)

In light of the attempts to remove all prohibition of abortion from our legal system, the life of the innocent unborn child is no longer given universal protection in the laws of our land. Moreover, the absence of all legal restraint promotes the acceptance of abortion as a convenient way for a woman to terminate the life of her child and the responsibilities that she has as its mother.

The implications of this proposed change in legal philosophy are enormous. Once we allow the taking of innocent human life in the earliest stages of its development for the sake of convenience, how can we logically protect human life at any other point, once that life becomes a burden?

The assertion is made that a woman has a right not to be forced to bear a child against her will, but when a woman is already pregnant, this right must be considered in light of the child's right to life, the woman's responsibilities as its mother, and the rights and responsibilities of the child's father. The life of the unborn child is a human life. The destruction of any human life is not a pri-

vate matter, but the concern of every responsible citizen.

We remain convinced that human life is a priceless gift, and our pastoral duty prompts us to reaffirm that "God, the Lord of life, has conferred on men the surpassing ministry of safeguarding life, a ministry which must be fulfilled in a manner which is worthy of man. Therefore from the moment of conception life must be guarded with the greatest care, while abortion and infanticide are unspeakable crimes." (Pastoral Constitution on the Church in the Modern World, No. 51)

Once again, we declare our determination to seek solutions to the problems that lead some women to consider abortion. We pledge our efforts to do all that is possible to remove the social stigma that is visited on the woman who is pregnant out of wedlock, as well as on her child. We also pledge the facilities and the efforts of our Church agencies to provide counseling and understanding to the woman who faces a difficult pregnancy. At the same time, we are encouraged by the scientific advance of recent decades that has already provided us with ways to support and maintain the life and health of the mother and the development of the child in the womb.

Finally, we are aware that the value of human life is not exclusively a Catholic concern. Many Americans agonize over the loss of life involved in modern warfare, the serious ethical questions raised by recent scientific and surgical advances, the implications of pollution on our environment and the long-range effects of drug use. But safeguarding the life of all men requires safeguarding the life of every individual, for our hold on life itself is only as strong as the weakest link in our system of law.

FULL EMPLOYMENT BUDGET BASIS FOR REAL ECONOMIC GAINS IN THE NEXT YEAR

HON. GILBERT GUDE

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1971

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, the full employment budget which President Nixon has proposed for fiscal 1972 should be the basis for real economic gains in the next year. As the President said in his budget message:

The full employment budget idea is in the nature of a self-fulfilling prophecy: By operating as if we were at full employment, we will help to bring about that full employment.

By stimulating economic activity during slow periods and checking the economy when it is overheating the full employment budget provides a built-in system of checks and balances. This system eliminates the guesswork and wishful thinking of past budgets.

A further advantage of the full employment budget is that by holding outlays to match the revenue produced by the tax system operating at full employment, there is an automatic ceiling on Government spending. Again, this is a highly desirable feature in view of the huge deficits that have been run up in the past, most notably 1968, when the Federal Government spent \$25 billion more than it took in. This type of gross overspending should be nearly eliminated

by the automatic checks built into the full employment budget.

The budget proposed by President Nixon is ideally suited for the management of a huge, industrialized economy. I am pleased that President Nixon has made America the first major country to move in this direction.

WOMAN OF THE YEAR

HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1971

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure I call the attention of my colleagues to a resident of my 20th Congressional District in Pennsylvania who recently was honored for "generous involvement and personal dedication" to her community, McKeesport, Pa., and its citizens.

Mrs. Anne Kascak of 902 Soles Street, a mother of five children, was singled out for personal recognition by the McKeesport Allied Veterans Association as the "Woman of the Year." For years, she has labored diligently on behalf of veterans, particularly those who are hospitalized, and veterans organizations. She also has been extremely active in her church and community projects.

Mr. Speaker, this gracious lady is a charter member of the Ladies Auxiliary to Catholic War Veterans Post 1559, joining the unit and its organization in 1952. Since then she has held every office in the local chapter. In addition, she has served as president of the Allegheny County Chapter of Catholic War Veterans Auxiliary in 1958 and also has held office on the State level.

Mrs. Kascak has worked long and hard on numerous charitable projects sponsored by the Catholic War Veterans. She has spent many, many hours comforting and cheering patients at Oakland, Leech Farm, Aspinwall and Deshon Veterans Hospitals. Presently the secretary of the local post chapter, Mrs. Kascak has remained active in hospital work and volunteer programs.

However, she has not confined her dedication to veterans alone. She has worked equally hard to promote pride in people of her own national origin. Because of her efforts in this field a nationality insurance program, "Jednota," has become well known to citizens of Slovak descent in the area.

Evidence of the esteem held by veterans groups and the city of McKeesport for Mrs. Kascak was clearly demonstrated by the number of people who attended the testimonial in her honor. More than 200 guests were there, including many prominent figures in the city, county, and State:

John T. Walsh and Bernard Novak, members of the Pennsylvania Legislature; Leonard C. Staisey, chairman of Allegheny County Board of Commissioners; John G. Brosky, judge of common pleas court; Joseph Hreha, past president of the Allied Veterans; David Ward,

chaplain of that organization; Samuel J. Rinella; George Matta, past commander of Catholic War Veterans Post 1559; John R. Yeager, president of Allied Veterans and the Rt. Rev. Msgr. Michal A. Dravecky, chaplain of the Catholic War Veterans Auxiliary and pastor of Holy Trinity Roman Catholic Church, McKeesport.

Mr. Speaker, I believe people such as Mrs. Kascak, who sacrifice much of their private lives to help others, should be recognized and it is with pride that I insert this tribute to her into the RECORD today.

SPECIALTY TUBULAR STEEL IMPORT PROBLEM

HON. FRANK M. CLARK

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1971

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, I would like to address Congress on the import problem and how it relates to the producers and markets of specialty steel tubular products.

The address follows:

SPECIALTY TUBULAR STEEL IMPORT PROBLEM

Of all the mill forms of steel, pipe and tubing account for about 10 to 11% of total shipments of steel. Steel specialty tubular products, in turn, account for about 15% of the shipments of all steel pipe and tubing. Therefore, when we refer to steel specialty tubular products we are referring to a product which makes up about 1½% of the total shipments of all mill forms of steel.

Specialty tubing, by definition, is either seamless (made from a solid round bar of steel) or welded (formed from flat rolled strip and welded into tube form); it is produced in carbon, alloy and stainless steels to meet various special requirements for pressure of mechanical applications. A great number of applications require special metallurgical, physical and mechanical characteristics to meet the needs of the end use service conditions. These can involve combinations of such properties as high temperature strength, low temperature strength, corrosion resistance, abrasion resistance, hardness, toughness and resistance to fatigue failure. On the whole, it is an engineered product; the equipment used to manufacture it is expensive and complex; the "know-how" is by no means simple; and, the cost of engineering development is considerable.

The question has been asked many times—what does specialty tubing do for the people in the United States. The average individual has never seen it, has never bought it in its mill form and, in all probability, if he were shown it and asked what it was, would say it was a piece of pipe. That is one of the clues to the import problems of the specialty tubing industry. The same difference exists between a piece of butt weld water pipe and a seamless stainless nuclear quality tube as exists between a little Piper Cub airplane and the 747; the same difference exists between an outboard motor boat and an aircraft carrier; the same difference exists between a stripped down small automobile and one of these new giant box-car-like truck trailer combinations.

To get back to the question, what does steel specialty tubing do for the people in our country—

First—just about all the electrical power developed in the United States comes to us—

courtesy of steel specialty tubing. In this case it is boiler tubes and related types of tubes of carbon, alloy and stainless steel—sometimes seamless, sometimes welded, depending on pressures and temperatures involved. Steel specialty tubing is used in large quantities in coal, oil and gas fired power generation type boiler installations. Specialty steel tubing is also used in nuclear power generation type boilers.

The automobile we drive contains ball and roller type bearings, a transmission, and a number of other parts—made from steel specialty tubing. The same can be said about trucks, farm machinery, locomotives, railroad cars, airplanes and helicopters—military, commercial, and the other types.

Every gallon of oil, every gallon of gasoline, every gallon or pound of the other hydrocarbons—somewhere in their life were processed through equipment such as furnaces, heat exchangers, stills, and condensers employing steel specialty tubing.

The same can be said about just about every one of the myriad of chemical compounds used by industry, used by farmers and used by homeowners.

And, let's not overlook food processing where the attributes of stainless steel in tube form maintain product purity.

These are but a few of the many uses of steel specialty tubular products. In relation to these uses:

1. No other mill form of steel can do the job at all or, alternately, as economically as steel specialty tubing.

2. No other metal can do the job at all or, alternately, as economically as steel specialty tubing.

3. Domestic producers of steel specialty tubing can adequately take care of the needs of the domestic markets for the product.

4. Domestic producers of steel specialty tubing have in the past, and will in the future, invest their money and their efforts to develop tubular products which will take care of the needs of the market.

What about the import problem?

There are four of the family of steel specialty tubular products which are hurt badly now; a fifth is fast reaching the point of being hurt, and a sixth showing signs of injury.

1. *Seamless stainless and heat resisting tubular products.* Total current domestic production is about 18 thousand tons per year; imports in 1970 were about 6,400 tons. This calculates out to over 35 percent of domestic production.

2. *Seamless alloy pressure type tubular products.* Total current domestic production is about 55,000 tons per year; imports in 1970 were about 12,000 tons. This is about 22 percent of domestic production and it has been increasing yearly.

3. *Seamless carbon steel pressure tubing.* Total current domestic production is about 100,000 tons per year. Believe it or not, until the Tariff Schedule was revised beginning in 1971 there was no way of measuring the imports of the product. Based on market knowledge, however, imports for boiler tubing alone are estimated at 25 to 30 percent of domestic production and increasing yearly.

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. Based on market knowledge, imports of boiler tubing alone are estimated at 30 to 40 percent of domestic production and increasing yearly.

5. The welded stainless steel tubular products member of the family is fast reaching the point of being hurt. Domestic production in the size range $\frac{3}{8}$ " through 4.500" in diameter in 1970, as measured by the Welded Steel Tube Institute is about 28,000 tons. In 1970 imports were about 4,600 tons or over

16% of domestic production, about double that in 1968.

6. The sixth member of the family, currently showing signs of injury, is seamless alloy steel bearing tubing. Domestic production is in the neighborhood of 225 to 250 thousand tons per year. In 1970 imports were 16.5 thousand tons, much higher than 1968 and more than $5\frac{1}{2}$ times what they were in 1964. The market is further injured by increasing imports of finished bearings as well as imports of automobiles and machinery—the prime markets for bearings.

There are other members of the family of steel specialty tubing becoming exposed to imports. The problem we have today came to full bloom since 1964. What will be the problem in five or six more years—unless something is done. We, who are part of this industry, are genuinely concerned.

We are not only concerned because of the quantities of the materials involved and the share of market currently enjoyed by imported steel specialty tubing—but

We are concerned about loopholes and questionable product definition in the Tariff Schedule, the measuring tool for imports. If there is not an unquestionable measuring tool, how can a quota system work?

We are concerned about the fact that scheduled changes in duty actually lower the tariffs on the products currently injured. And, to top it off—unless we are sadly mistaken the cost of entry (duties, taxes and other charges) for these specific products are lower—much lower—for the foreign producer bringing it into this country than we must pay to export the very same product into their countries.

We are concerned about the fact that the voluntary quotas, arranged for in late 1968, did not work with our product in 1969 and this same situation was more grievous in 1970, and there is no reason to say it won't be worse in 1971.

We are concerned because those who make government decisions tend to believe that a tube is a pipe is a tube. They do not appear to recognize that steel specialty tubing is a rather sophisticated product, requires highly specialized manufacturing equipment, and specialized manufacturing know-how, and is an extremely critical product when related to its use.

There are a fair number of companies in the United States who manufacture steel specialty tubing. Some manufacture seamless; some manufacture welded. Some manufacture carbon steel tubing; and some manufacture stainless and heat resisting. Some manufacture pressure tubing; some manufacture mechanical tubing. Some are integrated—that is, make their own steel and process it to the finished tube; some purchase rounds and make seamless tubes; some purchase flat rolled stock and make welded tubes. Some purchase a semi-finished tube hollow and redraw it to smaller sizes.

Some are large units of diversified steel producing companies; some are rather small companies. To put it into today's vernacular, each domestic producer of steel specialty tubing does his own thing. Collectively, they are geared to satisfy the needs of domestic markets.

But these domestic markets simply are not large enough to take care of the productive capacity of the domestic industry and increasing imports from the rest of the world. The domestic markets are not insatiable. The domestic markets for steel specialty tubing are relatively small.

And, what happens when markets diminish, or disappear? Is it not logical to say that the companies which serve that market either go out of business or tool up to manufacture a product for which there is a market?

This is what is happening now in the steel specialty tubing industry. And it can be pre-

dicted that if something is not done to curb the growing imports of the six key products mentioned earlier, and some others on the horizon, this nation of ours will be increasingly dependent upon Japan, West Germany, United Kingdom, Sweden and a number of others.

The subject of imports of steel specialty tubular products may be of little interest to the average citizen of the United States. But none can deny that the average citizen is interested in the products and services supplied to him by the markets for steel specialty tubular products. Consider these markets—electrical power generation, oil, gasoline, the automotive industry, aircraft, chemicals, machine tools, food processing, farm machinery, construction machinery.

It does not appear to be logical that those in government would knowingly permit such vital industries to become dependent upon overseas supplies of a common vital component—steel specialty tubing. But, if something is not done to control the increasing imports of that common vital component—steel specialty tubing—dependence can become a fact.

WINDING DOWN THE WAR BY HEATING IT UP FAST

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1971

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, much comment and controversy has resulted from administration decisions to intercede in Cambodia and mobilize substantial American and South Vietnamese forces near the border of Laos.

In this connection the Nashville Tennessean in a recent editorial questioned the tactic of "Winding Down the War by Heating It Up Fast."

Because of the interest of my colleagues and the American people in our involvement in Southeast Asia, I include the editorial in the RECORD:

WINDING DOWN THE WAR BY HEATING IT UP FAST

In his conversations with television commentators not long ago, President Nixon said the end of the American combat role in Vietnam was in sight; that the war was winding down and that it is "beginning to end."

Lately, the American public has had some object lessons in "winding down a war." One was a resumption of air strikes against North Vietnam in retaliation for having reconnaissance planes fired upon. But the ultimate reason, Mr. Nixon indicated, was to discourage any buildups by the North that would threaten "our remaining forces in Vietnam."

Now, the South Vietnamese, with American support, have launched twin drives into Cambodia and toward Laos. Some 10,000 Saigon troops have made an incursion into Cambodia similar to those across the border last May and June. Seven thousand or more were there already.

The aim of the drive, according to one source, "is to be sure we haven't missed anything that would endanger the withdrawal of U.S. troops."

The strategy behind the thrust at Laos is to cut the Ho Chi Minh trail and convince North Vietnam that any future large scale offensive in Cambodia or in southern South Vietnam might be imperiled by having its supply lines cut off from the rear.

American field commanders have long

wanted to move into Laos and cut the Ho Chi Minh trail, but previously the arguments against it have prevailed. They are that this would only widen an already oversized battle area, undermine the useful facade of a neutralist regime in Laos, and give North Vietnam the excuse it needs to seize Vientiane.

The two operations have already brought threatening noises from Communist China and the pledge to support the Communist forces "until final victory."

In the two operations, South Vietnam is tying up the use of three divisions, which is a questionable expenditure of manpower when the Saigon government has enough problems for its troops at home.

Although American air support backs both operations, it is doubtful that Mr. Nixon would risk the political storm at home by sending U.S. ground forces into Laos. So the action in Cambodia and Laos will have to be carried by the South Vietnamese.

And the question this boils down to is what happens if the Saigon troops do engage in major action—and get bloodied to the point of defeat?

The thrust of Vietnamization was to prepare the South Vietnamese troops to defend their own country against the enemy. But they are now being used to spearhead operations in Cambodia and another aimed at Laos.

If this is part of the process of winding down the war, perhaps the next idea of the planners will be to invade North Vietnam—after all the main sanctuaries and staging areas are there.

THE 150TH ANNIVERSARY OF
GEORGE WASHINGTON UNI-
VERSITY

HON. GARRY BROWN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1971

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, as a graduate of the George Washington National Law Center, I am pleased to join my colleagues today in extending recognition and congratulations to the George Washington University on its 150th anniversary.

Those who live in the Washington area are aware of the contributions that this institution's alumni are making to the immediate community and to the Federal Government. I understand that most recent statistics indicate that some 20,000 graduates reside in the metropolitan area, and that the university is represented by more alumni throughout the Federal Government than any other university in the country.

The school's impact, however, extends far beyond Washington. In my own State of Michigan, for instance, the former Governor and the present Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, George Romney, is a graduate of the George Washington University, as is my colleague and friend representing Michigan's Sixth Congressional District, CHUCK CHAMBERLAIN. I know other States can also count among their leaders in government, business, and the professions, alumni of the George Washington University.

This school's contributions, to the Nation, however, should not be measured solely in quantitative terms, that is, in

numbers of graduates in prominent positions across the country. It is the quality of the contributions being made that is the real measure of the university. And the majority of these contributions are being made relatively quietly in the day-to-day lives of men and women in community after community across our Nation.

One such contribution made by a graduate of the law school in 1899, George V. Weimer, a man little known in the Washington area but widely respected as a circuit court judge in Kalamazoo, Mich., had the greatest influence on my decision to attend the George Washington Law School. His years of service to the community of Kalamazoo exemplified the highest standards of personal and professional integrity and made an inestimable contribution to the quality of life and practice of law in that community.

Mr. Speaker, the quality of Judge Weimer's life and of that of thousands like him, a quality to which the George Washington University made important contributions, is, I think, the real measure of the greatness of this university, and in the final analysis, pays far higher tribute to this institution than any words we may utter here today.

PRESIDENT SETS A PATTERN OF
LEADERSHIP IN DOMESTIC AF-
FAIRS

HON. ROBERT T. STAFFORD

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1971

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, in his first two major addresses to this new Congress—the state of the Union and the budget message—the President has set a pattern of leadership in domestic affairs that shows great promise for this country.

A distinguishing quality of the President's initiatives is their boldness. He has clearly indicated that he does not intend to run a caretaker government; and he has cast away the cosmetic approaches used too often in past administrations. The President's proposals are not rhetoric; they are far reaching, in fact, revolutionary ideas that would change the entire structure of our Government.

A second characteristic of the President's new initiatives is their merit. Whether it is revenue sharing, Government reorganization, welfare reform or health care, the administration has taken a commonsense approach to reform. It has taken a hard look at our domestic problems and put forth meaningful solutions. They are not vague, blue sky ideas, but solid programs which can be enacted now if the Congress only has the will.

In considering the President's legislation, the Congress must do so with utmost seriousness of purpose. There are no throwaways in the President's legislative program. The six great goals are each aimed at solving a critical problem in our society. If we approach them with the same spirit of boldness, of willingness to innovate, as displayed by the administra-

tion, we can bring about these long-needed reforms of government.

SPEECH OF EAGLE SCOUT CHARLES
P. ILLSLEY

HON. SHERMAN P. LLOYD

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1971

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, the Boy Scouts of America is presenting its annual report to President Nixon and to Congress this week through 14 Boy Scouts and Explorers, 12 of whom are regional winners of the Reader's Digest-BSA National Speaking Contest and two of whom were selected for their activities in conservation.

At a kickoff breakfast this morning, presided over by our colleague the Honorable JOHN Y. MCCOLLISTER of Omaha, Nebr., who was himself a member of the Mid-American Council Executive Board, member of the National Council Executive Board, and chairman of region 8 of the Boy Scouts of America, a most impressive presentation speech was made by a young constituent of mine, Eagle Scout Charles P. Illsley of Salt Lake City, who was one of the two 1971 national youth representatives. He is the son of Mr. and Mrs. Charles F. Illsley of 3428 South 2610 West, Salt Lake City. He is a student of Granger High School in Salt Lake City, one of the upper 2 percent of his class and belongs to the National Honor Society.

His speech to the assembled Members of Congress and scouting executives was written only within the last few days, but it represents the dedication of the Boy Scouts of America to a conservation program designated as SOAR, denoting the motto "Save Our American Resources." At the request of many of my colleagues who were impressed with the talk made by Charles under these auspicious circumstances and because of my own interest and desire, I insert in the RECORD for wide distribution and readership the speech which Charles presented:

SPEECH BY EAGLE SCOUT CHARLES P. ILLSLEY

Members of Congress, Scouters, Scouts, and Friends: In the Beginning God created the Heavens and the Earth and every living creature. He created man in his own image and made him steward of the earth. He looked at his handiwork and it was good. God rested on the seventh day.

After the seventh day man began to do a little creating on his own. He progressed from the Stone Age into the Jet Age. Unbelievable advances have been made in technology, medical science. He produced the awe-inspiring mushroom cloud, transplanted human hearts and has left his footprint upon the lunar surface. And yet modern science is still so young that 80% of the scientists who ever lived are alive today.

I think you will agree with me that these are wonderful and exciting times. Yet these changing times have brought many problems . . . Wildlife threatened with extinction, some species have already gone beyond the point of no recall. Our rivers and lakes are polluted and the oceans show signs of refuse in their waters. The very air we breathe bears traces of our technological advances. Some

anthropologists tell us that man is out on a limb and is busy sawing off that limb. We are facing an environmental crisis of a most grievous nature!

President Nixon has challenged the Boy Scouts of America to undertake a massive program of conservation education and action activities in 1971. He challenged us to a keen awareness of importance of using our natural resources wisely. He challenged us knowing this awareness is vital to the young people since they must manage these resources with prudence and imagination in the years ahead.

My generation is the first to view our earth from the moon. The Apollo moon flights have demonstrated with astounding clarity that this "Good Earth" is a closed circuit system. All the water, soil, air, and vegetation so vital to life are contained within this one circuit. There is absolutely no way we can obtain more of these resources.

The youth members of the Boy Scouts of America accept the challenge of President Nixon and Congress. Project SOAR—Save Our American Resources—is designed to meet that challenge by preserving and recycling the elements necessary for life—a process which must occur if man is to live in harmony with his environment.

Project SOAR has three ultimate objectives:

1. The importance of all natural resources is vital to young people personally, to the future of their country, and to their way of life in a democracy.

2. Young people should develop an understanding of their interdependence with their environment.

3. They must also understand their responsibilities as citizens to contribute to the development of a better environment in which to live.

At the last National Jamboree in Faragut Park, Idaho, I heard Chief Scout Executive Aldon Barber quote these lines:

"I am only one, But I am one
I cannot do everything, But I can do something
And that which I can do, is that which I
must do
And by the Grace of God, I will"

Indeed, "One man can make a difference and every man should try."

Project SOAR will motivate the American public through the boy and the young man membership of the Boy Scouts of America. The possibility of some 6 million members telling a conservation story through word and deed to parents and sponsors of scouting alone, could influence a substantial segment of the American public.

Astronaut Ed White made a thought-provoking statement. He was speaking about his thoughts as he walked in space:

"Our problems look mighty small from 180 miles up. The world looks cleaner . . . so much more beautiful. Maybe we can make it that way . . . the way God intended it to be."

The young people are the world's best hope on earth. By what we choose to do, we shall nobly save or meanly lose the last best hope of earth—or earth itself.

Project SOAR is our answer.

**HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 22,
CALLING FOR NATIONAL WEEK
OF CONCERN FOR PRISONERS OF
WAR/MISSING IN ACTION**

Hon. PETER H. B. FRELINGHUYSEN
OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1971

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join in this bipartisan

effort to continue focusing public attention on the plight of American prisoners in Southeast Asia. As I have noted on previous occasions, this problem has become for all of us in this body both a national concern and a national frustration. To date, all attempts by Congress and the executive branch to alleviate this totally unsatisfactory situation have proven unsuccessful. As a result, we have felt rising indignation, not unmixed with a sense of futility.

Nevertheless, Hanoi—despite its intransigence on this issue—is not totally immune from the pressure of U.S. public opinion. Although it has consistently chosen to flout the Geneva Convention to which it is a signatory, the regime has recently attempted to convey the impression—however misleading and inaccurate—that an "official" list of POW's has, in fact, been released. The claim was transparently false, but the attempted deception indicates that Hanoi is listening.

Similarly, a recent upsurge in direct, spontaneous communication with the North Vietnamese leadership apparently has had some effect. For instance, the Herndon Co. of Madison, N.J., which sponsored a "write Hanoi" campaign over a year ago, reports that since the campaign began, three times as much mail has been received from U.S. prisoners.

This joint resolution is designed to signal to the North Vietnamese that American concern over this issue is real and continuing—and that in the long run compliance with our legitimate demands will be in their best interest as well.

I urge my colleagues to join in this effort to make the signal both loud and clear.

A REALISTIC HEALTH CARE PLAN

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1971

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, I was heartened to note that in his state of the Union message, President Nixon introduced a realistic health care plan. We have recently been treated to a great variety of health plans, some of which are patently absurd. I would particularly note one such scheme which would require an appropriation approximately equal to all the money the Government spends on domestic resources.

Such flights of fancy are not in the best interests of this country, and it is reassuring to see that the administration takes health care more seriously.

The President's health proposals are within our financial means and, more important, the administration has put its priorities for health care in the proper order. While it may be politically expedient to promise every citizen free medical care, the administration has rejected such rhetoric and chosen to bite the harder bullet.

Anyone who has had to wait for hours in a doctor's office or been turned away from a hospital because of lack of beds or travel 30 miles to reach the nearest

doctor, knows that our real problem in health care is in the delivery of services. That is the problem the administration has chosen to confront and it should be the problem which the Congress addresses when we discuss health care.

THE AMERICAN FARMER'S INTERESTS WILL NOT BE JEOPARDIZED

HON. KEITH G. SEBELIUS

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1971

Mr. SEBELIUS. Mr. Speaker, in the January 19 issue of the Southwestern Miller, a most respected and well-read publication throughout the world and a leading spokesman for the breadstuffs industry, there is an editorial I would like to commend to the attention of my colleagues.

The editorial concerns a letter from the White House written to my good friend and colleague, Senator Bob DOLE, of my home State of Kansas. The letter is significant because it underlines this administration's policy regarding American trade, agriculture and this Nation's future grain negotiations. In effect, it states the American farmer's interests will not be jeopardized by the European Common Market advocates of liberal trade.

The letter also serves another purpose. It points out specifically how Senator DOLE is continuing to fight for the best interests of his State and the American farmer—not only as a U.S. Senator, but as the leader of the Republican Party as well. The letter follows:

A LANDMARK LETTER

The recent letter from the White House to Senator Robert Dole of Kansas spelling out President Nixon's position in regard to British grain import proposals is an official utterance of major importance in the recent history of American trade policy. That letter, written by William E. Timmons, a White House aide, at the suggestion of President Nixon, most significantly discloses that the President has told Prime Minister Edward Heath of the United Kingdom that the U.S. government is "unwilling to accede" to the British requests.

What the British proposed and the President rejected are two actions regarded as a preamble to eventual U.K. membership in the European Community—an increase in minimum import prices on grains next spring to be followed by adoption of a variable levy system beginning next July 1. The President has the power to reject the increase in minimum prices in view of the U.S. participation in a five-country agreement that originally allowed the U.K. to impose minimum levels on grains moving into the country from abroad. The aim of that original agreement was to lessen the cost to the British government of deficiency payments made to farmers at levels that reflected the difference between actual market income and specific support levels. Since imports govern the level of the U.K. market, British espousal of import minimums was at least understood among supplying nations as a step to relieve a severe strain on the budget. It also is recognized that the proposal to raise the minimums in that original agreement is simply a preliminary step toward increasing grain prices within the U.K., not as a budgetary move, but as a pre-

ude to embracing the Common Agricultural Policy of the European Community.

That the Heath government has not sought to suppress knowledge of its ultimate goal is indicated by the second request—that the United States accept its wish to adopt a variable levy system on grain imports beginning with the 1971-72 crop year. As the Timmons letter notes, the U.S. ability to prevent that from happening is not as great as in the case of the import price advance, since the latter can only occur with the consent of the United States. "We do have very strong rights under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade," the White House letter notes. From the tone of the letter, it is obvious that the President made clear that this country strongly opposes adoption by Britain of a variable levy system. No other course could be followed by the President unless it was his intention to forsake agriculture as one of the principal advocates of liberal trade.

The letter from Senator Dole that prompted the welcome White House reply is in itself a highly significant communication, coming as it does from the man who now serves as chairman of the Republican National Committee. The senator, representing Kansas in the House for many years before his election to the Senate two years ago, always has displayed a keen awareness of the importance of trade to the economy of the nation's most important wheat-producing state. His standing in relation to the national scene is now substantially enlarged and strengthened. For that reason, Senator Dole's recognition that British negotiations for entry into the European Community stand as about the last hope in achieving moderation in the Community's destructive agricultural policies is also important.

One of the most intriguing aspects of the White House letter is its confirmation that the British government "made another proposal to which we have not formally reacted" during the recent visit of Secretary of Agriculture Hardin to London. That hints of some negotiating headway that should be facilitated by the ground rules President Nixon laid down so emphatically for future grain negotiations.

KIWANIS OPERATION DRUG ALERT

HON. JAMES D. (MIKE) McKEVITT
OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 9, 1971

Mr. McKEVITT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of the House of Representatives to the accomplishments of Kiwanis Clubs around the Nation over the past 2 years in informing our young people of the dangers of drugs. Denver is a case in point. Two years ago the Capital City Kiwanis Club launched its "Kiwanis Operation Drug Alert." It is a program that sent speakers, including ex-addicts, into the junior high and high schools of the city to inform young people about the dangers of drugs. The program has been tremendously successful, although its real success probably cannot be measured.

One of the leaders in the Kiwanis program has been Mr. Theodore "Ted" R. Johnson of Denver. He is the international president of Kiwanis. We are extremely proud of Ted Johnson in Denver; among other things he is the first Denverite to serve as international president of Kiwanis. I am told that the next project of Kiwanis will be to focus on

improving the quality of life. I am confident that this new program will also be a success and I again want to commend Ted Johnson for the leadership he has provided as international president of Kiwanis.

GREECE—A DIFFERENT OPINION

HON. JOHN G. SCHMITZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 9, 1971

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, the following letter appeared in the Williams Alumni Review, fall 1970. I hope that all my colleagues will take the time to read this short letter written by Mr. Bayard Stockton who has lived as a journalist in Greece since 1964.

The letter follows:

DIFFERENT OPINION

To the Editor:

I hate to take issue with fellow Williams graduates (or erstwhile professors), but Professor Simpson's sympathetic review of James Beckett's *Barbarism in Greece* in the spring number of the *Review*, as well as the substance of the book itself deserve a few words.

Firstly, I am a journalist and have lived in Greece since 1964. Secondly, I have written a book about the Greek revolution which will shortly appear in the U.S. (*Phoenix with a Bayonet*, Georgetown Publications, scheduled to be on sale Oct. 15.)

All the foreign correspondents in Athens and most of the Western foreign embassies here have gone to considerable lengths to determine whether the charges of systematic torture raised primarily by disgruntled Greek exiles such as Andreas Papandreu are justified. None of us has been able to substantiate the charge. There have been isolated cases of torture, due to the zealous officiousness of individual policemen. These officers have been disciplined. Papandoulos himself once unguardedly said he would hang any cop from a tree in Constitution Square whom he determined was guilty of torture.

The charges are part of a wider effort, subtly directed and heavily financed, using the facile exiles as well as well-meaning liberals to discredit a regime which is demonstrably improving the lot of the Greek citizen. The chaos that existed before was real. One simple instance is that I rarely received the *Review* because the postal system was so inefficient.

As for the documentary record. I can only say that misinformation is a highly tricky but effective technique practiced by the Soviets and their allies. I was interviewed by one of the Amnesty International investigators; he struck me as biased, woefully misinformed and naively conspiratorial. Andreas Papandreu, appearing in front of the Council of Europe's Human Rights Commission could not remember whether it was the toenails, the fingernails or maybe the teeth of a friend of his which had been "extracted." Witnesses were coached, suborned and threatened by the militant "liberals." The hearings were in no way fair to the Greek government which, however, was in no position to make its case heard effectively. The International Red Cross report merely examined the conditions of detention of the Island detainees, and found them by and large satisfactory.

Some of these thoughts, and some speculation about where the Revolution will go, or even its significance for other countries, appears in a booklet called *The New Approach*

published locally, which is in the Williams Library.

A couple of final points: a) the Greeks who work in West Germany (but not in large number in France), seek the employment themselves. To only a limited extent are they recruited. Most are anxious to go in order to build a nest egg for investment, marriage or whatever when they return to Greece; b) The Human Rights charges which are now being resurrected at Strasbourg have become so obviously tangential that one of the earlier prosecuting nations, The Netherlands, will not associate itself with the latest brief.

Far better than my words here is the advice to anyone who feels strongly about the matter of the justice of the Colonels' seizure of power and/or of their methods (which admittedly are at times painfully obtuse) to come to Greece and investigate as much as he likes. No one will stop him. In fact, the government welcomes open and honest inquiry from abroad.

BAYARD STOCKTON '51.

Athens, Greece.

A TRIBUTE TO THE CARRIER PIGEON

HON. CHARLES J. CARNEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 9, 1971

Mr. CARNEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce a bill today in support of issuance of a special postage stamp as a tribute to the effective services performed by homing pigeons for the Armed Forces of the United States during three major wars: World War I, World War II, and the Korean conflict. It is not much of an exaggeration to say that without the pigeons we would have had trouble making it through those wars.

The pigeon has been used as a battlefield courier for almost 2,000 years. Extensively employed in World War I, the pigeon was found capable of flying 500 miles in one day, averaging 40 to 50 miles per hour. With a tail wind he could average 70 miles per hour. Compared to the courier dog's range of 4 miles at 10 miles per hour, the pigeon clearly proved his worth.

The U.S. Army, unlike Great Britain, continued maintenance of its pigeon lofts after World War I. With the outbreak of World War II, the Army Signal Corps instituted emergency measures. The pigeon center was expanded and 40,000 pigeons were raised and trained for service. Hundreds more were ordered, and civilians were encouraged to contribute homing pigeons for military service.

During the Korean war once again the need for a speedy, yet mobile, means of communications to serve small probing patrols was recognized. Wire, although it has been reduced in weight and bulk until a man can carry a mile's length of it on his back, was not the answer. Then, too, even a whispered conversation carried a long way on a cold, still night. When patrols go out the enemy gets pretty close. Radio was not the answer in this situation, either. The answer to the problem was clear once someone suggested it—pigeons. So the Signal Corps came up with a loft of them.

The pigeon proved his worth against

the Korean hawks. Those Korean hawks were enormous—the size of an eagle. Twenty pigeons of a total of 116 received for active duty in Korea were victims of this enemy. Only one pigeon is known to have been killed by friendly forces, this by a U.N. soldier who had a language barrier problem. There were no reported desertions.

The pigeon is not without his faults. He would rather lose valuable time by following rivers and valleys than fly over a mountain. No one has been able to convince our fine feathered friend that the shortest distance between two points is a straight line.

Nevertheless, I think all must agree, Mr. Speaker, that the faithful carrier pigeons who have served us so well have earned not only a place in our history books, but a special tribute, in their honor. It seems to me highly appropriate that this tribute be the issuance of a special postage stamp.

ON REVENUE SHARING

HON. EDWIN B. FORSYTHE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1971

Mr. FORSYTHE. Mr. Speaker, President Nixon's far-reaching revenue-sharing proposal is a program that I believe the Congress, in its wisdom, must enact.

I am pleased to join many of my colleagues in sponsoring the President's \$5 billion general revenue sharing legislation, which I believe is a vitally needed first step toward breathing new life into our State and local governments.

I realize that there are problems with far-sighted programs of this nature, and I am sure there are pitfalls which must be avoided.

But I believe the time has come for the politicians of this country to begin turning the power of government back to the people. And, I don't believe the people will be satisfied until this is done.

Americans today, as our President has said, are tired of an impersonal government. They are demanding self-determination and, my colleagues, this means that there must be a shift from Federal rule to home rule, from faceless manipulation to personal participation.

During the political campaign of 1968 Richard Nixon remarked in Williamsburg, Va. that the American system had gathered so much momentum that we could not detect the slow erosion of our personal freedom, the gradual diminishing of human dignity.

And, he added:

Now, a generation later, we feel it. And we miss what we lost.

He said:

Americans have the feeling of being a cog in a huge machine; of being no longer in control of our own lives; of not having our own important say in the direction of our communities and our nation.

He said further:

Then we must find a way to make government work for all of us without dominating any one of us. We have to establish new re-

spect for the qualities of initiative, personal sacrifice, and readiness to seize opportunity, that made the individual American the wonder of the world.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I believe this total \$16 billion revenue sharing program recommended to us by the administration is a beginning in the realization of this goal.

There are those who say in this Chamber that we cannot trust our localities and our States to responsibly spend money collected by Federal taxes.

For 38 years power has been drained from the people and it has been transferred to Washington, where it has intoxicated generations of politicians and bureaucrats. I wonder if this is really any better.

I have said many times that Government can be operated most effectively and most efficiently by the people who know and understand the local needs.

These people back home want to be heard. They want to have a greater say in the governmental decisions that affect their daily lives and their futures. I believe promises can, indeed, be transformed into performances at the local level.

Mr. Speaker, I say we must untie the hands of our local officials and give them the means to cope with the critical problems with which they are beset. I am convinced this can be accomplished with the assurance that the job will be done. The Federal Government always will have the means to withhold money if it is misdirected or misused by the States and localities.

Recent surveys have revealed that a huge majority of Americans support the concept of revenue sharing.

Local officials and Governors across our land have urged approval of the program.

A former distinguished member of this body, William T. Cahill—now the fine Governor of New Jersey—has urged Congress to enact this program.

The New Jersey Legislature was the first in the entire Nation to adopt a resolution calling for a constitutional convention to devise a revenue sharing plan.

Since then, many other States have followed.

Meanwhile, the newly-elected chairman of the New Jersey Association of Chosen Freeholders, George Makin of Ocean County, has also urged approval of the program.

These are only examples of the burgeoning support the proposal is receiving in my State, and my district.

I urge my colleagues in the House to join in support of this most important measure.

UNIT RULE

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1971

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include my current weekly report to the people of my district as follows:

YOUR CONGRESSMAN REPORTS FROM WASHINGTON

(By FRANK T. BOW, Member of Congress)

WASHINGTON.—In their unseemly haste to abolish one of the major reforms of the legislative reorganization act, the "liberal" northern Democrats in the House of Representatives resorted to one of the most undemocratic parliamentary procedures ever devised.

Having proposed that the minority staffing provisions of the new law be repealed as a first act of business of the new Congress, the "liberals" went on to insist that the action of the Democratic caucus be binding upon all members of that party. They proposed and the caucus adopted a "unit rule", under which all Members of the party are bound and required to vote as directed if two-thirds of the caucus supports an issue.

This "unit rule" has been the tool of political bossism over the years, wherever a ruthless majority seeks to stifle dissent. It strikes at the heart of the parliamentary system. The whole concept of free and open debate is destroyed by the unit rule. No Member of the Democratic Party is free to speak his own mind or vote the dictates of his own conscience when the caucus invokes the unit rule.

I hope this cynical exercise of antidemocratic power will be kept in mind when the same men who invoked its use this year speak publicly about the necessity for reform and modernization of the legislative process. They have taken a step backward into the era of the Tammany Hall bosses and the one-party politics of the old South. It is difficult to reconcile their public pronouncements with their private power plays.

EDITORIAL REACTION TO THE PRESIDENT'S STATE OF THE UNION MESSAGE

HON. SAMUEL L. DEVINE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1971

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, editorial reaction to the President's state of the Union message has been overwhelmingly favorable. While most newspapers have quite properly reserved the right for further comment pending the details of the administration's legislation, they have been almost unanimous in pointing out that the President did address himself directly to our tough domestic problems.

As an illustration of this point, I insert in the RECORD six editorials which represent a broad geographic spectrum:

[From the Birmingham News, Jan. 24, 1971]

A NEW REVOLUTION

The address Richard Nixon delivered to a joint session of Congress Friday night was far from a run-of-the-mill State of the Union message.

In its organization, its emphasis and its eloquence, it was extraordinary.

Foregoing the customary broad-brush treatment of the situation in which the nation finds itself at a particular time, Mr. Nixon chose to confine himself to six "great goals" which, if achieved, he said, could launch a "new revolution" in this country—a peaceful revolution as exciting and significant as the revolution out of which came the United States of America.

There will be, obviously, considerable and heated debate of his six recommendations. The debate will not necessarily follow strict party lines, for some of what he proposes is

distinctly un-Republican—or at least un-traditional-Republican.

Just about everyone has come around to the view that his proposed "full employment budget," involving a deficit up to the amount of federal revenues which would be generated if the nation were experiencing full employment of its labor force, is necessary and feasible.

And there's not likely to be much opposition to his conservation and environmental protection goal, although no doubt there will be opposition to specific proposals for achieving it. The people simply demand that greater attention be given to this matter, and congressmen know how to sense their constituents' mood.

The concern here is that the environment is such a politically attractive subject these days that they may stumble over themselves trying to outdo each other, and thus end up doing little.

Less unanimity exists on the desirability of the family assistance plan—a guarantee of a base income of \$1600 a year plus \$860 in food stamps, for a family of four—which is at the heart of Mr. Nixon's reform program.

There is widespread agreement that welfare reform is urgently needed; there is agreement with the President's avowed goal of aiding the needy and stopping aid to those who could help themselves but won't. The President's advisers believe that eventually the program proposed by him will encourage welfare recipients to get off the dole and begin producing rather than consuming tax revenues. But they admit that's a fairly long-range hope; the immediate effect would be to add millions more names to the welfare rolls.

We'll have to wait further development of the President's proposals in the health field. His call for more money for medical education and cancer research was clear enough and will have strong support; his ideas for how to guarantee medical care for the poor are not yet as clear, and this issue will be further clouded by efforts of some Democrats to expand the concept to cover all citizens, not just the poor, with a blanket national health insurance program.

The most dramatic part of the President's speech, the part earning for him the right to label his proposals "revolutionary," was that section containing his recommendation for a massive reversal of the tides of power in the country.

For several decades those tides have moved inexorably toward Washington, where they have created a pool of centralized power. Mr. Nixon said, in effect, that too much power has accumulated there, that it can't be exercised effectively to serve the needs of the people, and that it is time to begin returning some power to the governments nearest the people—and with the power, the resources for carrying out their increased responsibilities and opportunities.

This, truly, is the sort of "revolution" in which all Americans—most pointedly including those who have been tempted by the street orators to believe that violence is the only means of changing "the system"—can enlist.

It won't be an easily won revolution, for those who exercise the power now won't surrender it easily. Nor will there be total agreement on strategy and tactics—revenue sharing, for example, or drastic reorganization of executive departments.

But he has raised a stirring banner and—faced with a Congress dominated by the other party and recognizing the reality of the system by which the President proposes and Congress disposes—he invited the lawmakers to assume the credit for enacting his proposals: "This can be known as the Congress which . . ."

Needless to say, he is likely to remind voters next year of his own role in all this—and, likewise, of Congress's.

If the Democrats stall or subvert his "revolution," he can remind the voters just as easily that "this is the Congress which did not . . ."

As we said, it was an extraordinary political document.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Jan. 25, 1971]

REVOLUTIONARY PROGRAM

President Nixon was not exaggerating when he spoke of his State of the Union program as revolutionary. And it is no exaggeration to say that it will call for an almost revolutionary burst of activity on Congress's part if the program's potential for good is to be realized. The President has set forth measures which would shake the federal government to its foundations and work great changes in the lives of tens of millions of Americans. Congress must respond constructively. If the much that is progressive and worthwhile in this program is passed, there will be ample credit for all persons and parties.

It would be a serious mistake—practically and, we also believe, politically—for Congress not to study President Nixon's bold and far-reaching program carefully and with constructive goodwill. For there is a great deal in it which, whether in exactly this form or with adaptations, goes to meet a number of today's gravest problems. At the very least, this program seeks to make both the instrumentalities of government and federal programs more responsive to the needs of today's complex and troubled society.

Welfare reform, seeking to combine a floor under poverty with work incentives, is desperately needed to bring dignity and order out of a situation which grows more chaotic and unsatisfactory daily.

Revenue-sharing with state and local government has become an absolute must if these are to be restored to financial health and to social and political effectiveness. Furthermore, President Nixon is on sound ground when he recognizes that the federal government has become so immense and remote as to be "musclebound." Sixteen billion dollars is a vast sum, but it is not too large for the vast job which needs to be done.

We warmly welcome the President's decision to confront the problem of federal reform. Whether the amalgamation of the 12 remaining cabinet posts into eight is the best approach must await further study. But we applaud the idea of zeroing in on Economic Development, Human Resources, Natural Resources and Community Development because these sum up in broad but succinct outline so much of today's challenge to make life better.

It is natural that increasing thought be paid to better and more equitable health care for all. But each individual must be allowed to choose the method of healing which his conscience dictates. Furthermore, care must be exercised that no profession, medical or otherwise, be given undue influence or power in national life.

Few physical changes could make life pleasanter for more people than a great national park, open space and recreation program. It is desperately needed.

An expansionary, deficit budget will be justified to the degree that it stimulates the economy, lowers joblessness, without encouraging or maintaining inflation. This can be achieved, but it will require bold and firm guidance and control.

This program could work tremendous national changes, most of them in a needed direction. We urge that, in this period of social, economic and political crisis, this program be studied for what it can do for the nation, not for what it can do for party or politician. It will, of course, require refinements. But let these have the single aim of increasing the program's potential for good.

[From the Gary Post-Tribune, Jan. 23, 1971]

HAS THE STATE ENOUGH UNION?

The 92nd probably will not be "recorded as the greatest Congress in this nation's history" as President Nixon says it has a chance to become. Neither is it likely to join him in "a new American revolution . . . as profound, as far reaching, as exciting" as the one 200 years ago. That probably would be asking too much of a Democratic Congress working with a Republican President in a time, which, while continually critical, is not gripped by the sort of overriding crisis which tends to blot out partisan differences.

However, by working together through compromise toward some of the generally popular, though in detail controversial, "six great goals" of the President's State of the Union message, the two branches could get much done that needs doing, much that most people want done.

The danger is that for reasons sometimes partisan and sometimes ideological or controversial they won't make as much progress as they should. The hope must be that both sides see that there is more to be gained in the 1972 elections, as well as for the country, in getting more done than did the 91st Congress.

The President verbally at least recognized that potential in discussing welfare reform, which he called the "most important" part of his first listed goal of "left over legislation." He said "we may honestly disagree on what to do but we can meet." They didn't last time around. We still believe, though, the President is on sound ground in advocating both an income floor and the work incentive concepts. So do many congressmen. Somewhere they should agree on details.

Everyone is for the "second great goal" of "full prosperity in peacetime," and the President has shown courage in departing Republican orthodoxy to propose an expansionary "full employment budget" (one with a built in deficit) as one way of achieving it. If Congress balks at that it needs to find an alternative that works. But the economy needs more than oratory.

The third goal of attacking environmental problems is one everyone favors, but the big problem here could be Democratic liberals wanting to spend more than the President and forcing vetoes which could hurt both sides. The public will want more action than extremism. That same danger may be involved in the fourth goal of "improving the nation's health care" with some Democrats already pushing for a "health insurance" program so broad that Nixon might balk.

Revenue sharing with the states and cities may face its toughest fight from Democratic conservatives led by powerful Ways and Means Chairman Wilbur Mills. Still, the President's request to put \$5 billion more into it without cutting other urban programs should win it new liberal support. There is courage in the proposed executive reorganization by cutting 12 Cabinet departments to 8. It could bring sounder business management. The question may be how sound it is politically considering entrenched interests of some in the bureaucracy and some in Congress.

The "Union" as the President sees it is in a "State" of opportunity for real progress, but it will require hard-headed common sense and much political unselfishness to achieve it.

[From the Times-Picayune, Jan. 25, 1971]

NIXON MESSAGE WELL CONCEIVED

For his State of the Union message, President Nixon has delivered a well-conceived document of unusual depth for what it can mean to the nation domestically.

Who can argue against need for: welfare reform, stimulation of the economy, bettered health care, more financial help for state and

local government, overhaul of sprawling bureaucracy and improvement or restoration of our natural environment?

Mr. Nixon will be unfolding his blueprints for specifications on how he believes these goals best accomplished. And it is at this juncture his approaches will come under close—even hypercritical—examination in the 92nd Congress and the country.

The message was far from routine. It dealt with what confronts individual Americans in putting bread on their tables, doctoring their ills, preventing deterioration in services provided them by their local governments, alleviating the smothering load of impersonalized government and protecting their natural surroundings.

Questions do arise, but they are not to be argued before specific programs are forthcoming from the White House. That is, they are not to be condemned unless there is partisan resolve that a Republican president is incapable of good proposals.

That some in Congress are willing to pass judgment on the six-goal objective prematurely before seeing its details is a fresh nudge that the new Congress may be even less congenial to the President than the undistinguished 91st. For the presidential election is 21 months away.

Comparison of Mr. Nixon's first and second State of the Union messages mirrors changing times. A year ago the emphasis fell on peace; curbing inflation with such measures as a balanced budget; crime control, and anti-pollution.

Now withdrawal from South Vietnam is well advanced; inflation curbs are slowing down the economy to the point that stimulation has priority, including an expansionary budget; crime is subsiding here and there, if not in New Orleans; anti-pollution efforts have made first strides, however unsteady.

The 91st Congress did a pedestrian job in dealing with many great national concerns, and in a variety of respects gave short shrift to presidential objectives set forth in the 1970 State of the Union message.

For the country's sake, we hope there is a larger area of agreement in the months to come.

[From the New York Times, Jan. 24, 1971]
NIXON'S "REVOLUTION"

President Richard M. Nixon's State of the Union message more than lived up to advance billing that it would be a bold blockbuster recharting the whole course of American government.

What Mr. Nixon has proposed is nothing less than a complete break with the philosophy of centralized power that has dominated the nation for two generations.

The President called his blueprint a "new American Revolution." Perhaps "restoration" would be more accurate, for it would revive the concept of coexisting federal and state centers of authority on which the wise framers of the U.S. Constitution based our society.

President Nixon will rely on two tools in fashioning this 180-degree turnaround from the policies of the past 40 years. The first is revenue-sharing, the pass-along of federal funds to states and communities with the fewest possible strings attached. The second is a drastic shake-up of the executive branch to make its departments correspond to functional requirements rather than serve parochial interests.

THE MESSAGE

To President Nixon, the State of the Union message was a call to "a New American Revolution," offering a chance "to close the gap between promise and performance in American government" and providing "the foundation of a new greatness . . . in all the years to come."

To the Republican leader of the House, the President "unveiled a visionary course for the nation."

To a member of the majority leadership, the message was "Pabulum."

How the 1971 State of the Union message will finally be seen is, for the present, a question without an answer. The speech is either a milestone in the physical structuring and the philosophic development of American government, or it is a bag of tattered dreams. The decision depends on two actions that have not yet taken place. First, the presentation to Congress of specific proposals, filling in the details of Mr. Nixon's six great goals. Second, the reaction of Congress to those specific proposals.

The President has it in his power to transform his bright vision into a shallow bid for political advantage. He can guarantee the failure of his plan to reverse the steadily increasing flow of power to the center of government by using his pledge to return the power to the people as a declaration of war on Congress. He can reduce his revenue-sharing program to an attack on the social progress of the New Deal, the Fair Deal, the New Frontier, the Great Society. He can taint his welfare reform plans with reaction and repression. He can try to pin the label on obstructionism on the 92nd Congress. He can scrap his revolution for a campaign issue.

Congress is possessed of equal powers of destruction. As the presidential election draws near, the Democratic leadership will be tempted to view the Nixon proposals not as an administration program to be considered on its merits, but as a political target to be shot on sight.

But there is reason to believe that both the President and the Democratic leaders recognize the fact that the critical needs of the country relegate the question of whether Mr. Nixon will be a one-term President to a position of secondary importance. The President had no word of criticism for past congressional performance. He made, instead, an eloquent plea for future cooperation. Senator Mansfield, the majority leader, called the President's message "excellent and hopeful," adding: "I want to see the specifics; it was painted with a very broad brush."

Senator Mansfield is right on both counts. He will have more to say on the program when the details are spelled out. So will we. But the speech was extraordinary in eloquence and in scope. There were notable omissions—crime, race and violence were scarcely mentioned. But something more important than the missing legislative details was presented to Congress and to the American people. They saw a President unawed by new, broad programs, a President willing to change governmental and economic concepts in the face of changing conditions, a President seemingly eager to meet the complex challenges of leadership. If the promise of a change of presidential style contained in the State of the Union message is translated into the reality of administration performance, the "long, dark night of the American spirit" that Mr. Nixon spoke of may indeed be ending.

ONLY HALF THE PIPELINE FACTS

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1971

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, a recent issue of the Detroit Free Press carried an editorial commenting unfavorably on the Department of the Interior's environ-

mental impact statement with regard to the proposed trans-Alaska pipeline.

So that my colleagues may have an opportunity to be familiar with the Free Press' views on this matter, I insert the text of the editorial in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

ONLY HALF THE PIPELINE FACTS

In the case of the new oil pipeline proposed for Alaska, former Secretary of the Interior Walter Hickel has the right idea. If environmental safeguards are established, there's no evident reason why the pipeline shouldn't be built.

But the performance of present Interior officials has so far been less than encouraging. The draft report they issued Wednesday in support of the project fails to include key details on pipeline design, and on the location of segments elevated to avoid melting the Alaskan permafrost.

Thus the public hearings planned for February may fall well short of full and energetic examination. "If you don't know what you're commenting on, how can you comment?" one environmentalist complains. And if Interior hears none but pabulum criticism, how can it arrive at balanced conclusions on how best to complete the project?

Interior hasn't been very forthright even about the purposes of the line. The draft report said the project would serve national security by reducing dependence on Middle Eastern oil. But in truth very little Middle Eastern oil comes to the United States, and any immediate security value in the Alaskan line would be indirect at best.

The line has a great deal more to do with sustaining the economic health of a nation that runs on oil and oil-using machines. That is well enough. Societies must run and, as they do, an environmental price must be paid. The only alternative is to clean the earth of humanity altogether.

But the price can be kept in bounds, and society's incursions on nature planned with more diligence than Interior is displaying. This pipeline project is a critical factor in the Alaskan environment, and the safeguards taken will set precedents for later attempts to use the earth without poisoning it.

Full understanding and discussion would be better for all concerned.

WELFARE IN AMERICA EXAMINED

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1971

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, Nick Kotz of the Washington Post has written a comprehensive series of articles on welfare in America. He notes in closing that:

America may or may not make the called-for re-allocations in the nation's wealth, resources, and energies, but observers of the welfare crisis believe fast, short-range action is mandatory.

I recommend these articles, from February 7 to 9, 1971, editions of the Post, to my colleagues:

THE WELFARE TIDE—A HUMAN CRISIS

(By Nick Kotz)

Bertha Hernandez supported her family in the slums of Houston, Tex., for 18 years on the strength of her back and her ability to turn out spotless laundry for the ladies in the suburbs. The tiny Mexican-American woman raised three sons by working seven

days a week, earning \$30 to \$45 when business was good.

She never went near a welfare office until 1968, for a number of reasons: Under Texas welfare regulations she made too much money. She knew the state seldom helped "her people." The presence of a husband further disqualified her for public welfare, even though he drifted in and out of the household and only occasionally contributed a few dollars earned by moving furniture or digging ditches. And she was proud.

But in 1968, a national tide reached Bertha Hernandez.

The tide was a phenomenon of the '60s. The civil rights movement began to show that in many cases poverty was the result of discrimination and therefore not a personal sin. The war against poverty further dramatized the problems. Federal court decisions challenged welfare agencies to justify why they arbitrarily excluded poor families from payments. The easy entry, low-skilled jobs in the central cities began to shrink with automation and the growth of suburbs. Inflation began to make it impossible to raise an urban family of four on \$45 a week. Television convinced the poor that the nation really might care about them.

For Mrs. Hernandez, personal circumstances helped make the decision; her age, a final breakdown of her 18-year marriage, the accumulated wear and tear of scrubbing and ironing seven days a week.

"I was too proud before," Mrs. Hernandez says, "but the migraine headaches got just too bad."

She went to the Texas State Welfare Department office that October and signed up for \$38.50 a week under the Aid for Dependent Children (AFDC) program.

Thus the four members of the Hernandez family became a statistic in what President Nixon has called a national scandal—the crisis in welfare.

In Texas, AFDC rolls have doubled in the two years since Mrs. Hernandez's family became recipients. Nationally, in the same two-year period, AFDC rolls have gone from six million to nine million recipients. Today, almost 10 percent of the nation's children are being supported by welfare. In 1968, AFDC welfare payments cost taxpayers \$2.5 billion. Today, the cost is \$5.3 billion annually, with the federal government paying \$2.9 billion and state and local government footing the balance.

Some state and local officials, unprepared for the new tide or unwilling to appropriate funds to meet it, say the program is pushing them toward bankruptcy.

Similar welfare programs operate for the aged, the disabled and the blind, but the AFDC program, with accompanying Medicaid benefits, accounts for most of the rising cost and numbers.

IN MASS CONFUSION

"Our welfare funding is in mass confusion, our recipient rolls are growing by 10,000 monthly," Texas Gov. Preston Smith told his state legislature last month. His answer: fund the state's share of Mrs. Hernandez's AFDC check for only 10 more months, meanwhile beseeching the federal government to take over the entire program.

The present AFDC program has "degraded the poor and defrauded the taxpayer," said President Nixon. His solution: the proposed Family Assistance Program, "the most comprehensive and far-reaching effort to reform social welfare in nearly four decades."

Mr. Nixon's plan, now before Congress, would provide more federal funds to reduce the state's share (22 per cent in Texas) of Mrs. Hernandez's \$154 monthly welfare check, on which she is supporting Rudy, 17, Philip, 13, and Robert, 10. But the President's proposal would not add a penny to her check, since Mrs. Hernandez's payment already exceeds the \$1,600 annual (\$133 monthly) fed-

eral guarantee of the program for a four-member family.

In fact, payments to those now on AFDC would rise in only the seven Southern states that now pay less than \$1,600 annually, while 36 other states, including Texas, would continue providing support at less than the official federal poverty line and less than their own established standards of need.

Since all the Hernandez children are of school age the Family Assistance Plan would require Mrs. Hernandez to accept either job training or jobs offered her at a minimum wage of at least \$1.20 an hour. If she found a job she could still keep part of her welfare check "as a work incentive," but not necessarily as much as present welfare regulations would permit her to keep if she were working now.

\$3,920 MAXIMUM

The Nixon plan also would provide, for the first time, federal income supplements to 12 million persons in families of "the working poor," permitting up to \$1,600 in federal aid to boost their total incomes to a maximum of \$3,920.

In the eyes of many angry taxpayers and politicians, Mrs. Hernandez and people like her are lazy, cheaters, breeders of illegitimate children and riders in welfare Cadillacs. To sympathetic liberals, she is the product of a culture of poverty that has trapped 25 million Americans at the bottom of this most affluent society.

Mrs. Hernandez's life does not fit traditional welfare myths, but her attitudes and recent actions are indicative of the new aspirations of the welfare poor.

Growing up in the generations-rooted poverty of the Southwest's Mexican-Americans, she never finished the sixth grade in school. Of her \$154 monthly welfare check, \$30 goes for rent in overcrowded public housing and \$37 for food stamps "that don't stretch a whole month." When the children need shoes, she bakes and sells pies; when Rudy wanted to study the clarinet, she traded out \$40 worth of laundry work for a used one. She states forcefully that "my middle-class concerns include group therapy, which she believes is helping Philip with emotional difficulties."

And she is no longer ashamed of welfare. Although she doesn't look the part, she is even blossoming as a community leader "to help people get the right to a decent life." Less than five feet tall, a dumpty little woman with long brown hair, she appears older than her 43 years. She wore an apron when timidly attending her first welfare rights meeting. Now she sits on three community boards, is determined that other poor people get on welfare, that benefits be raised, and that the poor be permitted full access to education and all the benefits of an affluent society.

Bertha Hernandez, welfare statistic, symbolizes a new movement in this country—a movement regarded both by critics and advocates as a welfare revolution.

Strangely enough knowledgeable critics of the spiraling welfare rolls and advocates of expanded government aid for the poor agree closely about most of the long-term and short-term causes of the welfare revolution.

Conservative welfare commissioners such as Burton Hackney of Texas and William Sterret of Indiana agree, for example, with much of the analysis given by Richard Cloward, a professor at the Columbia University School of Social Work and resident philosopher for the national welfare rights movement:

A 25-year migration of unskilled black, brown and white poor from rural areas to the cities created a vast pool of eligible poor people who originally came to cities seeking work and a better life. Most worked at menial jobs, survived off the charity of relatives or lived by their own wits, hustling in the swelling ghettos. Their economic plight worsened as unskilled and semi-skilled grew fewer and

industry moved out of the central cities into the suburbs.

At this point, unemployed men began deserting their growing families in record numbers and the scene was set for a welfare explosion. And then the political climate forced open the welfare system, which had been tightly guarded until this point by an ingenious set of federal, state and local restrictive practices.

"The '50s were a period of calm in the cities, so there was no pressure to open the rolls," says Prof. Cloward, "but the riot-torn '60s were a different matter. The federal government responded through its intervention to try to deal with the turbulence in the cities. The political response and the overwhelmingly important force was the anti-poverty program—the Vistas, legal services, community action agencies—that's what spawned the welfare rights movement.

"The recent rise in the rolls is chiefly a political phenomenon, not an economic one. The urban blacks couldn't gain housing, education or jobs, but they now had political power, particularly with the National Democratic administrations, and they did gain welfare. Finally, the present recession came at a time when restrictive (welfare) practices had collapsed all over the country."

The "welfare crisis" today comes in large part because in the past most families technically eligible for welfare were, in fact, arbitrarily excluded for a variety of reasons. In the past few years, court decisions and new federal regulations have taken the position that if a family meets the standard that its children are needy and there is no fraud, it has to be granted welfare status if it wants it.

For the first time, welfare clients had lawyers representing their cause, and restrictive welfare department regulations and practices came tumbling down in a torrent of Supreme Court and lower federal court decisions.

The Supreme Court knocked out the so-called "man in the house" rule, by which welfare departments summarily cut off AFDC families whenever welfare investigators found a man living with or visiting an AFDC mother.

Next, the Supreme Court ruled unconstitutional the one-year residency requirement by which states and counties kept newly arrived migrants from benefits.

The Supreme Court then invalidated the vague "unsuitable home" device by which Southern states had purged thousands of welfare families from the rolls on grounds that mothers were not caring properly for their children and home.

Lower federal courts eliminated the "step-father responsibility rule," under which a stepfather was required to assume financial responsibility for his wife's AFDC-supported children from an earlier marriage.

New HEW regulations, backed up by the federal courts, required welfare departments to act on applications within 30 days, rather than the frequent indefinite delays. The new regulations prohibited cutting persons off the rolls arbitrarily, without first giving them an opportunity for a fair hearing.

Congress, in a little-noticed amendment to the 1967 Social Security Act, required states to update their cost-of-living standards, though not necessarily the actual benefits. Washington, D.C., for example, until last year paid AFDC recipients on the basis of 1953 housing costs and 1957 food and clothing costs.

The District and many states responded by raising the standard, but then paying only 75 per cent of it in benefits. Nevertheless, the higher payment standard made far more families eligible for benefits.

Another provision of the same law for the first time provided a positive "work incentive," permitting families to keep part of

their earnings. Previously, all earned income was deducted from welfare payments.

Vista volunteers, Legal Service attorneys, community action agency workers and the emerging National Welfare Rights Organization helped steer the poor through the still formidable bureaucratic welfare jungle. Many of the poor learned for the first time about their legal rights.

Finally, the stigma that had kept many eligible poor away from the welfare office began to lessen as the poor and their allies openly lobbied for welfare benefits as a right, not "charity." And as welfare became more respectable, many of the urban poor began to view it as an acceptable alternative to their traditional dead-end jobs as maids, janitors and kitchen helpers—jobs that often paid less or only slightly more than rising welfare benefits in northern industrial states.

Welfare advocates and welfare critics, in accord as to those root causes, stop agreeing at this point. They differ markedly in assessing the implications of the welfare crisis for American society.

From Columbia Prof. Cloward's viewpoint, "the crisis is really the reform—namely that poor people are finally getting some money. The normal state of the system is that the poor get nothing."

National Welfare Rights Organization Director George Wiley adds: "If this is a crisis, there ought to be a bigger one. My question is not why so many people are getting benefits, but why so few. In a law-and-order society, these people have been denied their legal rights."

Government officials, on the other hand, define the "crisis" as a burden to the taxpayer and to government budgets and as a disruption to the economy.

"The crisis is basically fiscal," said HEW Under Secretary John Veneman in an interview. "State and local government can't handle it. And the whole [welfare] system is posing a challenge to the wage structure in the country. Seven and one-half million people are working for less than the minimum wage. It's a fundamental challenge to low-wage, marginal employment. It creates an alternative, seriously undermining these jobs."

Within the general public and the government, there has always been angry disagreement over the real characteristics of the welfare poor. Myth blends with fact in efforts to analyze family structure, divorce, desertion, illegitimacy, racial composition, work ethics, welfare fraud, economic and geographic mobility, and living standards of AFDC recipients.

Several facts are clear. Widening access to welfare benefits did not occur simultaneously throughout the country. Numerous states still prevent the vast majority of potentially eligible poor from obtaining benefits, and access to welfare in even the highest-benefit states has not necessarily produced economic security for the recipients.

New York City is the welfare capital of the nation with more than 800,000 women and children receiving the highest AFDC benefits (nearly \$4,000 annually for a family of four). But a critical shortage of low-cost housing, an absence of jobs, and the highest cost of living nationally makes women swear about "welfare hell" in this supposed welfare paradise.

The city's AFDC rolls have risen from 195,000 in 1960 to 809,000 today. The city's share of welfare costs has grown from \$89 million 10 years ago to \$500 million last year, including \$182 million for AFDC alone.

Judith Irby, an attractive 31-year-old black mother of six, would like to know, "Where has all that money gone?" She knows it has not gone for public housing, for which she has been on the waiting list for 10 years, or for adequate child day care facilities, the absence of which forced her to quit work.

Home for Mrs. Irby and her children was a rat-infested apartment with gaping holes

in the walls, until the building was condemned. The New York City welfare department moved her family to the Hamilton Hotel, until it also was condemned last month as unfit for human habitation. She's still on a welfare tour of the city's fleabag hotels and says of her recent homes: "I've never lived in hell but I can imagine what it's like. Believe me, we don't want to raise our kids in filthy slums. This is killing them."

Leaving rural poverty and her husband in Georgia, Sarah Glover came to New York in 1956 with a job as a sleep-in maid. Then she supported her children by caring for invalids. She always considered welfare a last resort, and that came when she had an eviction notice in her hand and only bus fare in her purse. "I went with my children to the welfare department and told them, 'I'm moving in somewhere, if I have to move in with you.'"

A 30-week manpower training course in bookkeeping "gave me hope," says Mrs. Glover. "Then the only job I was offered was \$71 a week as a cashier clerk. I would have lost my Social Security, and with five kids to support, I couldn't take it. So I went back on welfare."

Indeed, a New York AFDC mother receiving an average \$278 welfare check is better off than she would be working at the typical \$274 monthly salary level for which AFDC recipients can qualify. And with Medicaid benefits, she is far better off than many of the city's working poor.

The willingness of women to regard welfare as an acceptable alternative to work appears related directly to welfare benefit levels, HEW studies show. In high-benefit states like New York, only 8 per cent of AFDC women work, but in states like Mississippi, Georgia and Florida where payments are near the bare survival level, more than a third of recipients supplement their welfare checks with low-paid jobs.

In New York City, the question of work is fast becoming academic, particularly for poor men. New York welfare officials estimate the city has lost several hundred thousand unskilled and semi-skilled jobs in the last few years.

"This has become a city of the very rich and the very poor," explains William Johnson, who has just completed a welfare study for New York's Rand Institute. "The jobs and the middle-income people are leaving for the suburbs, and what's left is the trapped migrant, who can't find housing or transportation to follow the jobs. The jobless husband deserts and the family goes on welfare." "Desertion, sure," says Beulah Sanders, leader of the New York Welfare Rights Organization. "Do you think a man is going to sit there and see his family starve?"

Life may or may not be worse for the welfare poor in Indiana, which, in contrast to New York, pays the lowest welfare benefits of any Northern state (\$150 a month for a family of four) and has the smallest proportion, of its poor receiving AFDC benefits—2 per cent.

"The entire philosophy of welfarism is alien and foreign to the people of Indiana," explains State Rep. Robert Bales, chairman of the House Health and Welfare Committee. "We run a very tight ship."

FIFTY-THREE PERCENT A YEAR

But the rolls are rising even in Indiana. The number of people receiving AFDC payments went up 53 per cent last year.

And in contrast to New York, where virtually all AFDC recipients are black or Puerto Rican, 55 per cent of the new welfare poor are native, white Hoosiers who grew up in rural poverty and now are moving to the cities and towns.

Marilyn Schwab, for example, grew up on a farm and moved to Richmond, Ind., where her husband worked in a tire factory. After

her husband deserted her last year, Mrs. Schwab says she tried supporting her three sons working at two jobs—a tavern until 2 a.m. and then in a radio parts factory starting at 7 a.m. "I ended up in the hospital with nervous exhaustion," she says, "and for the next six months we lived on a \$12 weekly grocery order, until they finally accepted me on welfare."

Of her \$150 monthly welfare check, Mrs. Schwab says \$58 goes as rent for an unfurnished apartment. "We make our own clothes or pick up used ones at a church," she said. "I had to call the school to say I didn't have shoes for two boys. This is not right. Children should have new clothes."

Mrs. Schwab's bare living is now endangered by a government and taxpayers revolt. For the politicians in Indiana, New York and Texas are now debating whether to cut the welfare payments of Mrs. Schwab in Richmond, Mrs. Glover in New York and Mrs. Hernandez in Houston.

WELFARE: TAXPAYERS REBEL—DEPARTMENTS TIGHTEN ELIGIBILITY RULES

(By Nick Kotz)

Edith Reese, 19, unmarried mother of a 2-year-old daughter, looked at the list of 47 jobs. It included, "zoo keeper—apply at Indianapolis zoo" and "go-go dancer—call 291-1010."

She had walked 21 blocks to the county welfare office to ask for welfare for her daughter. The case worker told her:

"Before I will even give you an application form, you have to try all these jobs. You must get the lady's or man's name at each place, the time and date you went there, and what they told you. I want it in writing."

Edith Reese said, "How am I going to get there? I don't even have bus fare."

The case worker replied, "You'll do it or else you'll never get an application."

Miss Reese started with the less exotic jobs—kitchen helper, janitor, counter lady—but at each place she received such comments as, "There's no vacancy here. Tell the welfare office to stop sending people here."

Partway through the list of 47 jobs she consulted the Indiana Welfare Rights Organization, which threatened legal action if the county did not give Miss Reese an application form. She received the form and filled it out. Several weeks passed without a decision on the application. The welfare rights group pressed again. The county said they'd put Mrs. Reese's child on the Aid to Dependent Children program if she would drop any legal action.

"This is the new game," says Jill Hatch, organizer in Indianapolis for the National Welfare Rights Organization. "It's one of the new maneuvers. The welfare departments are really digging in their heels."

"The new game" is part of the welfare crisis.

Battles like the one between Marion County and Edith Reese are being duplicated daily in welfare offices, governor's offices and state legislatures throughout the country.

On one side are the poor. Empowered by court decisions, new federal regulations and welfare rights groups, they are increasing the size of Aid for Dependent Children (AFDC), the nation's major welfare program, at the rate of 200,000 a month.

On the other side are state and local governments, confronted with growing welfare lists, facing either drained treasuries or angry taxpayers or both. In response, many states are using a variety of stratagems to discourage and delay welfare applications or increased welfare benefits.

Some states and cities face bankruptcy, but others have tax and welfare policy rather than pocketbook problems.

Indiana, for example, ranks 11th in total personal income but although 17 per cent

of its population is poor it has a smaller percentage of its residents receiving child welfare benefits than any state in the country. Its state taxes are relatively low—40th per capita among states—and it hopes to keep it that way.

To keep taxes low, Gov. Edgar Whitcomb recently vetoed a state welfare appropriation that would have permitted the state to comply with a federal requirement that welfare payments be based on the 1969 cost of living. It would have cost the state \$10 million. It would have raised support for a mother with three children to \$47 a week from the current \$37.50, the lowest payment of any state outside the Deep South.

"We ended the fiscal year with a healthy \$56 million surplus," Gov. Whitcomb told the state legislature last month. "I always feel proud to live in Indiana because things are going so well." The observation was made at a governor's conference, where he noted, "that the states that spend the most, tax the most, also have the most civil disturbance, the highest welfare, and the most crime. I ask you to give thought to these matters, and let us work together to make Indiana an even greater place to live . . ."

Several days after Whitcomb's speech, the legislature sustained his veto of higher AFDC grants. The governor and legislature knew that the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare would cut off Indiana's federal welfare funds on April 1, if the state has still refused to raise its AFDC payment standards. If the governor and legislature do not have a change of heart, the state's dwindling AFDC funds will force a reduction in Mrs. Reese's welfare check, rather than permit the federally called-for increase.

Indiana's actions do not represent an isolated example of a growing government rebellion against the cost of welfare. Ten other states and the District of Columbia have not raised their benefit standards to match present living costs, or otherwise violate separate provisions of the 1967 Social Security Act. Nine states last year reduced AFDC benefits.

In an effort to save \$11 million annually, the District refuses to provide a congressionally-ordered "tax break" for 5,000 AFDC mothers who work full time at low-paid jobs. As an incentive for them to work, the law requires that eligible welfare recipients be permitted to keep one-third of their earned income rather than have the entire amount subtracted from their welfare checks. The District refuses eligibility and the "work incentive" to these women with full-time jobs.

The District's pennypinching may prove counter-productive. A woman applying for AFDC support last month was told her full-time job, earning \$74.50 a week cleaning offices at night, disqualified her family. The next day the woman with her five children was back, minus job, and onto welfare with a \$313 monthly check. The District would have saved money by letting her work and receive a greatly reduced welfare check. But the often-stated goal "let's get them back to work" is often lost sight of today by governments fearful of sheer numbers on welfare.

Nevada last month cut off 22 per cent of its AFDC recipients. In the view of Ronald Pollak, a leading welfare rights attorney, Nevada violated the court-ordered rights of all 3,000 recipients by denying each family a "fair hearing." Pollak says an investigation now under way already indicates that hundreds of those denied assistance were clearly entitled to their welfare checks.

Leading the welfare rebellion is California Gov. Ronald Reagan, whose state has 1.5 million AFDC recipients, the highest number in the nation. California's annual AFDC payments now total \$900 million, and the state pays one-half of this cost. California's soaring AFDC costs are more a product of an incredible rise in recipients—now coming on the rolls at an annual rate of almost 400,000

persons—rather than the state's generosity in benefit payments. Seventeen states pay higher benefits than California's average monthly grant of \$193, an amount that meets only 51 per cent of the state's self-established standard of need.

Rather than endlessly raising taxes to pay welfare costs, Reagan says he will "excise the cancer eating at our vitals." The California governor, already facing a federal welfare fund cutoff for refusing to provide the 1969 cost of living increase, now plans to eliminate the "tax break" for working AFDC mothers, put thousands of them to work on public projects, and revise eligibility standards downward.

[One Reagan proposal applauded by liberals, is to simplify welfare payments for the elderly, disabled and blind, thereby eliminating the need for hundreds of welfare workers.]

California's welfare burden is compounded by the largest old-age assistance rolls in the country. Its total of 317,000 elderly recipients is 50 per cent higher than that of any other state. When California's Medi-Cal costs are added the state's taxpayers end up paying more per capita for total welfare costs than those of any other state except New York.

New York was the first state to respond generously to the welfare rights movements' demands for legal entitlements, and, ironically, the first to plug up liberal provisions in its welfare laws.

In its most successful campaign, the National Welfare Rights Organization in 1966-1968 helped thousands of New York City AFDC mothers claim the "special grants" provided for clothing, furniture, kitchen appliances and other essential needs. At the height of this drive, in August 1968, welfare mothers had won \$100 million in special grants, an average of \$104 per welfare family. Since these benefits had to be sought in individual bouts with the welfare office and most welfare recipients did not participate, those participating actually received far more than \$104 in benefits.

Reacting against this successful campaign, the New York State Legislature eliminated the special grants and slightly reduced total AFDC benefits.

Two to four years ago people were pulling themselves together through the vehicle of special grants," says New York City Welfare Department official Robert Jorgen. "When that ended, hope ended. Now there's no money for furniture or for winter school clothing for the kids."

Despite the legislature's best efforts welfare costs continue to soar and New York Mayor John V. Lindsay is attempting countermeasures. Lindsay, the liberal mayor twice elected with black votes, had voiced approval several years ago when the percentage of welfare applicants accepted on the rolls increased from 60 to 80 per cent. Now, he is tightening welfare eligibility, has rejected his welfare to force the state and federal governments to take over the city's share of welfare costs. At present, the department's budget is too expensive, and his filed suit federal government pays 50 per cent, and the city and state split the balance.

Lindsay challenges the complicated formula by which welfare costs are shared by cities, states and the federal government. New York City pays \$500 million a year as its share of total welfare costs but there are laws in 25 states that permit their cities to pay nothing.

In general, the richer the state, the smaller the portion it gets of federal money for welfare. As the individual level of monthly payments go up, the federal share becomes smaller. Thus, the federal formula encourages states to pay low benefits.

The difference among states is most dramatic in the case of Texas. Texas is rich,

sixth in total personal wealth. But although it spends only \$80 million in state welfare money on its 2.6 million poor, the federal government pays almost 80 per cent of total welfare costs for Texas, compared with 50 per cent for New York and California—each of which pays out more than \$1 billion.

"We know we've been restrictive," Texas Welfare Commissioner Burton Hackney said in an interview. "Of necessity, we've had to be restrictive and serve only the poorest of the poor."

Texas has used a number of devices for keeping down its welfare payment. It is the only state with a constitutional limit on welfare spending—any substantial increase in individual benefits or total recipients requires a referendum and an act of the legislature.

It required a court order last year to force one-third of the state's counties to operate a food assistance program for the poor. The state welfare department has a maximum of \$50 allowance for rent, regardless of the size of the poor family, 75 per cent of whom live in cities.

In 1969 when welfare funds began to run out the maximum payment for a family, regardless of size, was cut from \$135 a month to \$123. This meant that a family of ten had to live on \$31 a week. After a federal court invalidated this cut, voters raised state welfare funds from \$60 to \$80 million. Now funds are exhausted again and Gov. Preston Smith says he will not recommend another increase in welfare spending.

Despite pressures of higher taxes and less wealth than Texas, many other states are attempting to meet the rising welfare costs for the poor. Thirteen states raised their welfare payments last year. Many states are either raising taxes or making excruciating, Solomon-like choices between competing human needs. Oregon, for example took school funds to meet welfare crisis needs, and Vermont Gov. Deane Davis froze state spending on education to raise AFDC payments. "A high quality of education is part of the long-range solution," Davis said. "But the tragedy is, a long-term solution is of little help to a child who is hungry, sick or cold this winter."

The most devastating governmental blow to the welfare rights movement may have been signaled last month in a 6-3 U. S. Supreme Court decision, says Ronald Pollak, who successfully argues federal court cases that helped open up the welfare rolls. Justice Harry Blackmun, in his first written opinion, ruled that a welfare recipient must admit a caseworker to her home. It is not the immediate case that bothers Pollak so much as the welfare philosophy now expressed by a Supreme Court majority.

Commenting on the notorious midnight welfare raids which lower courts long ago ruled unconstitutional, Blackmun pointedly left open the possibility that the constitutionality of such searches will "present another case for another day." Blackmun compared welfare aid with "purely private charity" and said the benefactor "expects to know how his charitable funds are utilized."

"The court has come very much in tune with the political climate," said Pollak. "Judges are again seeing welfare as a gratuity, not an entitlement. A beggar must prove himself worthy. If we've now lost the support of the Supreme Court, it's very hard to figure out of strategy."

The next struggle over the welfare crisis will be in the present Congress, as it debates President Nixon's Family Assistance Program, and alternatives offered by welfare advocates and critics.

WELFARE IN AMERICA: "CONSUMING OUTRAGE"
(By Nick Kotz)

The nation's welfare rolls have swollen by almost three million persons since August 1969, when President Nixon first proposed his Family Assistance Plan. The annual costs

have risen by \$1.7 billion. And Congress is once again debating how to cope with what the President calls "a monstrous consuming outrage" for both the taxpayer and the welfare poor.

The Nixon administration's answer is a controversial new plan that would for the first time offer federal income supplements to workers in low-paid jobs. Any family of four with less than \$3,920 annual income could gain benefits, ranging from a few dollars to \$1,600. The hope of this plan is to ease the financial plight of 11 million "working poor" and keep them off the soaring welfare rolls.

The Nixon plan also would attempt, by a "carrot and stick" approach, to lift some of the 9.5 million now on welfare back into the workforce.

Most of these poor are women receiving benefits for their dependent children.

The underlying thesis of the proposal is to place a floor under the income of every family with children. Need rather than dependency would be the governing factor.

Every family would be guaranteed \$500 for each of the first two family members and \$300 for each additional child. Thus, a family of four would receive \$1,600, if they had no other income.

President Nixon calls his plan "the most comprehensive and far-reaching effort to reform social welfare in nearly four decades." Initially hailed by many liberals because it embraced the concept of a guaranteed annual income, it enraged many conservatives who consider it the straw that will finally destroy the American work ethic that a man should rise strictly by the sweat of his own brow.

The Nixon proposal passed the House last year, but was blocked in the Senate by an unlikely coalition of conservatives appalled by the cost and the emerging philosophy of guaranteed annual income and liberals dissatisfied with the benefit levels and the provisions forcing recipients to work at low-paid jobs.

But the debate has broadened into far wider issues. At heart, critics of the welfare crisis and of the President's proposed solution are questioning what kind of country America is or should be.

Does a work ethic originally premised on "useful work," still apply to an affluent society that spins out both redundant luxuries and grinding poverty? Does the country need a fundamental re-allocation of its wealth and resources to meet basic human needs?

The questions, endless, are being asked as Congress scrutinizes the Family Assistance Plan and wonders how to stop the spiral in which thousands are forced out of employment—or leave voluntarily—for welfare.

Criticism of the Family Assistance Plan grows as various state and local officials examine how it would affect their tax rolls, as well as welfare rolls.

"The Family Assistance Plan represents only another attempt to add a patch to an already overburdened system of welfare patches," says Texas Gov. Preston Smith.

Concerned mainly about the skyrocketing state costs, conservative Smith and other governors want to turn over the entire welfare burden to the federal government. Liberals such as Rep. Donald Fraser (D-Minn.) also see full federal control as a way to untangle the welfare bureaucracy and bring justice to the poor.

Recently the powerful House Ways and Means Committee has become intrigued with the idea that a federal welfare system might provide the most direct and helpful kind of revenue sharing with the states. The states' share of welfare program costs is about \$5 billion a year, the same amount the President has proposed for new funds going into revenue sharing.

The most conservative governors, such as Ronald Reagan in California and Edgar Whitcomb in Indiana, are considering another approach withdrawing their states from the present federal-state program and operating much less costly welfare entirely on state and local funds. Both strongly oppose the Nixon plan's guaranteed income for the working poor.

From the viewpoint of advocates for the welfare poor, the President's plan provides far too little money and too much potential coercion.

"The Nixon plan is an attempt to stem the tide of rising benefits," says George Wiley, director of the National Welfare Rights Organization. "This so-called welfare reform will be more punitive than the present system. The welfare department will be a new employment agency for substandard industry, agriculture, laundries, sweatshops." Labor union leaders criticize the plan for subsidizing low-wage pay, and say it will undermine efforts to organize farm and domestic workers.

Wiley's National Welfare Rights Organization favors a \$5,500 a year guarantee annual income. Additional incentives to the working poor would bring their incomes up to a maximum of \$10,000. The plan would cost \$50 billion a year and provide varying benefits to 100 million Americans. Despite its costliness NWRO's plan has a surprising number of supporters: the White House Conference on Food and Nutrition endorsed the plan at its December, 1969, meeting.

The Family Assistance Plan would affect the lives of 25 million poor Americans in differing ways.

The plan really contains two different proposals, one brand new and the other a reworking of an existing welfare plan:

1—A form of guaranteed annual income for "working poor" families with children.

This would offer benefits to almost 11 million Americans in families who now cannot receive welfare, in most cases, because there is a father in the house and he works.

Any family of four with less than \$3,920 annual income would get some benefits. From the maximum payment of \$1,600 for a family with less than \$720, payments would decline as work income approached the \$3,920 cutoff. Almost one half the potential beneficiaries live in the South.

Take a drug store clerk trying to support a wife and two children in Washington, D.C., on a \$1.60 an hour salary, the federal minimum wage. His \$64 weekly paycheck would be supplemented by \$5.70 weekly in federal "family assistance." His annual income would rise from \$3,328 to \$3,624. He would have to agree to accept job training or move to a higher-paying job if a suitable one were offered.

The program would be paid for entirely out of federal funds. The administration estimates the first year costs at \$1.7 billion. Benefits would be the same, no matter which state a person lived in. In this and other respects, Family Assistance for the working poor would differ from the second part of the plan.

2—A revision of the present Aid to Dependent Children program, in which federal, state and some local governments share administration and costs. It would continue to assist families in which one parent (usually the father) is absent or incapacitated. Most of the present 9.5 million recipients are mothers and children. Most of the mothers do not work.

At present, benefit levels are set by the states and the federal government simply pays part of whatever level the states establish. Payments for a family of four now vary from a low of \$720 a year in Mississippi to a high of \$4,164 in New Jersey. The Family Assistance Plan would only slightly alter this disparity.

The proposed plan would establish, for the first time, a federally paid floor under ADC payments of \$1,600 for a family of four—raising payments for the one million recipients living in the seven Southern and Border states that now pay less.

For example, it would add \$76 a month in benefits for Mary Williams, who tries to support three children in a Mississippi shack on a \$57 ADC check.

But for the 8.5 million receiving ADC payments in the 43 states whose benefits are above the floor, the Nixon plan does not offer increased benefits.

Pamela Johnson and her two young children in Houston, Tex., would receive the same \$129 welfare check. Although the Nixon plan would require states to maintain benefits at the present level and would permit a maximum of \$3,720, it is unlikely any states would raise their payments. Most states want to cut benefit costs, not raise them.

As in the present system, Mrs. Johnson and Mrs. Williams could retain part of their earnings from a job and still get welfare benefits although reduced. But under the Family Assistance Plan, they would be denied \$500 of their annual welfare payments if they refused job training or "suitable" employment paying at least \$1.20 an hour. The plan also would offer day care for children.

The revised ADC plan is being touted to state and local governments chiefly on the basis that it will reduce their share of program costs. The federal government would pick up \$356 million of the \$2.3 billion state and local governments will pay this fiscal year in AFDC costs, plus \$166 million for adult welfare programs: old age assistance, aid to the blind, aid to the disabled.

But state officials throughout the country are becoming increasingly doubtful as to whether the Nixon plan might end up costing them more money.

All agree, for one thing, that the present cost-sharing inequity among the states would be maintained. The federal government would take over the entire cost for Alabama, Arkansas, Louisiana, Mississippi, South Carolina, Tennessee and Missouri. Cost savings to the biggest states would differ widely depending on their present efforts.

State officials and others are appalled that the plan would very likely continue—and probably even further complicate—the present tangled federal-state-local partnership of welfare costs and administration.

Further, officials in most states now believe that their share of soaring Medicaid costs will soon outstrip any possible benefits in ADC cost-sharing. The administration acknowledges this problem but says it will reduce Medicaid costs by its forthcoming Family Health Insurance Plan. The plan most likely will transfer some of these costs to the welfare poor, who now get Medicaid benefits.

State officials also are skeptical about how many welfare recipients can be put to work. Of the 9.5 million ADC recipients, less than 200,000 are able-bodied men. The expected workers are principally mothers, 80 per cent of whom have children under eight years old.

The administration hopes to put 40 per cent of available, they question whether the plan's provision for 250,000 job training slots will be any more successful than a present program for job training, which is falling. The child day care program is criticized as too expensive if the only rationale for it is to put women into low-paid jobs and inadequate if the purpose is to help children.

In addition, many state officials believe the best contribution of mothers should be to care for children growing up in already broken homes. The poor also strongly oppose forcing a woman to work if she would rather care for her children.

"These are people with large families," says Wilbur Williams, chairman of a welfare re-

form committee in Houston. "The mother should be home caring for them. This is not putting a family together. It's destroying it."

The level of benefits provided the poor under the Family Assistance Plan is hotly disputed by both liberal and conservative critics, but for very different reasons.

In the judgment of the conservative Council on Economic Development and of many in the economic-political power structure of the Deep South, the support level is too high. The CED believes that hundreds of thousands of service jobs such as waiters, gas station attendants, and household help are now going begging partly because welfare benefits already pose too attractive an alternative. Some Southerners fear, for example, that a black woman with three children no longer will work as a maid at \$15-20 a week if her welfare check rises from \$15 to \$30.79 a week.

Advocates for the welfare poor argue that the plan is designed to put a lid on higher benefits the poor have been winning in the federal courts, in Congress and by their own efforts. "Whenever the federal government talks about reform," says Richard Cloward, a professor at the Columbia University School of Social Work, "it means reimposition of restriction and of the system. The normal state of the system is that the poor don't get anything."

The Nixon administration does want to put a lid on benefits. The plan would permit 48 states to freeze benefits to ADC recipients at as much as \$2,100 below the federal poverty line of \$3,720 for a family of four. Forty-three states could continue paying less than their own "standards of need," a cost of living appraisal of the essentials of life: food, clothing and housing.

Another basic criticism of welfare advocates is that the combination of continued low payments and the "must work" provision will force the poor to continue performing the lowest-skilled, dirtiest and worst-paid jobs. Debate over the work requirements leads inevitably into the broader implications of welfare reform as they affect the essential quality of American life.

"Has welfare become an acceptable alternative to work?" questions Robert Patrecelli, deputy under secretary of HEW. "We think that liberals won't face up to that possibility."

Indeed, the poor are openly expressing growing unwillingness to trade even a meager welfare check for jobs at the bottom of American society.

"Who needs to be trained to wash dishes or clean toilets?" questions Dorothy Pittman Hughes, a black community leader in New York City. "What happens when we ask for meaningful work, like a proposal to train black mechanics to run their own cooperative business? That competes with someone else and it's turned down."

Asked in an interview what work the welfare poor would be expected to perform, HEW Under Secretary John Veneman replied: "Where they will work will depend on the economy. With today's economy there would be problems. Logically, they would work in services—hotel, food, beverage, janitors, cleaning, domestics."

What if the poor would rather care for their children than do that kind of work?

"If a woman is adapted to that kind of work," replied Veneman, "Then I think she should do it. If someone has been a maid for 10 years at \$1 an hour then that's an appropriate job."

The welfare poor also criticize the \$1.20 wage at which they would be required to accept jobs under the Family Assistance Plan. It is 40 cents below the federal minimum wage law.

"I don't think the Social Security Act is the place to set the minimum wage," says

Veneman of this criticism." It's a fact of life that millions of jobs pay below the minimum wage."

The over-all criticism by welfare reformers is that the Nixon administration's Family Assistance Plan, doesn't try hard enough to really change the present facts and quality of life for poor Americans.

A survey for HEW recently showed that 80 per cent of women receiving welfare would like to work, and 40 per cent are good prospects for employment. But these women have increasingly shown in their job training choices that they not only want decent salaries but work in human services rather than drudge labor. They sign up eagerly to become nurses aides, community action aides, day care center workers.

Daniel Patrick Moynihan, the former White House counselor who helped design the Family Assistance Plan, is impatient with criticism about the nature of work. As a pragmatist, he says that the first need of poor people is for more money. He thinks the plan establishes that right for the first time.

"Do you have a meaningful job?" Moynihan asked a critic. "How many Americans have meaningful jobs?"

Leaders of the National Welfare Rights Organization quote author William Stringfellow on the point of jobs. Stringfellow contends that the "work ethic" lost its legitimate original meaning when most Americans no longer produced tangible products of human needs but "redundant luxuries in which the package rather than the product is marketed." Yet the affluent American society still "enforces the work ethic with a literal vengeance against the poor."

Stringfellow, along with welfare rights advocates Richard Cloward and Michael Harrington, says the poor will be lifted out of their welfare poverty trap only by a massive reassignment of national priorities. Their viewpoint, shared by many liberal members of Congress, is that the government should redirect its resources into jobs that would help improve the quality of American life.

Sens. Jacob Javits (R-N.Y.) and Gaylord Nelson (D-Wis.) introduced legislation last week to spend \$1 billion creating 200,000 public service jobs.

America may or may not make the called-for re-allocations in the nation's wealth, resources, and energies, but observers of the welfare crisis believe fast, short-range action is mandatory.

Dr. Henry Rossner, scholarly assistant director of the New York City Welfare Department, has worked at that city's welfare problems for 37 years. Last week, while two Americans were walking on the moon, Dr. Rossner observed:

"Welfare is a holding action and I'm afraid we don't have any long-range programs. Public assistance is the price we pay for social order. Over \$1 billion a year is going into the slum areas of this city. Do you think all those people in Bedford-Stuyvesant and Harlem would starve peacefully?"

MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN—HOW LONG?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 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?

PROVIDING ADDITIONAL ASSISTANT U.S. ATTORNEYS FOR THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

HON. WILLIAM M. McCULLOCH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1971

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, at the request of the Attorney General I have introduced a bill to amend the Revised Organic Act of the Virgin Islands. My able colleague on the Judiciary Committee, Mr. POFF, is a cosponsor of this legislation. This amendment would delete from section 27 of the act the phrase which prevents the appointment of more than one assistant U.S. attorney for the Virgin Islands.

In all U.S. judicial districts the United States Code, 28 U.S.C. 542, authorized the Attorney General to appoint one or more assistant U.S. attorneys in any district when the public interest so requires. In this way the Attorney General may adjust the number of assistants in light of changes in a district's case volume. The limitation contained in the Revised Organic Act of the Virgin Islands prevents such a discretionary adjustment in that district.

The existing situation in the district of the Virgin Islands requires elimination of this limitation and extension of the Attorney General's discretion to this district.

At the present time the volume of judicial business within the Virgin Islands exceeds that for U.S. judicial districts which presently employ two assistant U.S. attorneys. For example, for the first quarter of fiscal year 1971 which ended September 30, 1970, the case flow for the Virgin Islands and for U.S. districts with two assistants compared as follows:

Category	
Virgin Islands:	
Filings	89
Terminations	118
Pending	160
Districts with 2 assistants:	
Filings	51
Terminations	51
Pending	143

Final statistics for the fiscal year 1970 were as follows:

Category	
Virgin Islands:	
Filings	212
Terminations	195
Pending	194
Districts with 2 assistants:	
Filings	170
Terminations	156
Pending	148

The workload capacity of the Virgin Islands district will be further increased when their new judgeship, which was authorized in the recent omnibus judgeship legislation, is filled. I call to my colleagues' attention the fact that after approval of the additional judgeships, the Ninety-first Congress approved a supplemental appropriation, Pub-

lic Law 91-665, which provides for 122 new assistant United States Attorney positions to serve their 61 judgeships created by the omnibus judgeship act. This number of attorneys is based on a ratio of two attorneys for each judge, reflecting the general feeling that new judgeships increase work capacity and hence require additional attorney assistance in the affected U.S. Attorney offices.

If the limitation of one assistant United States Attorney for the Virgin Islands is not eliminated, there will soon be only two attorneys, the United States Attorney and his assistant, to handle the litigation of two judgeships. This volume would place an undesirable burden on the attorneys to the detriment of the representation of the United States in that district. The Attorney General should have the authority to review the situation and to increase the complement of assistant United States Attorneys in accord with the needs of the district.

Accordingly, I recommend prompt consideration of my proposal to remove the limitation and vest the needed discretion in the Attorney General.

CONSUMER PROTECTION

HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1971

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, once upon a time Americans enjoyed the reputation of being good horse traders when it came to transacting business. Unfortunately, this trait has all but disappeared today. More often than not the individual buyer now is mesmerized and influenced by massive, sophisticated, cleverly worded advertising campaigns which disguise a pig in a poke as a top shelf product.

Subsequently, the consumer is being robbed as surely as if someone stuck a gun in his ribs. Through fraud, deception, manipulation or neglect, he is bilked out of \$30 of every \$100 he spends. The total "take" from this type of robbery is estimated at \$200 billion a year, and it is high time this rising crime rate against the American consumer is stopped.

Last week I placed in the hopper a bill I believe can stop it—if the proposed agencies to be established are permitted to function—and do function—in a responsible, efficient manner for the benefit of the buying public. Similar bills, I know, are being introduced by several colleagues. I am confident the Committee on Government Operations, in its wisdom, will study these bills and consolidate the best of each into a single piece of legislation which will guarantee the American consumer a fair value for a purchasing dollar.

I would like to see an Office of Consumer Affairs created and empowered with the authority to coordinate programs and activities of all Federal agencies and advise and recommend to the Congress and the President on the development and improvement of consumer programs.

I would like to see a Consumer Protection Agency established which would represent the consumer in legal proceedings, encourage research and testing of

consumer products and publicize its findings.

I would like to see a Consumer Advisory Council set up, comprised of knowledgeable and experienced private citizens who would see to it the other agencies mentioned function in a responsible manner to the best interests of the consumer.

The interests of the consumer, Mr. Speaker, must be protected. It is true most of the manufacturers and distributors of products and services in our Nation are honorable and upright in their business dealings with the public. But, there are those who believe and thrive on P. T. Barnum's motto of a sucker being born every minute. They seek to gain—and do—at the expense of an unwary or trusting public. They are shrewd operators, clever, intelligent, and, in many cases, perfectly legal. But, in truth, they are morally, if not legally, dishonest. Their greed and lack of principle revolts any legitimate businessman or manufacturer.

Unfortunately, these days the consumer finds it difficult, if not impossible, to tell the good guys from the villains in this commercial melodrama. Too often the knowledge comes too late.

Because of present circumstances I believe the need for consumer protection is greater than ever today. The steep rise in the cost of living has wiped out any wage gains achieved by the average worker and now, with the continued increase in unemployment, he is forced to stretch his dollar as far as possible. Because he is more susceptible to bargains, he is apt to get less than he bargains for.

It is estimated some \$14 billion is lost by consumers in supermarkets each year. They are misled or confused by deceptive packaging and labeling on products. Billions more are spent on the purchase of ineffective, but widely advertised, drugs and nonnutritious foods. Medical and hospital expenses have boomed and families have been frightened into purchasing expensive private health plans which offer a pittance in return. Another \$8 to \$10 billion annually is wasted by consumers on repair work that was not necessary, not properly performed or which should have been covered by warranty or guarantee.

The monetary statistics are staggering, but there are others more shocking. There is the human factor to be considered. Injury and death have resulted from products foisted on the public by unscrupulous manufacturers and businessmen. Twenty million people each year are injured because of using unsafe products—110,000 of them are permanently disabled, 30,000 are killed.

In view of these statistics, it has become imperative quality controls be placed on products and appliances. Warranties and guarantees must be made to have meaning. The housewife is entitled to the assurance she can get reasonable repairs made on appliances and not be forced to continually purchase new replacements. Many homes today have two or three toasters gathering dust in the cellar because it is cheaper to buy a new replacement rather than pay exorbitant

repair costs, providing, of course, you can find an appliance repair man in the first place. They are extremely scarce today—and costly.

Loopholes in warranties and guarantees must be closed, particularly if an individual is threatened by the malfunction of the product. The Congress last year took unprecedented steps to protect the American worker by adopting a National Occupational Safety and Health Law. Can we do no less for the public which uses the product the worker produces? If manufacturers and suppliers of services are made to stand behind their written promises, I believe we will see safe, durable and better quality products roll off assembly lines and suppliers of services will improve that service rather than risk severe penalties.

Mr. Speaker, the "Buyer Beware" slogan of yesterday is outmoded today. I think it is time the producer pays if his product falls short of his promise.

A SHOCKING NEGLECT

HON. JAMES R. MANN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1971

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, many people are dismayed by the gap between President Nixon's rhetoric and his actions. We can now add to the list of the dismayed the leadership, and perhaps the membership, of the American Nurses' Association. Scarcely more than 2 weeks ago the American people heard Mr. Nixon promise to "propose a major increase in and redirection of aid to medical schools, to greatly increase the number of doctors and other health personnel." Surely the shortage of nurses is known by the President, and surely he was referring to such personnel as nurses when he referred to "other health personnel." And yet, as pointed out by the news release of the American Nurses' Association received by my office today there is a substantial reduction in the amount of funds provided for nursing education in the President's 1972 budget as compared to 1971. Of particular distress to me is the monstrous cut of more than 40 percent in the student loan program. The student loan program represents, to my mind, one of the finest investments that government can make, particularly in areas of critical occupational need. Such a program results in a minimal ultimate cost to the taxpayer. Surely this is the time to provide a "major increase" in these funds, which some people understandably thought the President meant, instead of a major decrease, which is what the President did. Perhaps the key word in his speech was "redirection." We are waiting, Mr. President, hoping that it will not be too little and too late. The news release of the ANA follows:

ANA DEPLORES NIXON'S NEGLECT OF NATION'S NURSING NEEDS IN PROPOSED 1972 BUDGET

NEW YORK, N.Y., February 1.—"Dismay and extreme disappointment" were expressed by

the American Nurses' Association to President Nixon at the inadequate level of funding for nursing education proposed in his budget for fiscal year 1972.

In a telegram on behalf of the ANA Board of Directors, President Hildegard E. Peplau, R.N., Ed.D., deplored the fact that while "other schools preparing health professionals are provided for in the proposed budget . . . nursing schools have not received any type of basic support to meet costs of education."

Dr. Peplau reminded President Nixon that "basic support was authorized by the Congress in 1968." She further pointed out that "the fiscal distress of schools of nursing is as urgent as that of other professional schools."

The American Nurses' Association has long taken the position that several registered nurses are needed as back up for every single physician if adequate standards of health care are to be achieved in the United States. It is widely known that units of recently-constructed hospital facilities remain unused due to the lack of qualified nursing personnel to staff them.

And yet, while in the proposed budget for 1972 funds for educating other health professionals has increased by \$90 million over 1971, there is a \$6.6 million decline in the proposed budget figures for nursing.

In the crucial student loan program, there is a cut of \$7.5 million from the slightly over \$17 million appropriated in 1971. The President proposes, moreover, not to release, until 1972, \$1.5 million of a total sum of \$9.5 million authorized by Congress for nursing school construction in 1971. The American Nurses' Association strongly urged the President to release the "total amount authorized by the Congress for the current fiscal year."

For such vital programs as special project grants for improvement of nurse training, and student scholarships, the sums recommended in the proposed budget, despite the vastly increased need for nursing in the nation, remain unchanged.

ANA informed the President that "assistance to schools and students is crucial if sufficient numbers of qualified nurses are to be prepared to meet the needs of the American people for health care."

"No existing or proposed health care system will work without adequate numbers of qualified nurses," ANA's message to the White House concluded.

At a time when it is clearly acknowledged by everyone from the President of the United States down that the health of the country is in jeopardy, the American Nurses' Association is deeply concerned that the critical need for quality nursing care in America today is not reflected in the President's proposed budget for 1972.

AMERICAN NURSES' ASSOCIATION,
New York, N.Y., January 30, 1971.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

The Board of Directors of the American Nurses' Association in session in New York, wishes to express to you its dismay and extreme disappointment at the level of funding for nursing education proposed in your budget for fiscal year 1972. No provision for basic support is proposed. Other schools preparing health professionals are provided for in the proposed budget. But nursing schools have not received any type of basic support to meet costs of education. Basic support was authorized by the Congress in 1968. The fiscal distress of schools of nursing is as urgent as that of other professional schools. We regret and seriously question this continuing neglect.

Assistance to schools and students is crucial if sufficient numbers of qualified nurses are to be prepared to meet the needs of the

American people for health care. No existing or proposed health care system will work without adequate numbers of qualified nurses. We urge the release of total amount authorized by the Congress for the current fiscal year.

HILDEGARD E. PEPLAU, R.N., Ed. D.,
President, American Nurses' Association.

PRIORITY STATUS NEEDED FOR SICKLE CELL ANEMIA

HON. ELLA T. GRASSO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1971

Mrs. GRASSO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call attention to an inherited blood disease, known as sickle cell anemia, which has by neglect become a national disgrace. This inexcusable ignored disease claims the lives of half of its victims before they are 20. It debilitates its survivors and makes their lives a living agony.

Over the past year, funds in excess of \$1 million have been spent by the National Institute of Health for research of sickle cell anemia. The National Institute of Arthritis and Metabolic Diseases has granted over \$600,000 for the study of the disease. President Nixon has said that both research and treatment programs will be expanded. The administration's health budget includes \$5 million for research of sickle cell anemia. A task force has been set up to investigate various ways of informing possible carriers about sickle cell anemia, and to study methods of detection and prevention. Programs have been planned already at the NIH and the National Institute of Arthritis and Metabolic Diseases.

There is no greater tragedy than that of a youngster who from birth is unable to fulfill the bright promise of his life. It is my fervent hope that sufficient appropriations will be made available at long last for continued work toward the prevention and cure of this disease. Also, efforts should be made at all levels of government to inform the public of the nature and impact of sickle cell anemia.

In this area of public information, I am very pleased to say that a Connecticut television station has taken a forthright lead in educating its viewers of the fight to detect and prevent sickle cell anemia. Mr. Leonard J. Patricelli, president of Broadcast-Plaza, Inc.—WTIC radio, TV, channel 3, Hartford, Conn.—has been constructive and productive in his editorials and special programs which are worthy of recognition and should serve as an example to the Nation of what can be done to bring public attention to the need for priority consideration of this little known affliction.

The following material on the good work Mr. Patricelli and channel 3 have done will provide informative reading for those who wish to learn more of this disease.

I include the article, as follows:

SICKLE CELL ANEMIA

In early November of 1970, Robert Patricelli, deputy undersecretary of Health, Education and Welfare, told his father, Leonard Patricelli, about sickle cell anemia.

Robert Patricelli called the neglect of sickle cell anemia a national disgrace and suggested that his father might consider doing an editorial on WTIC Radio and Television on the disease that has been termed "America's most neglected health problem."

The memorandum has led to an extensive campaign on the Hartford, Connecticut stations to make the public aware of what has been termed "the forgotten disease," and inherited blood disease that afflicts mainly blacks and takes the lives of half of its victims before they reach the age of 20. One in 400 black children are born with sickle cell anemia.

The disease can only be transmitted to a child when both parents have what is known as the sickle trait—a relatively benign condition that can be identified through a simple, inexpensive blood test.

After calling public attention to the existence of the disease in his first editorial, Mr. Patricelli devoted a second editorial to explaining how the disease's spread could be prevented through testing and counseling those with the sickle trait. The stations advocated statewide testing and a bill calling for such testing of school children will be introduced during the current session of the Connecticut General Assembly. The Hartford Board of Education, reacting to the WTIC editorials, has already arranged to test all children in the Hartford school in Grades 7 through 12 in March. Hartford has thus become the first city in the nation to conduct citywide tests of school children for sickle cell anemia.

In addition, WTIC-TV has presented two prime time television programs on sickle cell anemia and a third is contemplated. The first, December 4th, designed to introduce the southern New England audience to the disease, was a discussion featuring two of the nation's leading authorities on sickle cell anemia, Dr. Louis Sullivan of Boston and Dr. Robert Scott of Richmond.

The second, January 15th, was filmed at Howard University in Washington where Dr. Roland Scott of Freedmen's Hospital has worked in sickle cell anemia research for twenty years—with little support from either public or private sources. In the second program, Dr. Roland Scott (no relation to Dr. Robert Scott) told of his dream of a Center for the Study of Sickle Cell Anemia at Howard.

A committee, headed by Dr. Arthur Banks, president of the Greater Hartford Community College and composed of members of the WTIC staff and leaders of Hartford's black community, has been formed to find ways the stations can call additional attention to the disease and support efforts to treat and hopefully cure it. The committee is currently working on plans for a fund drive, public education program and a symposium for Connecticut doctors to be conducted under WTIC's sponsorship by Dr. Scott of Howard and his colleagues.

WTIC EDITORIAL NOVEMBER 12, 1970

Have you ever heard of a disease known as sickle cell anemia? Most people have not. Yet sickle cell anemia is one of the more common and one of the most serious of all childhood diseases.

Sickle cell anemia—this disease most of us have never heard of—is more prevalent than many of the more highly publicized childhood diseases. For example, the dreadful cystic fibrosis occurs once in every fourteen hundred births; sickle cell anemia occurs once in every five hundred births.

Half of the children born with sickle cell anemia die before they are twenty; half of

the remainder die before they are forty. The disease is characterized by severe anemia, by bone pain and by increased susceptibility to infection. It can cause stroke or seizures, chronic bone infections, enlarged hearts and livers and yellow jaundice. Women suffering from the disease bear children at great risk.

Here are some facts. There is no known cure for sickle cell anemia. There is little research being done to seek a cure. No foundation exists for the study of the disease. While volunteer groups raised nearly two million dollars for cystic fibrosis and nearly eight million for muscular dystrophy last year, less than one hundred thousand dollars was raised to combat sickle cell anemia.

Yes, there is one more fact you should know about sickle cell anemia, a fact that may account for its being one of the most neglected health problems in the nation today.

Sickle cell anemia is suffered almost exclusively by black people. It originated in Africa. It is the result of a mutation of the genes caused by a massive malaria epidemic many centuries ago and it is transmitted when each parent has a sickle cell gene which causes the blood cells to change their shapes. The disease has also been passed on to descendants of whites who were affected by the same malaria epidemic, but the vast majority of those who suffer from the disease are black.

If sickle cell anemia were as common among whites as it is among blacks, it might have received a great deal more attention than it has. There might have been a major research effort to seek a cure . . . there might have been a national foundation formed to fight the disease and there might have been a widespread educational program to prevent its spread.

These things are far overdue. The lack of attention that has been given to this disease is truly a national disgrace. At least now . . . we hope more people know about this terrible disease. And we promise you this is definitely not the last you will hear of sickle cell anemia on this station.

WTIC EDITORIAL, NOVEMBER 27, 1970

What can be done about sickle cell anemia?

This is a question we have been asked frequently since we presented an editorial on this dreadful disease two weeks ago. We have been contacted by scores of individuals and organizations by business and professional groups, civic organizations, civil rights groups and others who want to know more about this serious health problem.

One of the things we were asked was how sickle cell anemia got its name. That, at least, is easy to explain. Blood cells are normally round. But when a person is afflicted with sickle cell anemia, the shape of his blood cells changes from round to a shape resembling a sickle, the tool used to cut grain or high grass.

Most of the people we have heard from had not known about sickle cell anemia . . . an inherited blood disease that takes the lives of half of its victims before they reach the age of twenty . . . a terrible disease that strikes at children. Nearly always at black children.

In the past several weeks, we have been in contact with a number of doctors and medical school professors who are recognized as the nation's leading authorities on sickle cell anemia. We are bringing some of them to Hartford next week to appear on this station and hopefully to shed more light on this disease.

From our preliminary conversations with these authorities, one fact is already apparent. Sickle cell anemia can be prevented.

Sickle cell anemia is transmitted only when both parents have what is known as the sickle cell trait. It is not possible for a child to be born with sickle cell anemia if only one of his parents has that trait.

The sickle cell trait can be detected through a simple, inexpensive blood test. It is a blood test that could be given in schools, years before youngsters reach marriageable age, to warn them if they have the sickle trait.

If a man and woman, knowing that each has the sickle trait, decide to marry and have children, that's their business. However, the opportunity to protect unborn children from the tragedy of sickle cell anemia should be made available to young men and women. It is not being made available today.

If this simple blood test were administered by the State of Connecticut in the schools, thousands of youngsters would quickly learn whether or not they have the sickle cell trait. They would learn whether or not they, when married, can transmit sickle cell anemia to unborn children. This isn't being done in any state in the country. Connecticut could . . . and should be . . . the first.

THE FORGOTTEN DISEASE

Two of the nation's leading authorities on sickle cell anemia, the hereditary blood disease that affects Negroes almost exclusively, will discuss the disease on "Sickle Cell Anemia—the Forgotten Disease" Friday night (Dec. 4) at 8:30 on WTIC-TV.

Dr. Robert Scott, director of the Laboratory for Hematological Research at Virginia Commonwealth University, and Dr. Louis W. Sullivan, co-director of the Hematology Section at the Boston University Medical Center, were in Hartford earlier this week to videotape the program.

Appearing with them on the program are Mrs. Walter McBride of Hartford, the mother of a sickle cell anemia victim, and Dr. Merton S. Honeyman, a geneticist with the Connecticut State Department of Health.

Dr. Scott and Dr. Sullivan will describe the disease, discuss its history and explain steps being taken to treat it and to prevent it. They will also explain the significance of a treatment for the disease discovered by physicians doing research in Michigan and the Washington, D.C. area and announced last week.

Mrs. McBride will tell of the experiences her family has had in raising a youngster who has suffered from the disease for 14 years, and Dr. Honeyman will tell what the State of Connecticut can provide in the area of providing blood tests that will tell youngsters whether or not they have what is known as "sickle cell trait." Dick Bertel will be the program's host.

While in Hartford to tape the program, Dr. Scott and Dr. Sullivan were guests at a luncheon held at Broadcast House to give them an opportunity to discuss sickle cell anemia with a group of community leaders.

At the luncheon, State Senator-elect Wilber Smith announced that he will introduce legislation in the next session of the General Assembly to provide for testing for sickle cell anemia in Connecticut schools. The Rev. Richard Battles, chairman of the Hartford Board of Education, said he has asked school authorities to begin a feasibility study on testing, which was also endorsed by Dr. Allyn Martin of the Hartford City Council, Dr. Arthur Banks, president of the Greater Hartford Community College, and the Rev. Segundo Las Heras, a leader of the Spanish-speaking community.

Providing the simple, inexpensive blood test for school children was first advocated in a WTIC editorial by Leonard J. Patricelli, president of Broadcast-Plaza, Inc.

WTIC-TV will present another special program on "The Forgotten Disease—Sickle Cell Anemia" on Friday, January 15, at 7 p.m.

The program, filmed in Washington, D.C., Bethesda, Maryland and Hartford, is part of WTIC-TV's continuing coverage of what has been termed one of America's most neglected health problems.

Sickle cell anemia is an inherited blood disease that takes the lives of half of its

victims before they reach the age of 20. Nearly all of its victims are black.

The disease has already been the subject of a special program and two editorials by Leonard J. Patricelli, president of Broadcast-Plaza, Inc. The editorials stressed the lack of attention sickle cell anemia has received in the past and advocated statewide testing to detect it and prevent its spread.

Most of the January 15 program was filmed at Freedmen's Hospital of Howard University in Washington, D.C. and at the National Institutes of Health in Bethesda, Maryland.

Dr. Roland Scott of Freedmen's Hospital tells what he has tried to accomplish in dealing with sickle cell anemia with a minimum of support during the past two decades. In an interview conducted in the Pediatrics Ward at the Howard University hospital, Dr. Scott tells of his dream for the establishment of a Center for the Study of Sickle Cell Anemia at the predominantly black university.

Dr. Scott also explains his views of the widely publicized urea treatment for sickle cell anemia victims and tells why he believes the so-called urea breakthrough may be considerably less important than its initial publicity indicated.

The program also includes conversations with a 16-year-old sickle cell anemia victim and his mother and a statement from Dr. Donald Fredrickson of the National Institutes of Health who describes the federal government's role in sickle cell anemia research.

The extent of Dr. Scott's activities at Howard is illustrated with footage taken in Hartford's North End where a former student of Dr. Scott, Dr. Evans Daniels, is now operating a non-profit health center.

"The Forgotten Disease—Sickle Cell Anemia" was filmed by Robert Dwyer and John Coates, with sound by Randy Scalis. It was directed by Roy Benjamin and produced by Rufus Coes and Richard Ahles.

COMMENT BY MR. PATRICELLI FOLLOWING SECOND SPECIAL PROGRAM ON SICKLE CELL ANEMIA, JANUARY 15TH

This is Leonard Patricelli: When we sent a documentary crew to Washington, we hoped they would find some answers to your questions about sickle cell anemia. We wanted to show you what was being accomplished at Howard University, where Dr. Roland Scott has been working on sickle cell anemia treatment and research for decades. And we hoped to find out what the federal government was doing about sickle cell anemia and what help it could provide the states, especially Connecticut.

At Howard University, we learned that Dr. Scott and his associates are severely limited by a lack of support from either public or private sources. However, we also discovered that Dr. Scott has a dream—a dream that may someday become the Center for the Study of Sickle Cell Anemia. Such a Center, as Dr. Scott told us in the program you just saw, would provide care for sickle cell anemia victims, extensive research facilities and a bureau of education which would disseminate knowledge of this terrible disease to the public and to physicians in every corner of the world.

At the National Institutes of Health, we found that the federal government was not really prepared to say what it could do about sickle cell anemia. However, at our request, the government has been researching the problem and within a few weeks, representatives of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare will come to Connecticut to meet with key legislative and health officials. This meeting should provide some specific answers.

We can also report some local progress. Eight weeks ago, in a WTIC editorial, we advocated a program of testing and counsel-

ing for sickle cell anemia. On the fifth of January, Hartford became the first city in America to authorize citywide testing of school children. The Board of Education plans to begin voluntary sickle cell anemia tests in the schools this spring.

In other words, this program on sickle cell anemia is the last we will be able to entitle "The Forgotten Disease." It's beginning to look as if there is a growing awareness of this disease and a growing desire to do something about it.

In November, when we first broadcast an editorial on sickle cell anemia, we promised that it wouldn't be the last you would hear of the disease. Tonight, we have another promise. This is not the last you will hear of Dr. Scott's dream of a Center for Sickle Cell Anemia.

REPRESENTATIVE MOORHEAD URGES LAOS REAPPRAISAL

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1971

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, like many of my colleagues, I am disturbed by the most recent military incursion into Laos by the South Vietnamese Army.

With so little information available, it is hard to make accurate observations. But from what is known, I have my doubts about the total worth of this venture.

Let us, for the moment, set aside the congressional restraints embodied in the Cooper-Church language. I say this because the administration takes no heed from Congress, or else makes so literal an interpretation of the provision that Cooper-Church is all but negated.

What angers me is that I have a strong feeling that the rationale behind the Laos adventure springs from belief that the United States can bring a military end to the Indochina war.

Our Nation, according to the President, is pledged to a political settlement in Indochina. I think we should begin putting flesh to those words.

Last year, I introduced a resolution that resolved "that no funds in fiscal year 1971 be used to finance the operation of any American combat or support troops in Cambodia, Laos, or Thailand." Needless to say, passage of this resolution would have precluded what is now happening in Laos.

I plan to reintroduce similar language with an appropriate updating of fiscal year limitations.

An editorial in today's Washington Post is a very accurate account of the way I feel about the Laos activity.

At this time, I would like to put this editorial into the Record and urge all of my colleagues, who have not yet done so, to read this editorial and then ask themselves, What are we doing assisting an invasion of Laos?

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 9, 1971]

LAOS: REAR GUARD OR THIRD FRONT?

When the President came up with his Cambodian surprise last Spring, we were told that it was indispensable to our success in Vietnam, and that it would be as decisive as, let's say, Stalingrad or D-Day, and that we had bought a year's time or more in terms of disruption of enemy infiltration and de-

struction of supplies. Now, of course, we are hearing precisely the same things about the foray against the Laotian access routes—that this, too, will be decisive because the Laotian trails are all that remains of the enemy's lifeline to the South. This is the genuinely disquieting aspect of this latest Vietnam adventure, the sense that the Administration really believes it is doing something decisive—that *this is it*. It is the irrepressible tendency to oversell that shakes the faith of even those war critics who would like to accept the administration's scenario—the phased withdrawal, the irreversible process of Vietnamization, the skillful buying of time and all the rest.

But it isn't only the oversell; it is also the *wrong sell*; the South Vietnamese plunge into Laos could hardly have been presented with less regard for public and congressional sensitivities. First there were the futile efforts at secrecy which only fanned the darkest speculations; then there were the incomprehensible speculations from responsible officials themselves. It was almost as if the administration had gone out of its way for ten days to conjure up the worst in order to make the real thing more palatable—which might not have been a bad tactic were it not for its effect upon public faith in the real thing when it finally materialized.

The real thing, as far as we can gather, is a South Vietnamese sweep through the Laotian access routes, strongly supported by American air and logistics, but not by organized U.S. combat units. It is supposedly intended to impede the infiltration flow, if not to stop it, until the rains come in the early Spring. This, in turn, would materially affect the capacity of the enemy to operate much further South in Cambodia and South Vietnam during the late Spring months—until the monsoon season reaches that region in June. And so you buy not two months, but maybe eight or ten, and Vietnamization proceeds apace. It makes some sense, if you believe that Vietnamization will proceed; it then can reasonably be said to advance in a very positive way our prospects for a continued, orderly, even accelerated withdrawal from the war.

But it still isn't Stalingrad. It isn't intended—allegedly—to win the war—only to facilitate our disengagement from it. And it may not even do that, because the South Vietnamese could get badly mauled; or the repercussions could bring down the neutralist government of Souvanna Phouma in Laos with who knows what consequences; or—the North Vietnamese could react in the way they have reacted to every significant alteration of the ground rules on our part; they could come with one of their own. This is what has always bedeviled Vietnam—the unforeseen consequence. Last April 30, Cambodia was suddenly critical to everything—whereas it hadn't been worth more than a phrase in a definitive war report by the President ten days earlier. A month or so ago, who was saying that Laos was suddenly the key to it all? And what is there to say that next month it may not be a North Vietnamese build-up across the top of the Demilitarized Zone—or the beginnings of heavy infiltration down through the DMZ—which will be said to oblige us to embark on yet another, final, definitive military adventure beyond South Vietnam's borders for the sake of the safe withdrawal of our troops?

This is the sort of hard question to which we hear no answers from the men in charge. And this also is the sort of grim possibility that is once again causing some war critics to warn anew of an "expanded war" and to charge violations of the Cooper-Church restraints and to threaten, with some good reason, further congressional efforts to stay the President's hand. For they cannot find, either in the record or some of the rhetoric, much reassurance that this is in fact a strictly limited rear guard maneuver and not the opening of a third war front. And neither, as far as that goes, can we.

THE VICTIMS OF CRIME

HON. WILLIAM J. GREEN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1971

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill that I believe will indicate to the victims of violent crime, to their relatives and to their friends, that government is concerned about them and compassionately interested in their lives.

Crime is never neutral in its effects. Yet, the reaction of society to crime has generally been to focus less on the victim and more on the enforcement agencies and the criminal. In this country, we have a system of well developed criminal procedures. We take seriously the dictum that rights of all must be protected. We insist on correct rules of evidence. We demand of our court prosecutors and enforcement personnel fairness and restraint in the kinds of investigative and judicial methods utilized to secure justice.

We have provided our law enforcement agencies with new powers and new sources of money. We have increased the size of enforcement training and education programs. We have provided funding for updating police communications through the use of on-line computers and information networks. Police salaries are increasing. We certainly have not solved all the court and enforcement problems. There is a heavy backlog in our courts. We still have too few judges and prosecutors. We still have not reconciled the role of the policeman in our changing society nor have we taken adequate measures of the problems of the police in relation to the kinds of duties they are called on to perform. Their problems are ongoing and we must continue to seek answers to them.

But, in all of our efforts at criminal justice, one omission is glaring and overpowering—we have not considered with the same dedication and sensitivity the third sector of any criminal act—the victim. The victim of violent crime has become the "forgotten victim." His plight and suffering have too often been dismissed as the unfortunate byproduct of violent attacks.

Yet, if government has the obligation to protect its citizens, if it has the obligation to provide enforcement assistance, if it has responsibility for public safety, so too does it have the obligation to help and care for the innocent it fails to protect.

To do less is to abrogate and make null the very heart of the relationship between a citizen and his government.

As an idea and concept, crime compensation is hardly novel. Several foreign countries and a small number of American States already have crime compensation legislation. California, New York, Maryland, Massachusetts, and Hawaii, presently have ongoing programs. New York, for example, in its crime compensation policy notes that "many innocent persons suffer personal physical injury or death as a result of criminal acts. Such persons or their dependents may thereby suffer disability, incur financial hardships or become dependent upon public assistance."

The basic bill I am introducing today was first proposed by former Senator Ralph Yarborough in 1965. That bill did not pass the Congress, but Yarborough reintroduced it in each succeeding year. In December of 1970, Senator MANSFIELD introduced a version of the 1965 bill. The Senate majority leader's bill was reintroduced in the current session of Congress.

The bill I am introducing is similar to Senator MANSFIELD's bill. My bill, however, requires States to provide a program to inform victims about the availability of compensation. The provision also makes it clear that the State is to advise the victim of how to apply for such compensation. I am including this provision because the history of many of our programs suggest that unless an effective program of outreach is conducted, the benefits of the program will not be distributed equally among all of our citizens. If there is a program for people, then government must tell the people about it.

The bill would establish a Federal Violent Crime Commission and empower the Commission to grant awards of up to \$25,000 for victims of assaults, robberies, arson, murder, rape, attempted rape, kidnaping, and other violent crimes. Compensation can be paid to the injured person, to any person responsible for the care of the injured person and to the dependents or closest relative of any deceased victim.

The bill contains safeguard against fraud and an audit provision to insure against extravagant or unjustified awards. The Commission can withhold grants if the applicant has not complied fully with the provision of the act. The Comptroller of the United States is provided access to any of the papers, documents or books for the purpose of audit. Criminal penalties are provided for the misuse of the benefits of the act.

I will be the first to admit that this bill is not perfect. I am hopeful that hearings will be held in the near future and that at these hearings hard questions about the scope, cost, and impact of the bill will be ascertained. I invite these questions. I believe they need exploration.

I am convinced however, that society must make some attempt to understand and comprehend the plight of the innocent victim. I know that monetary compensation does not begin to repay the victim for injuries, for loss of income, for pain and suffering. I am not naive enough to believe that monetary compensation provides adequate condolences to the family of a murdered relative.

What compensation may do is to provide the victim or his family with the economic assistance and reserves to avoid the often catastrophic consequences following an unprovoked and unanticipated attack. Such compensation may provide the victim with the ability to pay unforeseen or extended medical costs. It may provide the victim with a source of income to cover some of the loss of wages caused by violent criminal acts.

While property crimes are generally covered by insurance, crimes against person, which have increased some 130

percent in the last decade, all too frequently leave their victims with sizable problems both financial and mental for which they receive no help.

Our society and government cannot become so large or so remote that it fails to identify with the individual citizen. Yet, government has too often failed to consider the victim of violent crime. I believe that this bill, while not addressing all the grievances and all the sorrow of the innocent victim, will make our governments more aware of the human factor in crime.

SEIZURE OF AMERICAN TUNA BOATS

HON. WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1971

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the recent seizure of American tuna boats by Ecuador points up the real need for a change in U.S. policy toward our territorial seas. Such incidents occur all too regularly, and they will continue as long as a double standard governs the law of the open sea. For too long, our friends and enemies have taken advantage of our generous 3- and 12-mile claims without returning the favor to American vessels. Ecuador, for example, used American-built destroyers to enforce its extravagant 200-mile limit; an irony which I do not find particularly humorous.

The historic rule of thumb among maritime nations has been that a country's territorial rights extend 3 miles seaward; the 3 miles representing the effective range of a 17th century onshore cannon. The United States continues to adhere to this traditional limit for navigational purposes, while claiming a 12-mile boundary for fishing rights. Both claims, I might add, are eminently reasonable when compared with those of most other nations.

But times have changed, Mr. Speaker. The 3-mile limit no longer guarantees our security, leaving us open to numerous forms of electronic surveillance and enemy espionage. The 12-mile limit no longer protects the rights of our fishermen against nations claiming 200-mile jurisdictions. And the entire situation merely perpetuates the inequity of the double standard which governs our international waters.

The joint resolution I introduced today calls for an international conference to resolve the debate over territorial seas. The need for such a panel should be obvious.

More important, however, my legislation would establish an American policy of reciprocity with regard to other nations. It would impose the same limits in U.S. waters on the ships of any country which itself claimed limits beyond what are considered to be normal under international agreement. Thus, Russian or North Korea ships would be allowed only within 12 miles of our shore, whether fishing or cruising; Ecuadorian vessels would be restricted from areas within 200 miles of the coast. It seems time,

Mr. Speaker, that we ask other nations to observe the same stringent rules we impose upon ourselves—or suffer the consequences.

The joint resolution I am introducing is identical to the one I offered at this time last year; only the circumstances are more urgent, and they demand immediate action by the Congress.

DEFENDERS OF DDT

HON. DAVID R. OBEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1971

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago those of us who have been working for some time to prohibit the further use of DDT won a significant victory when Environmental Protection Administrator William Ruckelshaus announced that the registration of DDT would be canceled for all uses, and that hearings would be held to determine whether DDT registration ought to be suspended immediately, effectively halting the shipment of that compound in interstate commerce.

In spite of the great and constantly growing volume of evidence that DDT is harmful to birds, fish, and wildlife, there are still some who contend that DDT is not the culprit at all. In an excellent article which recently appeared in the Washington Post, Irston Barnes answers these critics, and recites again the harm this chemical has done to the bald eagle.

I include the article in the Record at this point:

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 7, 1971]

DEFENDERS OF DDT

(By Irston R. Barnes)

Rearguard actions against the termination of the use of DDT, against governmental action to halt the damage to life and the environment, continue to be fought.

The recent decision of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, in response to a suit brought by the Environmental Defense Fund, the National Audubon Society, the Sierra Club and the West Michigan Environmental Action Council represents a signal victory for those seeking to use legal methods to protect the environment. The Court directed the government to cancel all registered uses of DDT and asked the Environmental Protection Agency to determine whether a suspension order should be issued stopping immediately all DDT shipments in interstate commerce.

The Environmental Protection Agency has responded with notices canceling the registration of all remaining uses of DDT. However, the statutes allow elaborate appeals, during which manufacturers could continue selling DDT, unless the EPA determines that all DDT uses are "an imminent hazard to the public." Such a finding could bring an immediate interim halt to interstate sales of DDT.

EPA Administrator William Ruckelshaus has promised such a review within 60 days.

Cancellation of registration will predictably be opposed by the manufacturers, by cotton growers (the principal domestic users) and by various spokesmen for the agrochemical complex who have for so long represented the chemical viewpoint in state and federal agencies.

Despite irrefutable evidence of damage to fish, birds and other wildlife of both man-altered and natural environments, defenders of chemical pesticides still protest that the

case against DDT is unproven and still seek to confuse the issue.

What appears to be a prime example of such tactics is an incredible article in the December issue of *The Virginia Outdoors*, an official publication of the Virginia Commission of Outdoor Recreation. The piece, "The Killing of the Bald Eagle," by Dr. H. Gruenhagen, is directed against "certain groups or individuals" who "pick out specific items for special emphasis," e.g., "the apparent decline of the bald eagle."

The article begins with a series of observations: the concern for bald eagles antedates the use of DDT; cutting of timber and pollution have degraded eagle habitats; a bounty was paid in Alaska on bald eagles (which could hardly affect eastern populations); and autopsies on 76 dead eagles performed at the Patuxent Wildlife Research Center from 1960 through 1965 showed that 54 birds died from identifiable causes related to man. His conclusion is a complete non sequitur: "that man is primarily responsible for the decline of the bald eagle and that the role of pesticides has been greatly exaggerated."

How could the author be ignorant of the true facts regarding the disastrous crash in bald eagle populations, particularly in the Eastern United States? The evidence has been much publicized and is overwhelming.

The year-to-year surveys directed by the National Audubon Society have established declining populations, declining numbers of active nests, and poor nesting success. Similar trends have been observed in the peregrine falcon, Scottish golden eagles, and American ospreys, as set forth in the documented report of an international conference at the University of Wisconsin in 1965. The list of DDT-endangered American species also includes the brown pelican, and other species are under intensive study.

The mechanism by which DDT kills species has been established in controlled research experiments at the Patuxent Wildlife Research Center, with the results so widely circulated that they could hardly be unknown to anyone expressing an opinion on the effects of DDT on wildlife. Sublethal accumulations of DDT and its derivatives interfere with the birds' calcium metabolism, causing

eggs to be so thin-shelled that they cannot be successfully incubated.

Sublethal ingestion of DDT and its derivatives also causes infertility in adult birds, infertile eggs, and young which do not survive to grow up.

Certainly the destruction of habitat, the general increase in pollution, and lawless shooting have reduced eagle numbers. But these forces did not interfere with normal reproduction. They have not made the bald eagle an endangered species!

When DDT came into general use in 1946, there were still hundreds of eagles nesting in Maine, in the Chesapeake Bay region, and in Florida and lesser numbers were nesting in the Great Lakes region and in many eastern states. Eagles could be seen flying over Washington. They nested all along the Potomac River below Washington. The 1949 Christmas Count in the Washington area recorded 20 bald eagles. (In the decade 1945-54 the Washington area Christmas Count recorded an average 10.3 bald eagles. In the decade of 1955-64 the average count fell to 2.1.)

A footnote on Dr. Gruenhagen's interest in eagles. He is reported to be an extension specialist of the Chemical, Drug and Pesticide Unit at Virginia Polytechnic Institute. From 1946 to 1958, he was a group leader in plant pathology for Dow Chemical. Earlier he was a plant pathologist in the Wisconsin and United States Departments of Agriculture.

SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFIT INCREASE NEEDED NOW

HON. FRED SCHWENDEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1971

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

OTHER PUBLIC RETIREMENT BENEFITS

Public retirement benefits other than OASDHI (excluding veterans' benefits) were substantially higher than private pensions, and, on the average, they were also higher than OASDHI benefits (table 5). The higher benefit levels for these public pensioners reflect the fact that in many of these programs, OASDHI benefits were not anticipated as a major source of income for persons retiring under the system. Private plans, however, explicitly or implicitly anticipate OASDHI benefits as a source of retirement income for their members. More than 35 percent of the aged units with other public pensions—chiefly railroad retirement and Federal Government pensioners—did not concurrently receive OASDHI benefits, the proportion was much smaller among private pensioners—about 3 percent.

Federal retirement programs are liberal in comparison with private industry and State and local government plans as a whole, because they relate pensions to peak earnings and maintain the value of benefits after retirement as living costs rise, through automatic adjustment of benefits. Furthermore, the high average benefits under Federal programs reflect the growth in the number of retirees with long service as an aftermath of the expanded employment of the forties.

Benefit levels under the railroad retirement system are at a substantially higher rate than those under OASDHI, because the wage-related benefit formula is more liberal in the former program. In addition, a system of supplemental benefits was introduced in 1966 for long-service railroad workers retiring at age 65. State and local government retirement plans, typically basing benefits on past earnings and length of service, also tend to provide benefits at a higher level than that of private plans.¹ Most of these government systems require substantial employee contributions, presumably reflected in higher benefit levels; most private plans are financed in full by the employer.

¹ Saul Waldman, *Retirement Systems for Employees of State and Local Governments . . . 1966* (Research Report No. 23), Social Security Administration, Office of Research and Statistics, 1968.

TABLE 5.—SIZE OF OTHER PUBLIC PENSION INCOME BY OASDHI BENEFICIARY STATUS: PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF AGED UNITS BY SIZE OF OTHER PUBLIC PENSION INCOME, 1967

Other public pension income	All units	Nonmarried persons			
		Married couples	Total	Men	Women
All units ¹					
Number (thousands):					
Total with other public pension income	1,466	614	833	243	589
Reporting on other public pension income	1,365	570	796	229	566
Percent of units	100	100	100	100	100
\$1 to \$149	1	(?)	2	1	2
\$150 to \$299	2	2	2	1	2
\$300 to \$499	4	2	5	6	5
\$500 to \$999	24	13	32	21	36
\$1,000 to \$1,499	18	15	21	11	24
\$1,500 to \$1,999	13	12	13	21	10
\$2,000 to \$2,499	14	16	12	22	9
\$2,500 to \$2,999	9	13	6	7	5
\$3,000 to \$3,499	6	11	3	2	3
\$3,500 to \$3,999	2	5	1	1	(?)
\$4,000 to \$4,999	3	5	2	3	2
\$5,000 to \$7,499	2	5	1		
\$7,500 to \$9,999	1	1	1	3	
\$10,000 or more	(?)	(?)	1	1	1
Median public pension income	\$1,538	\$2,188	\$1,214	\$1,738	\$1,104
OASDHI beneficiary units ¹					
Number (thousands):					
Total with other public pension income	926	441	485	132	353
Reporting on other public pension income	862	402	460	128	332
Percent of units	100	100	100	100	100
\$1 to \$149	2	(?)	3	2	3
\$150 to \$299	2	3	2		3
\$300 to \$499	5	3	7	8	7
Nonbeneficiary units					
Number (thousands):					
Total with other public pension income	520	173	348	111	236
Reporting on other public pension income	503	168	336	101	234
Percent of units	100	100	100	100	100
\$1 to \$149	(?)		1		1
\$150 to \$299	1		1	2	1
\$300 to \$499	2		3	2	3
\$500 to \$999	20	4	28	7	36
\$1,000 to \$1,499	21	7	28	14	35
\$1,500 to \$1,999	11	7	12	23	7
\$2,000 to \$2,499	19	23	17	36	9
\$2,500 to \$2,999	8	18	4	2	4
\$3,000 to \$3,499	8	20	1	2	1
\$3,500 to \$3,999	2	5	1	2	
\$4,000 to \$4,999	4	9	2	2	2
\$5,000 to \$7,499	2	6			
\$7,500 to \$9,999	1	1	1	5	
\$10,000 or more					
Median public pension income	\$1,768	\$2,721	\$1,272	\$1,996	\$1,092

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

² 0.5 percent or less.

TABLE 6.—SIZE OF OASDHI INCOME BY TYPE OF RETIREMENT BENEFIT FOR OASDHI BENEFICIARIES¹; PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF AGED UNITS BY SIZE OF OASDHI INCOME, BY RECEIPT OF RETIREMENT BENEFITS, 1967

OASDHI income	Married couples with OASDHI benefits and—			Nonmarried persons									
	Private group pension ²	Other public pension	No other pension	Total with OASDHI benefits and—			Men with OASDHI benefits and—			Women with OASDHI benefits and—			
				Private group pension ²	Other public pension	No other pension	Private group pension ²	Other public pension	No other pension	Private group pension ²	Other public pension	No other pension	
Number (in thousands):													
Total.....	1,009	392	3,438	605	476	6,353	287	128	1,476	317	348	4,876	
Reporting on OASDHI income.....	1,002	392	3,398	605	476	6,315	287	128	1,463	317	348	4,852	
Percent of units.....	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	
\$1 to \$249.....	(³)	8	3	1	2	(³)	1	(³)	1	2	(³)	(³)	
\$250 to \$499.....	(³)	8	3	(³)	5	6	2	3	1	7	7	7	
\$500 to \$749.....	1	19	8	6	39	31	5	34	25	7	41	32	
\$750 to \$999.....	2	17	11	11	16	24	6	16	20	16	16	25	
\$1,000 to \$1,249.....	4	11	13	27	16	25	16	13	23	36	18	26	
\$1,250 to \$1,499.....	10	12	16	36	14	11	49	24	21	24	11	8	
\$1,500 to \$1,749.....	14	12	13	20	7	3	24	11	7	16	5	1	
\$1,750 to \$1,999.....	13	7	12										
\$2,000 to \$2,249.....	32	8	14			(³)			(³)				
\$2,250 to \$2,449.....	16	5	7										
\$2,500 to \$2,749.....	2	1	1										
\$2,750 to \$2,999.....	2	1	1										
\$3,000 to \$3,499.....	1	1	(³)										
Median OASDHI income.....	\$2,040	\$1,150	\$1,483	\$1,304	\$826	\$870	\$1,396	\$960	\$1,008	\$1,188	\$775	\$840	

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 Includes a small number of units reporting both a private and another public pension.
³ 0.5 percent or less.

Though both public and private pensions showed the heaviest concentration in the \$500-\$999 range the median for public retirement benefits other than OASDHI (\$1,540) was \$600 higher than the median in private plans (table 5). For payments under public programs as for private-plan payments, levels were higher for married couples and nonmarried men (with medians of \$2,190 and \$1,740) than for women without husbands (median of \$1,105). The lower pension levels for nonmarried women reflect their lower earnings levels and shorter service periods (factors in the computation of benefits), as well as the reduced levels associated with survivor benefits.

Pensioners drawing only public pensions other than OASDHI in retirement typically had higher benefit levels than those receiving such pensions in addition to OASDHI benefits (table 5), for the reasons that were previously discussed. The median benefit of \$2,720 for couples in the former group was \$900 higher than the median for couples in the latter group. The difference between median public pensions for nonmarried men with and without OASDHI benefits was about \$600, but the medians for nonmarried women were about the same.

Type of pension	Median pension of—		
	Married couples	Nonmarried persons	
		Men	Women
OASDHI benefit.....	\$1,555	\$1,080	\$860
Private group pension.....	970	865	665
Other public pension.....	2,190	1,740	1,105
And OASDHI.....	1,800	1,395	1,005
And no OASDHI.....	2,720	1,995	1,090

In summary, the median private pension payment, as shown above, was not only lower than the median OASDHI benefit payment, but it was substantially below the median amount of public pensions other than OASDHI.

² For a detailed analysis of dual Federal Government and social security coverage, see Elizabeth Heldbreder, "Federal Civil-Service Annuitants and Social Security," *Social Security Bulletin*, July 1969.

REVENUE SHARING LEGISLATION

HON. C. W. BILL YOUNG

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1971

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join with 136 of my colleagues today in cosponsoring President Nixon's general revenue sharing plan, and I urge prompt action on this vitally needed legislation.

Local government in this Nation appears headed for destruction, the victim of long years of neglect and economic starvation. Unless we reverse this trend, life in America, as we know it, will be lost to us forever.

The President's plan to pump \$5 billion a year in new and unrestricted funds into our local governments is a major step in restoring vitality to our State and local governments.

My home State of Florida alone would receive an estimated \$167.5 million a year under the President's plan. Some States will receive much more—significantly, with no strings attached.

In our desire for so-called efficiency, we have rushed headlong into centralization of power at the Federal level. As a result, we have sapped the strength of our State and local governments, which lack many of the resources available to Big Brother in Washington.

It is long past time to decentralize, to return government to the people. Our local officials are most familiar with local problems, and best able to find meaningful solutions. Some of the worst decisions in recent years are the result of bureaucrats in Washington deciding what they think is best for people living thousands of miles away.

Yes, Washington on occasion has been willing to share some of its revenues with our local communities—but at the price of endless redtape and impossible conditions. A major feature of the President's

plan is that State and local governments would receive their share of the revenue with no strings attached, and determine themselves how the funds best be spent.

It is time we started trusting our cities, counties, and States. After all, it is they that make up what is best in America.

STOP BEING FUNNY

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1971

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the obvious public opposition to heavy taxation and an ineffective use of Federal moneys at all levels of government is properly emphasized in an editorial Saturday, January 30, in the Polish American—Chicago.

I believe it is pertinent, Mr. Speaker, for us to recognize that this logical public frustration with taxation is directed at all levels of government and under no circumstances will duplication of effort, waste, or unneeded government spending be tolerated. The editorial follows:

STOP BEING FUNNY

The old saying that "people are funny" was never truer than it is today. Never were there so many millions asking for public charity doled out to them under a pleasing variety of titles. We overlook the fact that government has no money to give that it does not first take from its citizens in taxes, or higher and higher public debt. The latter today requires the payment of over \$20 billion a year in interest charges alone.

No matter what the government, federal, state or local is giving you, don't think you are not paying for it. We are paying for exorbitant government spending and debt in inflated prices and the reduced value and buying power of the dollar. We are paying for it in everything we eat, wear and use. The amount of taxes withheld from the average income would have paid for a home not so long ago. What used to be put into savings,

now goes to the tax collector, and the one who earned it never sees it.

The people will have to stop being "funny" if they wish to save their bacon in the U.S. Your savings and your government are being destroyed by those who put politics ahead of fiscal responsibility.

TRIBUTE TO L. MENDEL RIVERS

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1971

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, the great loss which Congress and the Nation have experienced because of the death of our esteemed colleague, L. Mendel Rivers, is very well expressed in an editorial in the February 1971 issue of "The Officer," a publication of the Reserve Officers Association of the United States.

In a similar vein, the February issue of "Naval Affairs" published by the Fleet Reserve Association in Washington carries a great tribute to our esteemed departed colleague.

I submit both for reprinting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

LOOKING AHEAD 30 YEARS AFTER THE DEATH OF MENDEL RIVERS

One of the most powerful men in the nation, the President Pro Tem of the Senate, Richard B. Russell, said of the death of L. Mendel Rivers:

"No man ever lived who was more wholeheartedly dedicated to the defense of this Nation than Mendel Rivers and those of us who are convinced that a strong defense is our hope for continued freedom and peace have lost a champion.

"For three decades, I met with him in conference and we worked together in matters relating to the Armed Services. He not only had a far-reaching understanding of the operations of the Department of Defense, but he was unyielding in his efforts to insure that the Department was supplied with the necessary means to guarantee the security of this Nation.

"I am deeply saddened by his passing and I extend to Mrs. Rivers and her family my profound sympathy."

The depth of Senator Russell's convictions was conveyed more forcefully, however, in his private comment to friends that it would be another generation before the real tragedy of the loss of the House champion of national preparedness would be felt. Thirty years from now, he said, would come the time of reckoning with regard to this nation's safety, and even survival, because the stalwart, resolute, and therefore embattled, Chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, had been removed by death from the bastion he manned in this nation's defense structure and its defense philosophy.

Much has been written about Mendel Rivers, and the fact that he was a controversial figure on the national scene. The media generally have fully disclosed his character as the hero and guardian of the rights of the men and women in the uniform of the United States of America. And yet, in everything that has been written about Mr. Rivers, in summary of his career and his contribution to national survival, none has adequately conveyed the real strength of the man nor his spiritual commitment to protection of this country's institutions, its ideals and traditions.

The way the game is played in Washington, with channels of communication so greatly

broadened in this generation, national leadership is so often diluted, undermined or negated by the plethora of bombast and propaganda spewed out to the public and constituting as it does an intellectual pollution so thick that the citizenry cannot possibly be expected to make logical decisions based upon actual truth.

Mendel Rivers was not the victim of this miasma; he could not be intimidated by propaganda; his character was not subject to assassination. Despite all that has been said about him and the basis for the longevity of his service to the half million people of the First District of South Carolina, there is no general recognition of the degree to which he was held in the esteem and affection of the broad base of citizenry which he represented. The fact is that Mendel Rivers' stature, his gifts, his leadership and his warm personality made him an institution of historic Charleston and environs, whose history and mores were based upon the earliest and purest Americana.

If a man is known by his enemies, as well as by his friends, it can be said of Mendel Rivers that his career had a brightness upon which he should reflect; because he was despised and lampooned upon every opportunity, by every element of those who were not tolerant of his stern adherence to a strong military policy in the nation, including many who honestly and in good conscience deplored his giving first priority to national military safety, as well as by those who either were a part of, or encouraged, the miniscule element of American society who are in open revolt, advocating revolution and overthrow of our Government and its Constitution.

Chairman Rivers had the support of the great majority not only of the Armed Services Committee but of the whole House, as was demonstrated time and again during the past several years when he was a target of abuse and libel. It may be sadly true that as Senator Russell predicts a future generation may tragically discover that Rivers was right and that his critics were in deep error. Yet we cannot accept the thesis that his influence and example of leadership will not continue under the 92nd Congress, and the succeeding Congresses, because his policy and his resolution represented the very essence of unhappy but pure truth—that is that the United States of America can survive only if it remains militarily strong and if the leadership of the nation continues to insist that every citizen must be willing to place his life on the line as the price of freedom.

THE HONORABLE L. MENDEL RIVERS, 1905-70,
U.S. REPRESENTATIVE, FIRST CONGRESSIONAL
DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA

THE U.S. SERVICEMEN'S CONGRESSMAN AND A
SHIPMATE

Shipmate L. Mendel Rivers of Charleston Branch 50, Chairman of the U.S. House of Representatives Committee on Armed Services, joined the Staff of the Supreme Commander at 0240 E.S.T., Monday, 28 December 1970 while recovering from cardiac surgery at the University Medical Center in Birmingham, Alabama. Chairman Rivers underwent open heart surgery by Dr. John Kirklon on 11 December to replace a leaking mitral valve in his heart with a plastic valve. His post-operative recovery was progressing normally until 20 December when he suffered heart stoppage and was revived by chest massage. Thereafter, his condition remained critical, but improved slightly, until his demise.

The National Charter of the Fleet Reserve Association will be draped for thirty days. All Branches of the Fleet Reserve Association will drape their Charters for the same period commencing on 30 December 1970 in accordance with Section 2707 of the Fleet Reserve Association "Rituals."

Chairman Rivers was born on 28 September 1905 on a farm in Gumville, South Caro-

lina, near a place called Hell Hole Swamp, in the low country of that state's coastal plain. His father farmed and operated a small turpentine still. When Mendel (he never used his first name "Lucius") was eight his father died. His mother lost the family home and moved her six children to North Charleston where she took in boarders.

Young Mendel grew up determined to be a lawyer. He clerked in a country store, delivered papers pony-back, played outfield for a semi-pro baseball team and worked in the Charleston Navy Yard. He attended the College of Charleston and the University of South Carolina but was economically forced to quit his formal education. He gained employment in a Charleston law office where he pursued his law studies. He passed the South Carolina bar examination in 1932 before obtaining a law degree.

He served in the South Carolina Legislature from 1933 to 1936. From 1936 to 1940 he served as a special attorney in the United States Department of Justice; and was admitted to practice before the Supreme Court of the United States.

In 1940 he ran for Congress against the advice of seasoned and influential local politicians. He campaigned against "the Charleston crowd" and drew heavy support from the rural areas of the district. To the surprise of all, he won and thereafter never faced serious opposition. He had opposition in only two or three of his subsequent fifteen successful campaigns for reelection.

In the second session of the 88th Congress in 1964, The Honorable Carl Vinson, then Chairman of the House Committee on Armed Services, announced his retirement. Representative Rivers was the ranking Democrat on that Committee and he succeeded "Uncle Carl" as Chairman upon the convening of the 89th Congress in January 1965.

Shipmate Rivers was always a strong advocate of legislation beneficial to military personnel. He played a key role in the House's passage of the provision to restore the principle of recomputation of military retired pay for those who retired prior to 1 July 1958 in the 1963 military pay bill. He was Chairman of the House Armed Services Subcommittee on Military Medical Benefits in 1964. His leadership resulted in the enactment of Public Law 89-614 establishing the Civilian Health and Medical Program for the Uniformed Services (CHAMPUS) in 1966.

As Chairman of the House Armed Services Committee he immediately began to exert strong influence for the improvement of military pay, allowances and benefits. The first test of his leadership was the successful passage and enactment of a military pay raise that was twice the amount proposed by the Administration in its 1965 budget. Following that victory, military personnel knew they had found a champion and their benefits increased each year because of his legislative innovations, expertise and dedication to his philosophy, "The Serviceman and his family are entitled to a standard of living equal to the standard of living they're defending."

Chairman Rivers left no stone unturned and he never missed an opportunity to act in behalf of all military personnel. His record of military personnel legislation enacted is almost legendary in the annals of legislative history. He fought tremendous odds, including two Administrations, to provide our nation with an adequate military defense.

Chairman Rivers was a member of the Grace Episcopal Church in Charleston, South Carolina. Funeral services were held there at 1300, Wednesday, 30 December 1970 and interment followed in the town of St. Stephen, South Carolina. St. Stephen was the home of the Chairman's parents and is forty-six miles from Charleston. Shipmates National President Robert L. Bastian and National Executive Secretary Robert W. Nolan repre-

sented the Fleet Reserve Association at the church and graveside services.

His 82,500 Shipmates of the Fleet Reserve Association, indeed, all military personnel, active duty and retired, deeply mourn his passing. His beloved wife, Margaret, his daughters, Mrs. Robert Eastman and Marion, and young Lucius Mendel Jr. can take great pride in the Chairman's service to his nation and the Free World during the past thirty years. Dr. Albert Einstein said:

"ONLY A LIFE LIVED FOR OTHERS IS A LIFE WORTH WHILE"

Shipmate Chairman Rivers' life is the epitome of that statement. It will be a space of time before another like him walks with us and carries our burden to make the way easier for us, his Shipmates.

The family has requested that those who wish to remember Chairman Rivers in a special way may wish to address their remembrances to the L. Mendel Rivers Heart Surgery Research Fund, Department of Surgery, Alabama Medical Center, University of Alabama, Birmingham, Alabama. Messages of condolence may be addressed to: Mrs. L. Mendel Rivers, 640 Federal Building, Charleston, South Carolina 29403.

As the years roll by, one by one, we end our cruise. The anchor is dropped to rise from the waters no more.

Shipmate L. Mendel Rivers sailed through life's cruise, meeting more than his share of calms and storms, adverse tides and favoring winds; his ship of life has come to its final anchorage in a harbor still uncharted by mortal men. We who remain do not know the waters there, but we do know the course to steer and we believe that our Shipmate, setting his course by those beacons that have been given us, has found that harbor safely. To those loved ones whom our departed Shipmate has left behind, awaiting their own day of departure and voyage to that same harbor of eternal mercy, we can only offer our sympathy in this time of separation and loneliness. There are many words that could be used at this time to describe the good and outstanding qualities of the one who has gone before, but we of the Fleet Reserve Association, of which he was a member, sum it up in one word: Shipmate. That word, when spoken by naval men, embodies all that can be said of any man. Chairman L. Mendel Rivers was a Shipmate.

We who remain to carry on should not think of Shipmate Rivers as gone from us, but rather that he has been transferred to another ship or station where we all hope to be Shipmates again.

R. W. N.

FEDERAL REVENUE SHARING

HON. LOUIS FREY, JR.

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1971

Mr. FREY. Mr. Speaker, I think it is important to note that the White House does not believe it has erred in its proposal for sharing Federal revenues with the States and local governments.

Too often in the course of our history there has been validity in charges that an administration has erred in judgment or in fact when presenting an important program and, as a result, those charges have gone unchallenged.

But today, we see the President and the White House fully confident that they are right and fully prepared to meet the

challenge, from whatever source, when their basic premises are questioned.

May I repeat here today what Presidential Assistant John Ehrlichman said recently, because it is important that the facts be iterated constantly so that both the Congress and the people can judge revenue sharing on its merits.

Mr. Ehrlichman said:

We are not going to raise taxes or cut existing programs. It is not true that some cities and States will receive less money under the Administration proposal. It is true that some will receive more.

Governors, county executives, and mayors should all be aware of this and, being aware, should support the program wholeheartedly. It is, I believe, their salvation.

ANOTHER NEW YORK CITY POWER FAILURE

HON. RICHARD FULTON

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1971

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, another power failure, this one caused by an explosion of unknown origin, has again left a part of New York City without adequate electric service for a considerable length of time.

The latest interruption of service for the long-suffering New Yorkers came this past Sunday evening when midtown Manhattan slipped into partial darkness for over 2 hours.

The Consolidated Edison Corp., said the trouble was caused apparently by an explosion in an East Side powerplant, an explosion of unknown origin. Shortly thereafter someone phoned the Associated Press in New York in an attempt to give the impression that the incident was caused by sabotage. However, at last report no sabotage was indicated.

Mr. Speaker, for several weeks running now the New York City area has been suffering from one power shortage or collapse after another for a variety of causes.

However, no matter what these individual causes might happen to be, they all add up to an inadequate power supply production and delivery system not only for New York, but for the entire eastern seaboard and much of the United States.

It is my belief that the House of Representatives should closely study this situation, and for that reason I have introduced House Resolution 155, to establish a select House committee to investigate the energy resources in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, the most recent power collapse in New York City is yet another symptom of what may well be a serious disease which can cripple our future economic expansion and growth unless we diagnose, treat, and cure it immediately.

I believe the establishment of the select House committee called for in my resolution would be a significant first step toward a cure.

LUNAR TRIUMPH

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1971

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, with the successful return of Astronauts Shepard, Mitchell, and Roosa, the United States has again demonstrated that its hope for the future lies in its ability to apply technology. The same technology that has taken us so successfully to the moon on Apollo 14 is today being well applied to our problems right here on earth. The New York Times of February 7, 1971, carried a landmark editorial which places the success of our Apollo 14 in perspective. This editorial states well that—

Shepard and Mitchell have provided vivid evidence of how much more men can do in space than even the most ingenious instruments now available.

Programs now underway, both automated and manned, in the earth resources surveys and other areas of space effort will benefit from the experience of Apollo 14 if we have the will to adequately support our national space program. The editorial follows:

LUNAR TRIUMPH

Astronauts Shepard and Mitchell have enacted a brilliant chapter in the history of lunar exploration these past two days. They spent more time traveling over the lunar surface and covered a greater area of the moon than men have ever done before. They set up more scientific instruments, they conducted more experiments than any of their predecessors, and in a region of extraordinary geological interest they gathered far more lunar rocks and soil than the astronauts of Apollo 11 and 12 or the unmanned Soviet Luna 16 device. If they return safely to earth with their precious cargo, man's knowledge and understanding of the moon and of the origin of the solar system are likely to reach a peak well above the present level.

The Soviet press has in recent days been seeking to downgrade the Apollo flights and to argue, implicitly and explicitly, that scientific exploration by means of unmanned probes such as those Moscow has sent to the moon and Venus is adequate for man's desired knowledge of the solar system. Yet it must be recognized that it will be decades before instruments can do on the moon or another planet what Shepard and Mitchell did these past 48 hours. The variety of tasks they performed, the speed with which they worked, and the precise detail of the observations they reported back to earth are far beyond anything machines alone are now able to perform. Remote-controlled instruments are still clumsy, slow and limited means of getting information as compared with astronauts who have highly trained and versatile minds and bodies.

The success of Apollo 14, therefore, should go far to put in perspective the relative merits of manned and unmanned space exploration. The achievements of Soviet unmanned rockets in landing instruments on Venus, in returning three ounces of moon dust to earth and in putting Lunokhod into operation on the lunar surface were in every way remarkable. But now the exploits of Shepard and Mitchell have provided vivid evidence of how much more men can do in space than even the most ingenious instruments now available.

From a long-range point of view there is no real conflict between the two types of space exploration. Both are important, useful and, in fact, essential. It is in planetary exploration that instruments now offer the greatest promise, for they can go to Venus, Mars and more distant planets in the period immediately ahead, while it will be decades before men will be able to make those same journeys. But on the moon, as Apollo 14 has shown so irrefutably, manned visits are the most productive means of exploration.

FARM DISCONTENT

HON. JAMES ABOUREZK

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1971

Mr. ABOUREZK. Mr. Speaker, in analyzing the results of the 1970 elections, columnist after columnist has pointed out that it was in the traditionally Republican Midwest that the Republican Party suffered its greatest losses. Indeed, the largest gains in House seats made by Democrats in any one State was in the State of South Dakota. This should be convincing proof that there is a manifest dissatisfaction among American farmers.

In State after State where the Nixon-Hardin farm bill was an issue, Republicans fared poorly and Democrats did well. The farmer wants and deserves better than what has been offered to him. If this spark of dissatisfaction is not to be fanned into the full flames of farm revolt, we must consider corrective measures in the farm bill. I recognize the reluctance of Congress to go over this ground again so soon after passing major farm legislation. Yet, if we are to prove the American representative system viable, as we all believe it to be, we cannot ignore such a clear voice of protest as was raised at the polls last November by the constituency most immediately involved.

In support of what I say, and as proof of this dissatisfaction, I would commend to the attention of my colleagues the following letter by my good friend Ben Radcliffe, President of the South Dakota Farmers Union.

I include the article as follows:

SOUTH DAKOTA FARMERS UNION,
Huron, S. Dak., January 8, 1971.

HON. JAMES ABOUREZK,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR JIM: I note with serious concern the recent announcement that prices South Dakota farmers received for their products were down 12 per cent from a year ago. And each month the United States Department of Agriculture tells us the parity ratio has fallen again until now it stands at 67 per cent, the 1933 level. My concern is magnified by the fact that I am convinced the present farm law will spell disaster for thousands of South Dakota farmers.

If this year's program is any indication of what we can expect under the new bill, I can only be pessimistic about the possibility of the Secretary of Agriculture using what options the bill provides to raise farm income. Indeed, it appears that American agriculture is being made the whipping boy of our economy.

As you know, the Nixon-Hardin farm bill was rejected by the voters in the November election in every race where it was an issue. While the Congress may be reluctant to consider a new farm program after just passing one, it is my profound belief that we must have a new farm bill if agriculture as we know it today is to survive.

South Dakota can and should take the lead in this vital matter.

Sincerely,

BEN H. RADCLIFFE, President.

DENTAL CARE—A NEGLECTED ART

HON. LIONEL VAN DEERLIN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1971

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, in all the anxiety over the urgent need for improving the availability of medical care, those in the Congress and the agencies and the general public are inclined, I think, to pay too little attention to the vast deficiencies in the amount of dental care received by the people, particularly children. And this despite the fact that every President since Harry Truman has made separate appeals for making more dental care available, regardless of income.

The fact is the Federal Government, like States and local communities, continues to emphasize medical care while dental problems are shunted aside year after year.

An excellent article on the current problems of dentistry has been prepared for Dental Survey by George Connery, the magazine's Washington correspondent for more than 20 years. Mr. Connery suggests that now may be the time for the dentists themselves and their American Dental Association to make their own case with Congress and the Government.

Mr. Connery's article, as published in the current issue of Dental Survey, follows:

DENTISTRY'S HEALTH ROLE: A QUESTION OF "URGENCY"

WASHINGTON, D.C.—One big question hovering over all discussions here of national health problems involves national health insurance. It seems clear that a new system is on the way which will, for good or bad, affect almost all of the population.

Indeed, there is now so much support for the idea that the old battle lines are wiped out and the issue in the 92nd Congress is no longer whether the people are going to have help with their health care bills—but when this help will come, and how it will be provided. Whether dentistry is to be included, however, remains very much in doubt.

It should be noted that the controversial Dr. Roger Egeberg, chief medical officer for the Nixon Administration, went a long way toward crystallizing professional, public and governmental thinking on the issue. Dr. Egeberg, squarely on record as favoring national health insurance before he became a spokesman for the Republicans on health matters, has shaded his public remarks to stay a little closer to what was believed to be the Nixon policy of moving slowly—but he did not change his basic ideas, and never said he had changed them.

He dodged direct answers on whether national health insurance would be a good

thing by arguing that this question doesn't have to be answered now: His position is that the nation's system for training dentists, physicians and auxiliary personnel is incapable of turning out enough skilled manpower to meet the need, and that the socioeconomic structure for delivering health care is so hopelessly confused and unresponsive that it would have to be junked.

When the President's advisers, under irresistible public and political pressure, started putting together a massive program to improve the quantity, quality and availability of health care, Dr. Egeberg had thus persuaded much of the public, much of the profession and many of the leaders on Capitol Hill that drastic change was required. But Dr. Egeberg probably didn't expect that the Nixon staff people would go so far beyond what he was saying publicly was the first priority.

They accepted as a fact that more health professionals were needed and in a hurry, and that entirely new methods must be found for distributing health care and financing it.

Without officially shifting the Republican position so as to favor "socialized medicine," the Nixon team of legislative drafters took the step that Dr. Egeberg had hesitated to take—they decided that Social Security would have to be used to finance a huge section of the public's medical bills, from "catastrophic" costs for all income groups to some financial help to low-income and middle-income families.

How does dentistry share in all of this planning? Some dental leaders fear their profession—except for education—won't figure in a new system to any important extent, and that the public will suffer as a consequence. Others are convinced that the present private fee system can be made to work with a few changes, such as formation of more dental insurance systems and provision of dental care by more states in Medicaid plans for indigent and low-income families.

At any rate, an American Dental Association task force on national health insurance is expected to finish its studies by midsummer. Naturally represented in the task force of professional and lay leaders is the traditional viewpoint of ADA—to move carefully and slowly because dentistry won't be able to retreat from government red tape and controls once it voluntarily walks into them.

Edging the task force in the direction of co-operation with some phases of national health insurance is the American Medical Association, which is slowly but perceptibly shifting its position. The professional groups, however, will not have to go so far as to support "socialized medicine"—if only because the Nixon plan technically is not "socialized medicine," and great efforts will be made to point this out. (In the past ADA has supported AMA in opposition to national health insurance under Social Security.)

If ADA leads dentists into co-operation with government on national health insurance, it doesn't have too much time to lose in seeking to shape a new law so that the public's dental needs are properly serviced and the profession's rights protected.

Last session the hoppers in Senate and House were weighted down with a variety of health insurance plans, from lean and inexpensive catastrophic coverage to omnibus and expensive programs of complete health care. This year there will be still more of them in addition to the Nixon plan.

If there is anything nearly uniform about the varied plans, it is their almost total lack of provision for dental care. The omission is rooted in the fact that most legislators interested in the health fields get their advice largely from physicians and welfare workers, both in and out of government.

With almost no exceptions, those who influence the lawmakers are obsessed with the idea that government must intervene to get good medical care to all of the people,

and help them pay the bills, but that dental needs are not too urgent and can be met (except for charity cases) through the traditional private practice machinery.

At this writing it is not known whether dental expenses will even be included in the deductibles under the Nixon program, and planners haven't decided whether to allow them under the various benefits.

There is an opening for tax-paid dentistry in Medicaid, however. Part of the Nixon project is to completely revamp this program, which is run by states and now offers medical and some dental care to those on welfare and low-income families. The White House idea is to have the plan run by the Federal government with eligibility and benefits the same in every state, regardless of per-capita income.

Something more than half the states now provide a measure of Medicaid dental care, from very minor benefits to almost complete coverage. Congress now is looking into the possibility of allowing states to cut back and to relieve them of the requirement that they expand benefits for all medical and dental needs.

If this objective prevails, dental care probably will be largely eliminated from Medicaid.

Should dentists as a group decide to cooperate in any national health insurance idea, the pressure for more "health maintenance organizations" (HMO's) offers them another opportunity to have patients' bills paid—and to practice in a high-level dental-medical atmosphere as well.

President Nixon may or may not encourage this HMO concept, in which groups of physicians or physicians and dentists could contract with the government for the total medical or medical-dental care of patients and receive uniform per-capita payments for "keeping the patient healthy." This idea follows the pattern of the West Coast Kaiser program, which has offered evidence to Congress that it costs less to keep patients generally well than to treat them.

For dentists, official adoption of the HMO concept would offer a constant flood of preventive care. Whether dentists would like per-capita payment is, however, another question.

FASCELL URGES RESTORATION OF RECOMPUTATION

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1971

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, America owes no greater debt than to her retired servicemen and women. They have served their country with honor and courage.

The legislation I am introducing today provides that military retirement pay be based on current active duty rates. This more equitable system was used until 1963 when the Congress, acting in good faith, voted to discard the principle of recomputation and replace it with a straight cost-of-living increase for retirees.

Unfortunately, experience has shown us that the cost-of-living increase is inequitable in comparison to the recomputation principle. In recomputation, the retiree receives direct benefits from each military pay raise.

A rate of retirement pay based on current active duty rates has traditionally been one of the benefits which offset

the fact that military pay scales have consistently been lower than pay scales in the other professions.

Mr. Speaker, the legislation I am proposing has enjoyed the support of many of our colleagues in both Houses. They believe, as I do, that retirement pay should once again be linked directly with active duty pay so that automatic adjustments in retired pay will be assured whenever the active duty rates are changed.

I urge our colleagues to join me in supporting the restoration of the recomputation principle.

EMERGENCY MANPOWER LEGISLATION

HON. DAN ROSTENKOWSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1971

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, the alarming increase in the rate of unemployment in our country's urban areas is a situation which can no longer be tolerated. We in the 92d Congress must take up where we left off in the last Congress to insure final passage of strong emergency manpower legislation. Considering the crisis level this problem has reached in certain areas of our country, I was heartened to see that Senator NELSON's Subcommittee on Employment, Manpower, and Poverty, has acted swiftly to insure early passage of his emergency manpower legislation. It was also gratifying to witness the strong show of support for S. 31, Senator NELSON's bill, that was demonstrated by the Legislative Action Committee of the U.S. Conference of Mayors.

The presence of such prominent leaders as Mayor John Lindsay of New York, Mayor James Tate of Philadelphia, Mayor Kevin White of Boston, Mayor Carl Stokes of Cleveland, Mayor Joseph Alioto of San Francisco, and the mayor of my own city of Chicago, Richard J. Daley, at the hearings conducted by Senator NELSON's subcommittee this morning demonstrates quite clearly the concern that these urban leaders have for much-needed legislation.

I would like to insert a copy of Mayor Daley's remarks in the RECORD as they quite clearly depict the problems we in Chicago are facing in this area.

The remarks follow:

STATEMENT BY MAYOR RICHARD J. DALEY

I am Richard J. Daley, Mayor of the City of Chicago. With me is Samuel Bernstein, the city Manpower Coordinator who has served as Commissioner of Placement and Unemployment Compensation for the State of Illinois from 1942 to 1963, and formerly was Illinois Employment Security Administrator until he joined the city last year. He is an outstanding authority on employment and manpower training.

As Mayor, I am here to comment on Senate Bill 31 which is designed "to provide during times of high unemployment for programs of public service employment for unemployed persons, to assist states and local communities in providing needed public services, and for other purposes."

All the mayors of our cities have a direct

concern with the problem of unemployment. Although there are no statutes that fix the responsibility for employment on local government, the fact is that we are the closest to the people and they look to us for leadership in meeting problems that directly affect their lives. Further the place to meet problems is where the problems are, and the cities have the greatest numbers of the unemployed.

I believe that there are two aspects to the bill. One is to meet the problem of unemployment during periods of recession, and the other is to fill public service needs in such areas as environmental quality, health care, housing, neighborhood improvement, recreation, education and other programs that contribute directly to the betterment of the community. I would like to add a third consideration, and that is to provide maximum opportunity for a job to any one who has a genuine desire to work.

In regards to periods of high unemployment, there are questions that I believe deserve your serious study and consideration.

The requirement that there be in excess of 4.5 percent unemployment nationally for three consecutive months before the bill becomes operable appears to be unrealistic. Even when employment is high nationally we all know that there can be regional and local areas of unemployment. There must be consideration given to cover these conditions that do not reflect the national percentage.

We also recognize that even in those areas where unemployment may be under four and a half percent, the unemployment rate for minority groups may be substantially higher.

I know that there is considerable support for the theory of a mobile labor force—that workers will go from areas of high unemployment to more prosperous areas. To a great extent this may be true. However, there are some groups which do not respond to this pressure: the man who is over 45, the person who is unable to move for compelling personal reasons, and those who feel uncertain about the consequence of their move.

The further effect of this mobility is to place a greater burden on the city that accommodates them when the economic picture changes and there is unemployment. This is one of the reasons for the current plight of many of our cities.

I am confident, for example, that the city of Seattle will restore its economy but it will be in great difficulty in the future if there is an exodus of skilled labor from the city.

I believe that every section of our country should be strong economically and able to provide opportunity for employment for their residents.

I feel that this committee should give consideration to exceptions to the 4.5 percent formula.

The needs of the cities have become obvious. There is no question that cities could hire and efficiently use workers to fill unmet needs in public health, anti-pollution programs, education, public safety, sanitation and other equally important areas. We now have a situation that while the private sector is telling the unemployed it has no openings, there is a great need in the public sector to hire additional workers for essential services. But there are no local resources with which the cities can hire the additional personnel.

The opportunity for jobs in the public sector exists at the same time that the nation suffers from a six percent unemployment rate, with no assurance that it will not go higher before it declines to the 4.5 percent level that the President hopes to reach by late 1972.

This unemployment figure includes highly

skilled professional workers—managers, engineers, technicians, the recently returned veteran from Viet Nam with skills acquired in the armed services, as well as the unskilled and inexperienced worker who even with unemployment reduced to a level of 4½ percent would find it difficult to obtain a job in private industry. Chicago could, and would, hire workers from all skill levels—including engineers and technicians to do essential work not now being done. But its major thrust would be the hiring of the untrained and inexperienced and, through training, both on-the-job and in educational institutions, provide them with the skills that will enable them to make a real contribution to the welfare of the city in which they live. At the same time, it will lessen unemployment and provide the worker with an income for himself and his family, and with self-respect, and standing in the community.

Obviously, this is not a "made work" program. The city will create entry level jobs in vital departments where in-service training and accredited education will be used to improve the workers' skills. The Civil Service Commission will link entry positions to a city-wide career ladder based on proper task analysis so that employees will know that opportunities to advance will match their skill development. This is not new in Chicago. For years, the city has had an education incentive program for all its workers providing for released time and tuition reimbursement. Public service employment, to be truly effective, should include a commitment by the city to upgrade its workers and thereby improve its services to the community. Certainly this will afford workers an option of entering private employment as well as being absorbed into regular government employment as their skills improve.

A survey, just completed by the National Civil Service League, of departments in the City of Chicago showed that the city could use more than 30,000 additional workers in expanding services that would contribute directly to the community.

Typical jobs include engineering technicians, draftsmen, clerk-typists, health aides, data control operators and rodent control inspectors, as well as positions which do not require specialized skills.

Experience has taught us that even in times of high employment there are men and women who can not find a place in private industry. This is particularly true for those over 45, and these older workers not only include the unskilled or low-paid but the individual who has worked in a high-paid job for ten or fifteen years and has been laid off during a recession. In many instances he will not be hired back and he is finding it extremely difficult to get a job. There also is the young worker from 18 to 25 without a college education who finds it hard to get an entry job in private industry. The problem is even more distressing for members of minority groups.

Public Service Employment should not be just stop-gap employment—make-work jobs in which the worker simply marks time until the economy improves and unemployment is reduced to some arbitrary percentage. The employment and service needs are too great for any such limited program. Public Service Employment should generate real jobs; jobs in which the worker can take pride because he knows that he is providing a needed service; jobs which are not dead-end but those where the worker can see advancement opportunities in permanent employment.

The Committee should therefore consider extending the authorization for appropriation in section 4(a), beyond July 1, 1973.

If this permanency can not be assured through legislation, then the worker should be assured that he will not be dismissed until a suitable job is made available to him by the federally supported state employment service. Precedent for this already exists in

the Work Incentive Program for those who are in training under the "Aid to Families of Dependent Children" program provided in the Social Security Act.

In the last analysis, the Public Service Employment concept is not compromised if the worker, with his newly acquired skills, can continue his career by entering private industry. Government and industry could achieve no finer partnership than in a program dedicated to such advancement of the American worker.

In Chicago, as well as in other cities, we have taken advantage of every federal and state program in the employment field. We have been deeply concerned about the returning veteran from Viet Nam. We established a special office in the City Hall to provide job placement services for the veteran. We enlisted the aid of the state employment agency and private employers. This program was successful and we were able to place more than two-thirds of the applicants in good paying jobs—some in city government—most in private industry. With the decline of the economy, however, we now are not able to find jobs for returning veterans. And recently we have witnessed the bitterness of the veteran who has been laid off the job which we located and is seeking employment again.

Our Model Cities and urban opportunities program give the highest priority to job training and employment opportunities.

We also have a program opening the ranks of building trades unions to minority members through the Chicago Plan which is a cooperative agreement between building contractors, trade unions and minority groups for training and employing minority workers.

There is a universal realization that our present welfare system has become self-defeating. It appears to me that there is no better way to rescue able-bodied, employable, but unemployed, men from their present eroding idleness which slowly kills morale and initiative, destroys the spirit, and affects the off-spring, than to give meaningful work at decent wages.

Men and women need work. They need the chance to find themselves in the world. The opportunity for a meaningful job is the most important fact in maintaining a basic level of dignity in our way of life. Certainly employment is not a panacea for all of our social problems, but nothing will make a greater contribution toward alleviating such problems.

With the modifications I have recommended, I urge the passage of Senate Bill 31.

Thank you very much for this opportunity to appear before this Committee.

THE MAN FOR THE JOB

HON. CHARLES J. CARNEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1971

Mr. CARNEY. Mr. Speaker, I recently received a letter and poem authored by one of my constituents, Josephine Sturgeon, of Youngstown, Ohio, which I am pleased to commend to the attention of my colleagues:

HON. CHARLES J. CARNEY,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CARNEY: First let me offer my Congratulations to You as our new Congressman. We all felt that you would make it and we know that you will do a good job.

I won't burden you with any problems at this time because I know that you have many, We do have problems with our World

War One Widows which I will let you know about at a later date, regarding Pension cuts when Social Security raises are given.

This little piece of Poetry I composed myself in your Honor, Let me know if you like it.

Respectfully yours,

JOSEPHINE STURGEON,
Youngstown, Ohio.

THE MAN FOR THE JOB

No matter whose shoes you try to fill
The climb for you will be uphill,
Your Task's will be from dawn till dark
Upon this road you did embark.

Your many friends will wish you well
And really time will only tell,
That you were the man to take the reins
To solve our problems and make some gains.

Each day I bow my head and pray
That God take care of you today,
And guide you in your daily tasks
This is all that one can ask.

(Submitted by Josephine Sturgeon to Congressman Charles J. Carney, 19th District, Youngstown, Ohio.)

NEEDED: JUDGES EQUALLY CONCERNED WITH RIGHTS FOR VICTIMS

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1971

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, one of the most untouchable persons in America today, according to FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover's article in the current issue of the FBI bulletin, is the habitual lawbreaker who is granted freedom time after time by our liberal society prior to fulfilling any penalty. Mr. Hoover quotes statistics to show that after being prematurely released, a substantial majority of the repeating offenders are re-arrested within a few years. By abusing parole, probation and bail privileges, a sizable number of lawbreakers are free to again wreak their violence on society and to make city streets unsafe.

Mr. Hoover places much of the blame for this condition on the over leniency of judges who are hostile to police and are overly "root cause" sympathetic toward criminals.

Admitting that prisons and jails could be improved, Mr. Hoover points out that they are greatly improved over what they were in the past when it was still safe to use the streets to walk on. These facts would indicate that lawlessness is caused by lawbreakers—not on the condition of prisons.

Taking issue with the FBI Director is Judge John D. Fauntleroy of the Superior Court of the District of Columbia, and Kenneth C. Hardy, head of the city's Department of Corrections. Judge Fauntleroy rationalizes the releasing of convicted criminals gradually since "they're going to be back on the street sometime anyway." Hardy supports doubling tax funds for rehabilitation so as to put more offenders back into the community on work release, parole, and other human experimental programs.

The opinions of this Federal judge and official were publically expounded at the second annual meeting of the

Adams-Morgan Federation. Adams and Morgan are schools involved in an experiment in community control. School Superintendent Hugh J. Scott is reported to have said that Washington's schools are in a state of anarchy and that it would take more than a few years to really improve the situation.

Supporting Mr. Hoover's position is a group of law-abiding, taxpaying citizens of Baton Rouge, La., whom I am honored to represent. These understanding citizens have taken a strong stand for law and order. They realize that their local police officers are the front line in the defense of the citizen against crime, anarchy, and insurrection; and that the primary duty of organized society through its law enforcement officers is to maintain safety and protect the citizen's life and property. For these reasons, thousands organized a citizens for law and order group to support local police and to back them in maintaining a peaceful community.

In a recent statement, the Baton Rouge Citizens for Law and Order placed the responsibility for the spiraling crime rate in their city on the leniency of local judges. These citizens have issued a public notice to the elected judges to cease being soft on criminals lest their city deteriorate to the anarchy which prevails in some northern cities.

People power groups, such as the Baton Rouge Citizens for Law and Order, organized in communities throughout America can serve as a boon to making elected officials more responsive to the rights of the law-abiding people.

I insert several newsclippings following my remarks:

[From the Washington Star, Jan. 30, 1971]

HOOVER TURNS SPOTLIGHT ON INDULGENT JUDGES

(By Jenkin Lloyd Jones)

Old J. Edgar Hoover, long a clay pigeon for professional libertarians, has brought one up from the floor in the current issue of the FBI Bulletin.

From the files of the bureau he has collected a few gaudy examples of soft-headedness among some judges and parole boards which help explain why once-safe cities have become jungles and why citizens who used to stroll the streets in the evenings now barricade themselves in their homes.

Most disturbing, we now have on the bench some judges who are patently hostile to police.

One such character, according to Hoover, not long ago announced that he would hand out a light sentence to any defendant claiming mistreatment by police. The judge insisted on no corroborating evidence. He appeared perfectly willing to damn the police by hearsay.

One young thug, previously convicted of car theft, assault and attempted rape of a child, was captured after a gun battle following an attempted jewelry store holdup. Three policemen were injured.

But when the captive complained that the police had roughed him up, this judge sentenced him to two years probation, conditioned on his getting treatment for drug addiction. When the narcotics institution refused to accept him on the grounds that he could not be rehabilitated, the judge let him go.

This same judge gave a five to seven-year term to another hoodlum who beat a 75-year-old woman to death in a \$5 street robbery. The judge explained the light sentence on the grounds that if the woman had been

young and healthy she would probably have survived the beating and that, hence, it really wasn't murder.

A man arrested after an unsuccessful attempt to hijack an airliner was ruled by another judge as insane at the time of the attempt but sane for the trial. The court ordered the jury to turn him loose.

In a western state a man with a 40-year criminal record was sentenced to life in 1959 as a habitual criminal. Released after only eight years, he was picked up for a hit-and-run accident and given 30 days. Shortly thereafter, while on bond for a new armed robbery charge, he killed a police officer. He was finally given 20 years—much less than his 1959 sentence.

An appeals court in an eastern city freed an alleged burglar because, it said, the lower court had erred in not telling the defendant his trial could proceed without him. The defendant, who had been convicted 20 times in 33 years, had ignored two summonses to show up for trial. His excuse was that he had been depressed and gotten drunk.

A 6-foot 2 inch 185-pound youth, guilty of rape at gunpoint, attempted rape, robbery and assaulting arresting officers, was remanded to juvenile court because he was 16—right along with youngsters who break windows.

The FBI has followed up 19,000 offenders released from the federal criminal justice system in the year 1963. Of those put on probation, 57 percent had been arrested for new crimes within the next six years; of those paroled, 63 percent. Of youths under 20 released from federal custody in 1963, 74 percent had been rearrested by 1969.

Much is being said these days about the inadequacy of our prisons. They surely are. They are usually overcrowded, outmoded, overgloomy, understaffed, lacking adequate schooling and job-training and short on psychiatry and counseling.

But they are vastly better, in general, than any prisons we ever had in the past. And if life is less secure in America now than it was when we had worse jails and penitentiaries, if increasing numbers of innocent citizens are preyed upon by the beneficiaries of a generation of juvenile courts, hair-trigger parole boards and maudlin judges, let's not overblame the prisons. The locked-up prisoner is no menace. The unrepentant released prisoner is.

Says Hoover:

"In today's society one of the most privileged of creatures is the repeating offender, prematurely released time and again, free to abuse parole, probation and ball privileges while wreaking havoc upon law-abiding citizens.

"We have sunk into this morass through a distortion of human values. We have forgotten history's lesson that law, order and justice exist only when personal liberty is balanced with individual responsibility, that public welfare must take precedence over private privilege."

Amen!

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 7, 1971]

EXPAND AID FOR CONVICTS, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA WARNED

(By Andrew Barnes)

More police and better courts are only part of the solution to the city's crime problem, Judge John D. Fauntleroy said yesterday.

Crime prevention and rehabilitation of convicted offenders also will have to be improved if the city is to get a handle on eliminating crime, said Fauntleroy, a judge on the old Juvenile Court, now a part of the Superior Court.

Increased appropriations for police, and the reorganization of the courts under the D.C. crime act of 1970, may lull citizens into thinking that crime is really dropping, Fauntleroy told the second annual meeting of the Adams-Morgan Federation.

Some 80 percent of young offenders are "not dumb, not borderline, but clever individuals, who have the ability to achieve, to become good citizens."

"If you're going to be effective," the judge said, "you're going to have to start before offenders graduate" from juvenile into adult criminals.

Kenneth L. Hardy, head of the city's department of corrections, agreed. But making rehabilitation work will be costly, he said. The corrections budget must double next year if the job is to be done, he said.

And effective rehabilitation will mean putting more and more offenders back into the community on work release, parole and other programs.

"The general attitude of the community," said Judge Fauntleroy, "is keep them out of sight, keep them out of mind. They're going to be back on the street sometime anyway," and it is better to release them gradually while maintaining some control.

Crime was only one of the problems considered at the all-day session entitled "Adams-Morgan, A Community Gets Itself Together."

Schools and housing also presented clear problems with unclear solutions for the more than 100 citizens who took part many of whom represented the area's numerous organizations.

School Supt. Hugh J. Scott said, "One of the things that has got to be done immediately is change the image of the school system. It's a bad one."

But making real improvement will not be done in a few months, or even a few years, he added.

Making little direct reference to the Adams and Morgan schools, each of which is an experiment in community control, Scott nevertheless said, "I need the community behind me. You're my strength."

His next move, Scott said, will be personnel shifts to develop a leadership cadre of principals and administrators.

"I'm trying to destroy what I consider anarchy in the schools," he said.

A morning panel on renewing the community agreed on the need for more housing and more business in the once-affluent, now thoroughly mixed area bounded by S. Street, Connecticut Avenue, Rock Creek Park, Harvard and 16th Streets.

The problem, said the Rev. Channing E. Phillips, is to move "beyond the talking stage."

"Planners have not been sensitive to the community," said Mr. Phillips, "and are justly criticized. But having residents do all the planning is no better."

The community's role should be to lay out the concept to be followed by professionals, said Mr. Phillips, who is head of the Housing Development Corp., which has rebuilt Clifton Terrace on 14th Street NW.

[From the Baton Rouge State Times, Jan. 30, 1971]

LOCAL GROUP BLASTS "LENIENT" SENTENCES

A statement suggesting that local judges have been lenient in meting sentences to criminals, especially "influential" criminals and teenage vandals, was released today by Norman Day, president of the Baton Rouge Citizens for Law and Order.

The statement follows:

"The members of the Baton Rouge Citizens for Law and Order are becoming increasingly concerned over the decisions being rendered by local judges pertaining to convicted criminals. Our members feel that the leniency of judges toward criminals is largely responsible for the spiraling crime rate in our city.

"The Baton Rouge Citizens for Law and Order were particularly alarmed over the recent statement made by Judge Elmo Lear who said that punishment was not a deterrent to crime. Statistics clearly prove that

the criminal element multiples. Our entire system of law and justice has always been based on the premise that criminals must be punished or anarchy will prevail. The more we deviate from this proven truth, the more anarchy prevails. Judges owe it to society to carry out their sworn duty to uphold the laws of the land by punishing law breakers. We feel that judges who are at variance with this basic American philosophy should resign and perhaps seek employment in the field of social work.

"The Baton Rouge Citizens for Law and Order are also concerned over the preferential treatment that certain influential criminals receive over the insignificant unknown criminal. We were most disturbed over the light five-year sentence recently meted out to the local public official who confessed to stealing approximately \$500,000 of our tax money. We are also most alarmed over the fact that many of the instances of violence in the public schools seem to be performed by the same individuals and that these persons are not punished. Instead they are released whereby they return to the public schools and again commit criminal acts.

"Our organization's 3,000 members will be closely watching future sentencing of convicted criminals and, if necessary, will use their influence to remedy the deteriorating situation in Baton Rouge by taking whatever legal action is necessary to halt lenient judicial decisions."

NEGRO HISTORY WEEK

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1971

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, this week, February 7 through 13, is Negro History Week—an occasion which has been observed in Los Angeles for a number of years. In view of this observance, I would like to pay homage to these Americans whose participation in our Nation's development began in 1619.

The black man's history in the United States, although often neglected in our history books, is one of great achievement and accomplishment which have improved life in America. Due to the publicity and public adulation received by sports heroes and celebrities, the accomplishments of black athletes, musicians, and singers have often overshadowed the accomplishments of black scientists, inventors, educators, businessmen, and religious leaders.

However, throughout the history of the United States, the black American has made his mark and helped determine the outcome of events. Thus, any history of America must include the Negro.

Jean Baptiste Point DuSable, a black pioneer, founded the settlement of Chicago. Another black pioneer, Matthew Henson, was with Adm. Robert E. Perry when he discovered the North Pole in 1907.

Some 5,000 Negroes served in the Continental Army and Navy during the American Revolution. The first American to die in the cause of freedom was Crispus Attucks, a black man shot by the British at the "Boston Massacre" in 1770.

Nearly a quarter of a million black soldiers and sailors served in the Union

forces during the Civil War. Twenty of these men were recognized for valor and received the Nation's highest medal for heroism—the Congressional Medal of Honor.

There were more than 5,000 black cowboys in the Old West. A black man, Bill Pickett, invented the art of "bulldogging." James P. Beckworth was a black frontiersman who excelled in trapping and hunting.

The first black physician in America was James Derham, who established a prosperous medical practice in Philadelphia. The first doctor to perform open heart surgery was black—Dr. Daniel Hale Williams. Dr. Charles Drew, a black surgeon, invented the blood bank and became the world's greatest authority on blood plasma.

The achievements of Booker T. Washington and George Washington Carver are well known to students, but how many Americans have read the works of Alexander Dumas, the author of "The Count of Monte Cristo," and realized that he was of African descent, as was Samuel Coleridge-Taylor, and Alexander Jushkin. Black Americans such as Paul Laurence Dunbar and Charles Waddell Chestnutt have left their mark in the literary annals of America.

Black men have prospered in the field of business. C. C. Spaulding developed an insurance company that had assets worth \$33 million when he died. S. B. Fuller set up a firm in Chicago that manufactures toiletries and cosmetics and distributes them by door-to-door salespeople. The Fuller Products Co. is one of the largest black-owned businesses in America.

Leaders in the movement for civil rights have admired such leaders as Frederick Douglass, and, of course, the outstanding leader, the late Martin Luther King, Jr.

The residents of Los Angeles know the fine architecture of Paul Williams, who designed the Beverly Wilshire Hotel, a Saks Fifth Avenue store, office buildings, and mansions. He ranks high among architects of the world.

Incidentally, in 1969, I had the honor of participating in the ceremonies paying tribute to the late Pfc. James Anderson, Jr., of Compton—the first black Marine to receive the Congressional Medal of Honor.

The list of accomplishments by black men and women in the sports and entertainment field is endless. The record shows that the black men and women have been in the forefront. Whatever our history has been; whatever our future brings; the black man has made outstanding contributions and made this country and this world a better place to live.

OPEN LETTER TO MAN

HON. JOHN G. SCHMITZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1971

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, the following very beautiful statement about

the true place of women in a sound society recently came to my attention. In these days of rampant pornography, all-out drives for sex education, and destructive agitation, it recalls us to some lasting truths. I would recommend it particularly to the advocates of women's liberation as showing the way to real freedom and dignity for women.

The statement follows:

OPEN LETTER TO MAN

I am a Woman.

I am your wife, your sweetheart, your mother, your daughter, your sister . . . your friend. I need your help.

I was created to give to the world gentleness, understanding, serenity, beauty and love. I am finding it increasingly difficult to fulfill my purpose.

Many people in advertising, motion pictures, television and radio have ignored my inner qualities and have repeatedly used me only as a symbol of sex.

This humiliates me; it destroys my dignity; it prevents me from being what you want me to be; an example of beauty, inspiration and love.

Love for my children, love for my husband, love of my God and country.

I need your help to restore me to my true position . . . to allow me to fulfill the purpose for which I was created.

I know you will find a way.

SOCIAL SECURITY INEQUITIES

HON. FLETCHER THOMPSON

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1971

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, many of us are aware of inequities in the social security laws which we have been unable to get cleared up through legislation in recent years.

One of the most glaring of these is the way in which working wives are treated under existing social security laws and regulations. Basically, although payments to the social security fund are deducted from their wages at the same rate as from the pay of other workers, they are denied retirement benefits and they receive only marginal benefits at best.

One of the most eloquent dissertations on this problem I have read has been written by one of my constituents in the Fifth District of Georgia, Mrs. Margaret Reynolds, who is also a contributor to one of the outstanding community newspapers in our area. Because this Congress will again be called on to act on social security amendments, I insert into the RECORD the text of the article and I recommend that all Members who share my concern about the inequities of social security read it.

The article follows:

TAX BREAKS—BACKS

In an era when numerous segments of American society are protesting real or imagined wrongs, loudly—sometimes violently, and are having their causes championed by sympathetic individuals, private organizations and by the government, it is ironic that there exists a pathetic group which is the object of unconscionable injustice from an agency of the government itself.

Victims of this unfairness are a grey and weary band. They are not parading the

streets, attempting to disrupt society or even pleading their case. They stand, instead behind store counters, hunch over sewing machines or ironing boards, labor with heavy cleaning equipment, plod from door to door selling magazines or gadgets, beat out routine material on obsolete typewriters hour after weary hour. Here are the aging working wives of America, driving themselves doggedly after strength is spent because a vicious quirk in the application of the Social Security System denies them the right to retirement benefits for which they have been forced to pay. It is time that the American people become aware of their plight and moved to alleviate it.

Although payments to the social security fund are deducted from the wages of working wives, even in the lowest income brackets, at exactly the same rate as from the pay of other workers, they receive only marginal benefits—burial payments and in rare cases small disability allotments when they are totally disabled. Retirement income, the major goal of the system designed to make some kind of financial security possible in old age for persons who have worked diligently throughout their lives is seldom increased, nor is slightly early retirement practical, even with failing health, for the low-paid working wife even after years of enforced contributions. In most cases a married woman finds that she can draw as much or more under her husband's account than under her own with the cruel result that her payments have been nothing more than a tax on her right to work.

Statistically, the majority of working wives are possessed of limited occupational skills and of limited time because of their burden of family responsibility. Their incomes are therefore limited also and thus earned social security payments in almost all cases will be less than a wife's allotment with the shocking result that their deductions become an added income tax, placing this most poorly paid of all workers in brackets applied to the affluent. Few of the victims of the injustice understand it all. Almost all are inarticulate. In recent months, however, leaders of the movement to prevent discrimination and a number of Congressmen have become concerned and promise to take action.

To understand just how unfairly the system works, consider the situations of two families of identical income—seven hundred fifty dollars a month, nine thousand dollars a year—a figure which will provide marginal security and comfort in most sections of the country. In one case the husband is the sole breadwinner. At the present social security rate he pays just over four hundred dollars a year in social security taxes (5.2 per cent on his income up to seventy-eight hundred annually). For this payment, he and his family are provided with maximum protection including an anticipated retirement payment of one hundred eighty-five dollars a month and half the amount for his dependent wife when she becomes sixty-five. The wife will receive her portion if she has substantial private income or a pension from a non-social security covered position such as teaching, a governmental position or one covered by railroad retirement.

The second family does not fare as well. The husband in this case is able to earn only six hundred fifty dollars a month, seventy eight hundred dollars a year. He pays exactly the same social security taxes as his neighbor and is entitled to the same protection under the social security law. His wife, however, is impelled to seek employment to bring the family income up to the nine thousand dollars annually which permits a decent standard of living and social security taxes are levied on her income also so that the second family pays larger social security taxes. It will not, however, be due larger retirement payments.

It is estimated that the wife earning twelve to fifteen hundred dollars a year will pay almost a thousand dollars in social security taxes during her life time. If she is self-employed as is the case with women who take in sewing, sell merchandise on a door-to-door basis, perform piece work assignments, to name a few occupations an unskilled and time-pressed woman might undertake to raise family income, her payments will be fifty per cent higher since she and the government each contribute fifty per cent of the total rather than one-third as is the case when an employer makes a contribution. Furthermore, the worker who does receive employer contributions must justify such payments by her labor. Therefore, the working wife's real contribution is actually twice the amount deducted from her paycheck. This figure deposited in a savings account or invested would, with normal accrual, come to several thousand dollars. Yet, it is of no benefit at all to the working wife.

More knowledgeable women, aware of the injustice, seek employment in the teaching profession, in local governmental agencies or with the railroads which have their own retirement programs and in which no social security taxes are levied and earn additional old age income for themselves without reducing the amounts they will receive from their husband's social security accounts. The ignorant, the less versatile fall into the trap of paying additional social security taxes and receiving practically no additional protection.

The major revision of the social security system which came into effect in 1951 does reflect a realization that women, because of their physical and emotional make-up and because of the strain of child-bearing and child-rearing, usually need to withdraw from the struggle of wage earning some years earlier than their husbands and brothers. Under these provisions, a working wife is allowed to draw payments at the age of sixty-two. A cruel joker nullifies the benefits for if she accepts the offer, her payments will be reduced by twenty percent—for life! Thus if her earnings had averaged one hundred dollars a month during her working years, entitling her to payments of approximately sixty-five dollars in monthly retirement payments, she would forfeit twelve dollars and a half each month, leaving only fifty-two dollars fifty cents. Such a payment drawn during the three years between her sixty second and her sixty fifth birthday would amount to less than she had paid into the fund and its accrual and, furthermore, her wife's allotment, should she find it advantageous to change to it when her husband retires, would also be reduced permanently by the one hundred fifty dollars a year, a penalty few women could accept. If the couple should live an additional twenty or twenty five years, a prospect which becomes increasingly likely, her lifetime payments would be between three and four thousand dollars less, a frightening possibility in view of the steady rise in the cost of living.

To stress the unfairness of the situation, suppose that the man who was able to earn an adequate income alone had deposited only the difference in the social security taxes he had paid as against the assessment on his unfortunate neighbor and allowed it to accumulate interest over a long period of years, he could from it give his wife an allowance, beginning on her sixty second birthday, equal to payments the working wife might draw without exhausting the account before she could draw payments under his coverage at sixty five. More important, his wife's payments would not be reduced and she would therefore draw several thousand more if she lives the anticipated twenty or twenty-five years with the end result that the couple which had paid the lesser social security tax on the same income would, under identical

conditions draw much larger retirement payments.

The unfair application of the social security system to the situation of the working wife is doubtless a carry-over from earlier punitive attitudes toward women who seek careers outside their homes. Rooted in the Victorian contention that a mother's place is with her children, regardless of circumstances; that woman's entrance into the labor market constitutes a threat to the earnings of husbands and fathers; that women who step outside their assigned roles do so to escape household duties and child care, to gain luxuries or to fulfill an unbecoming vanity.

Nothing could be farther from the truth. The facts prove that the vast majority of working wives and mothers are actually self-sacrificing individuals who assume burdensome additional duties reluctantly, foregoing the joys of fulltime motherhood only because the needs of their children and the burdens of their husbands impel them to do all that they can.

Limited earning power of a husband is but one among multitudinous reasons which push women into attempting to add to family income. Obviously the family with four or five children instead of one or two, the family which has a seriously ill, a handicapped or a singularly gifted child requiring special expenditures, the family which has dependent parents or other unusual drains will be more hard pressed on an identical income than a small family without problems has. Conversely, a small inheritance can make possible the purchase of a home and allow rent to be used as mortgage payments which would place a family in a better position than another of like income which is not able to accumulate a down payment unless the wife goes out to work in order to accumulate a little capital. The possibilities are so many and so complex that no computer and no human mind, however compassionate, could come up with a formula which would separate the few women who work from choice from those who do so from necessity. The only reasonable attitude is to assume that they are driving themselves because of the needs of their families and to give them encouragement rather than abuse.

Certainly, the woman who has done double duty throughout much of her life is often in desperate need of respite as she enters her sixties. Yet in most instances where a husband's income has been inadequate during his most productive years, it is further reduced as he nears retirement. With little opportunity for accumulating in the past, the couple remains in desperate need of the wife's contribution, especially in view of the continuing inflationary pressures in the economy. The woman would be rash, indeed, to give up her position and settle for reduced social security payments, however exhausted she may be.

While a working wife cannot draw from her self-paid social security fund at the age of sixty-two without accepting a reduction, a widow of the same age is free to draw a full widow's payment. Few would argue that a woman in her sixties should draw the payment when her husband dies since he has paid for the protection. Even fewer would countenance denying solace to her working sister who has spent her energies over decades and now must survive in an expensive situation without the life insurance and other inheritance to which most widows are heir. It is reasonable to assume that the husband of the widow who has never worked was a good provider and that the couple has been able to accumulate, making social security payments less essential than they would be to a woman who had always needed to work and whose husband, while living, might be unable to earn much, if any, income. He might in fact be an invalid requiring expen-

sive care and great personal attention which would make work away from the home more taxing and more inconvenient for the aging wife. The position of such couples can be grim indeed.

Even when they are not, the working wife is entitled to retirement payments, in addition to those she is due as a wife, because she has paid for them. The basic purpose of the social security system is two-fold: (1) To provide protection for individuals who have worked during their life times in the form of old age income and protection against certain vicissitudes prior to retirement and (2) to create employment opportunities for young workers by making retirement attractive to those who have served their time in industry. Changes in the system to allow the working wife to draw from her own account, without penalty, at the age of sixty-two would serve these ends admirably. By allowing weary workers to enjoy well earned rest without penalty, the jobs to which they cling, often of the unskilled variety, would be freed for younger women wanting to help their families to a better life, to youngsters needing desperately to get a toe-hold in the economy, even to some of the hard-core unemployed.

The few years early retirement, thus, allowed the working wife would not, in most cases, consume even the social security taxes she has paid with normal accrual and should not reduce the amount she is due as a wife under her husband's coverage.

Many students feel that she should not be forced to choose between the two benefits which are due her but should be entitled to a combined payment worked out on a reasonable formula so that the social security covered working wife would not be in a disadvantaged position as compared with her sister who worked in a non-social security covered field and whose pension did not jeopardize her wife's benefits.

Leaders concerned with eliminating discrimination on the basis of sex and marital status feel that it is more important to right inherent wrongs in the system than to raise the general level of payments. Certainly, it would be less inflationary and would also work for a spread of employment by opening up jobs in an area where the young and the unskilled could qualify.

The main argument, however, must be that it is unmerciful to force women in failing health to continue working when they have earned—and paid for—retirement. A simple solution might lie in a meaningful relaxation of the stringent retirements for disability payments for the working wife who met certain qualifications when she reaches her sixty-second birthday. Most doctors would agree that an aging female with arthritis should not lift heavy equipment, plod from door to door or stand long hours in a store or that one with failing eyesight should be released from her labors as a seamstress or typist, that an older woman with even mild heart disease or elevated blood pressure should not perform heavy labors. In short, retirement for the sixty-two year old on a disability basis without penalty should be possible on the advice of a doctor or even if the woman, herself, feels that she is no longer able to carry on.

To protect the right to early retirement from the abuses which creep in to most programs, however well intentioned, certain requirements should be set up. A minimum working period should be established. Most students of the problem suggest a minimum of twenty years (twice the requirement of ten years work for permanent coverage) except for a small group of women now approaching retirement age who did not come under the system until 1951, and could rarely have accumulated twenty years. The social security system already has a formula

for determining eligibility of these women for retirement which is based on the accumulation of one quarter per year from 1951 until the year prior to their sixty second birthday. Early retirement might be possible for those who have earned a double number of required quarters whatever it should be. Requirements for recent employment should also be established both to protect the program from abuse and to achieve the secondary advantage of freeing jobs and thereby reducing unemployment.

If social security continues to work in a democratic, rather than in a socialistic fashion, it must be continually reexamined to maintain it as an earned retirement system rather than a dole. Contributions should be reflected in payments and other benefits and no group should be expected to pay into it without gaining an advantage.

LITHUANIA'S FIGHT FOR FREEDOM

HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1971

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, Americans of Lithuanian origin or descent and their friends in all parts of our great Nation will commemorate two very important anniversaries this month, starting February 13.

They will observe the 720th anniversary of the formation of the Lithuanian state when Mindaugas the Great unified all Lithuanian principalities into one kingdom in 1251; and secondly they will mark the 53d anniversary of the establishment of the modern Republic of Lithuania on February 16, 1918.

I strongly urge the administration to implement legislation by bringing the Baltic States case before the United Nations and demanding the Soviets to withdraw from Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia.

As I am a member of the Americans for Congressional Action To Free the Baltic States, I would like to include the following essay prepared by the Americans for Congressional Action To Free the Baltic States at this point in the RECORD, along with a copy of House Concurrent Resolution 416 of the 89th Congress.

LITHUANIA'S FIGHT FOR FREEDOM

THIRTY YEARS OF SOVIET OPPRESSION

For too long too many people throughout the world have been unaware of what happened to the people of Lithuania. The Kremlin is fond of saying that Russian imperialism died with the czar. But the fate of Lithuania shows this to be a cruel fiction. The Communist regime did not come to power in Lithuania by legal or democratic process. The Soviets invaded and occupied Lithuania in June of 1940, and the Lithuanian people have been suffering in Russian-Communist slavery for more than 30 years.

Americans of Lithuanian origin or descent, numbering over 1,000,000 in the United States, and their friends in all parts of the country will commemorate two very important anniversaries during the second part of February, 1971: (1) They will observe the 720th anniversary of the formation of the Lithuanian state when Mindaugas the Great unified all Lithuanian principalities into one kingdom in 1251; and (2) They will mark the 53rd anniversary of the establishment of the

modern Republic of Lithuania on February 16, 1918. But this celebration of Lithuania's Independence Day will not be similar to American celebration of the Fourth of July. It will contain no note of joy, no jubilant tone of achievement and victory. On the contrary, the observance will be somber, sorrowful, underlined with the grim accent of defeat and tragedy. For Lithuania has lost its independence, and today survives only as a captive nation behind the Iron Curtain.

The Lithuanians are proud people who have lived peacefully on the shores of the Baltic from time immemorial. Lithuania has suffered for centuries from the "accident of geography." From the West the country was invaded by the Teutonic Knights, from the East by the Russians. It took remarkable spiritual and ethnic strength to survive the pressures from both sides. The Lithuanians, it should be kept in mind, are ethnically related neither to the Germans nor the Russians. Their language is the oldest in Europe today.

After the Nazis and Soviets smashed Poland in September of 1939, the Kremlin moved troops into Lithuania and annexed this republic in June of 1940. In one of history's greatest frauds, "elections" were held under the Red army guns. The Kremlin then claimed that Lithuania voted for inclusion in the Soviet empire.

Then began one of the most brutal occupations of all time. Hundreds of thousands of Lithuanians were dragged off to trains and jammed into cars without food or water. Many died from suffocation. The pitiful survivors were dumped out in Arctic Siberia. The people of Lithuania have never experienced such an extermination and annihilation in their long history through centuries as during the last three decades. Since June 15, Lithuania has lost more than one-fourth of the country's population. The genocidal operations and practices being carried out by the Soviets continue with no end in sight.

Since the very beginning of Soviet-Russian occupation, however, the Lithuanians have waged an intense fight for freedom. This year marks the 30th anniversary of Lithuania's successful revolt against the Soviet Union. During the second part of June of 1941 the people of Lithuania succeeded in getting rid of the Communist regime in the country; freedom and independence were restored and a free government was re-established. This free, provisional government remained in existence for more than six weeks. At that time Lithuania was overrun by the Nazis who suppressed all the activities of this free government and the government itself. During the period between 1940 and 1952 alone, more than 30,000 Lithuanian freedom fighters lost their lives in an organized resistance movement against the invaders. The cessation of armed guerrilla warfare in 1952 did not spell the end of Lithuania's resistance against Soviet domination. On the contrary, resistance by passive means gained a new impetus.

The persecution of Solzhenitsyn, the clamp on Rostropovich and other dissenters in the Soviet Union received a great deal of publicity in the free world's press. Very well publicized were the Simas Kudirka-Coast Guard tragedy, the Hijacking of a Russian jet liner by Brazinskas and his son, death sentences imposed on two Jews and a young Lithuanian, Vytautas Simokaitis, for trying to escape the Communist tyranny. But this is only the tip of the iceberg of desperation in the Soviet empire. In slave labor camps in the Soviet Union millions of people are still being held. Many dissenters are being confined to psychiatric institutions and being murdered by the Kremlin thugs. It is an established fact that a brilliant Lithuanian linguist, Dr. Jonas Kazlauskas, 40 years old, was murdered in a psychiatric hospital in Moscow three months ago. His only "crime" was that he had received an invitation to

come to the University of Pennsylvania (in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania) as a guest professor for this very spring semester of 1971.

The Government of the United States of America has refused to recognize the seizure and forced "incorporation" of Lithuania by the Communists into the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. Our Government maintains diplomatic relations with the former free Government of Lithuania. Since June of 1940, when the Soviet Union took over Lithuania, all the Presidents of the United States (Franklin D. Roosevelt, Harry S. Truman, Dwight D. Eisenhower, John F. Kennedy, Lyndon B. Johnson, and Richard M. Nixon) have stated, restated and confirmed our country's nonrecognition policy of the occupation of Lithuania by the Kremlin dictators. However, our country has done very little, if anything, to help the suffering people of Lithuania to get rid of the Communist regime in their country.

At a time when the Western powers have granted freedom and independence to many nations in Africa, Asia and other parts of the world, we must insist that the Communist colonial empire likewise extends freedom and independence to the peoples of Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia and other captive nations whose lands have been unjustly occupied and whose rightful place among the nations of the world is being denied. Today and not tomorrow is the time to brand the Kremlin dictators as the largest colonial empire in the world. By timidity, we invite further Communist aggression.

The United States Congress has made a right step into the right direction by adopting H. Con. Res. 416 that calls for freedom for Lithuania and the other two Baltic republics—Latvia and Estonia. All freedom-loving Americans should urge the President of the United States to implement this very important legislation by bringing the issue of the liberation of the Baltic States to the United Nations. We should have a single standard for freedom. Its denial in the whole or in part, any place in the world, including the Soviet Union, is surely intolerable.

H. CON. RES. 416

Whereas the subjection of peoples to alien subjugation, domination, and exploitation constitutes a denial of fundamental human rights, is contrary to the Charter of the United Nations, and is an impediment to the promotion of world peace and cooperation; and

Whereas all peoples have the right to self-determination; by virtue of that right they freely determine their political status and freely pursue their economic, social, cultural, and religious development; and

Whereas the Baltic peoples of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania have been forcibly deprived of these rights by the Government of the Soviet Union; and

Whereas the Government of the Soviet Union, through a program of deportations and resettlement of peoples, continues in its effort to change the ethnic character of the populations of the Baltic States; and

Whereas it has been the firm and consistent policy of the Government of the United States to support the aspirations of Baltic peoples for self-determination and national independence; and

Whereas there exist many historical, cultural, and family ties between the peoples of the Baltic States and the American people: Be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the House of Representatives of the United States urge the President of the United States—

(a) to direct the attention of world opinion at the United Nations and at other appropriate international forums and by such

means as he deems appropriate, to the denial of the rights of self-determination for the peoples of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, and

(b) to bring the force of world opinion to bear on behalf of the restoration of these rights to the Baltic peoples.

NATIONAL COLLEGIATE PRESS DAY BACKED BY CONGRESSMEN

HON. EDWIN B. FORSYTHE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1971

Mr. FORSYTHE. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a House joint resolution authorizing the President to declare the last Saturday in April of each year as "National Collegiate Press Day."

It is my feeling, and the feeling of many of my colleagues, that the newspapers published on our college campuses play an important role in our higher education system.

They offer students a legitimate voice in educational affairs. They provide a method for the student body to make itself felt, effectively, and constructively.

College newspapers provide a valuable training area for future newsmen. Many of the most respected newsmen covering the National Government here in Washington began their careers in the university newsroom.

It is here that they are taught the importance of accuracy, of completeness, of never-ending pursuit of all of the facts. It is here that they are taught the great responsibility that is theirs.

The National Council of College Publications Advisers, the only national professional association of advisers to all college and university student publications, organizes National Collegiate Press Days in April when students and professional journalists meet in learning workshops.

I believe it is appropriate that the day of their session, which involves students and advisers from all 50 States and the District of Columbia, be designated by Congress and the President as "National Collegiate Press Day."

I am pleased that several of my colleagues have joined with me in sponsoring this resolution. I would ask for your support so that the measure can be approved and signed by the President in time for this year's session.

Following is a listing of Members of the House who have cosponsored the resolution:

Mr. THONE, of Nebraska; Mr. HELSTOSKI, of New Jersey; Mr. DUNCAN, of Tennessee; Mr. ANDERSON, of Illinois; Mrs. HICKS, of Massachusetts; Mr. SANDMAN, of New Jersey; Mr. WHITEHURST, of Virginia; Mr. HOWARD, of New Jersey; Mr. BIESTER, of Pennsylvania; Mr. HALPERN, of New York; Mr. EILBERG, of Pennsylvania; Mr. WARE, of Pennsylvania; Mr. WIDNALL, of New Jersey; Mr. RANGLE, of New York, Mrs. ABZUG, of New York.

PROTECT AMERICAN CONSUMERS

HON. JOSEPH G. MINISH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1971

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, I am today reintroducing two bills I sponsored in the 91st Congress to counter serious dislocations in the electronics industry.

The first bill, known as the "Truth-Import Labeling Act" is designed to protect the American consumer against false and misleading product labeling by providing him with identifying information as to where, by, and for whom products imported and sold in the United States are manufactured.

In recent years, there has been a tremendous upsurge in the quantity of electrical, electronic, and manual appliances and machines imported from abroad and sold in the United States under domestic brand names. The consumer may well expect the television set, radio, or other appliance he purchases bearing the name of a well-known manufacturer to have been made in the United States, when in fact the product may have been entirely produced in Europe, Japan, or another Far East country.

Related to the labeling problem is the larger question of unrestricted electronic imports. We can all agree that there are benefits to be derived by our country as well as by other nations through the promotion of free trade. However, in the electronic field the volume of imports has become so overwhelming that it has severely dislocated the domestic industry, put thousands of Americans out of work, and almost completely halted American production of many basic electronic components and products.

The second bill I am submitting today provides for an equitable sharing of the U.S. market by electronic articles of both domestic and foreign origin. An analysis of this measure follows together with a recent article by William Bywater, president of District Three of the International Union of Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers, outlining the plight of the American electronics worker.

I include the article as follows:

ANALYSIS OF LEGISLATION TO PROVIDE FOR AN
EQUITABLE SHARING OF THE U.S. MARKET BY
ELECTRONIC ARTICLES OF DOMESTIC AND
FOREIGN ORIGIN

Section 1 of the bill provides that the total quantity and value of any consumer electronic product and accessories of foreign manufacture that may be imported (or released from storage) for domestic consumption in any calendar year shall not exceed the quantity or value in which that product was imported (or released from storage) for domestic consumption in 1966. The proviso specifies that if the domestic consumption of an article increases (or decreases) more than 5% from the 1966 level, then the ceiling on imports of that article will be adjusted in an amount proportionate to the change in domestic consumption.

Section 2 of the bill parallels Section 1 with respect to electronic components of foreign manufacture of the types used in the manufacture of consumer electronic products. The base period here is the average

for the three calendar years 1964-1966 inclusive.

Section 3 of the bill provides that during the year in which the bill becomes effective the formulas utilized in Sections 1 and 3 of the bill shall be applied but the amount of the base domestic production used to calculate the maximum on imports shall be reduced to the proportion of the base year or years consumption which corresponds to the proportion of the calendar year remaining in which this bill is enacted.

Section 4 of the bill provides that the Secretary of Commerce shall allocate to importing countries a share of the allowable imports of consumer electronic products and components of particular types based upon the amount of past imports of such products by such countries during a representative period. The Secretary is permitted in his allocation to give due account to special factors which have affected, or may affect, the trade in any types of electronic articles. The Secretary is to give special favorable weight in the allocation process to foreign countries which have no greater restrictions on imports into their countries from this country upon their imports of such articles. The Secretary is to certify to the Secretary of the Treasury the allocations made under this Section.

Section 5 of the bill provides that the Secretary of Commerce, upon any interested party's application, determine whether domestic production of any article involved in this Act in conjunction with imports allowed under this Act is adequate to meet estimated annual consumption of the article. If a deficiency in domestic production is found, the Secretary is to determine the increase in imports that is required to eliminate the deficiency on the next calendar year, and to certify his determination to the Secretary of the Treasury.

Section 6 authorized the President to enter into agreements with foreign countries to provide for orderly and equitable access to our domestic markets in accordance with this Act. In accordance with any such agreements, the President may by proclamation adjust the amounts of imports allocated to foreign countries pursuant to this Act.

Section 7 of the bill provides that the release into our domestic markets of imported articles covered by this Act shall be regulated on a quarterly basis.

Section 8 of the bill provides that the determinations of the Secretary of Commerce and President under the Act shall be final.

Section 9 provides that the bill is effective upon enactment.

WHY FREE TRADE IS UNFAIR TO U.S. WORKERS (By William Bywater)

The International Union of Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers, like many other unions, is changing its position on foreign trade. Historically, we have been firm advocates of free trade. We felt that we could compete with any other nation in terms of skill and technology while we also saw the need for a balance between imports and exports.

But, trade is changing. We are no longer competing against foreign companies. Our competitors are divisions or domestic corporations. Almost every major American manufacturer has opened plants abroad to take advantage of low wage rates. They have shifted production from the United States to new foreign plants built with American capital and run by American management.

General Instrument Corporation is now the largest single employer in Taiwan with a plant employing 12,000 workers. Philco-Ford Corporation produces its radios in Taiwan. Other corporations taking advantage of the low wage rates of the island are International Business Machines Corporation, RCA, Admiral Corporation, Motorola, Inc., and Ampex Corporation.

Wage rates in these plants range from 15 cents to 35 cents an hour. They are matched by wage rates in that part of the world ranging from 10 cents an hour in Hong Kong to \$1 an hour in Japan. Obviously, the American worker, with an average hourly rate in the electrical industry of \$3.75 an hour, cannot compete against these wage scales.

When TV sets, transistor radios, typewriters, eyeglasses and a whole range of other consumer goods are brought into this country, they are given the brand-name label of the domestic corporation. They are sold on the American market at domestic prices. That black and white TV set made in Taiwan is not sold at one-tenth the price of the same model manufactured here at American wage rates. The American consumer does not really benefit from this kind of "free trade."

American manufacturers are now building their own plants in foreign countries, paying low wages and then shipping the products back to the United States, selling them as domestic items at domestic prices. This process has been so successful that the flight of American capital to foreign land has become an avalanche. In our own electrical-electronics industry, some \$2.5-billion was directly invested in new plants and equipment abroad in the last decade. This sum does not include profits earned, accumulated and re-invested abroad.

We have now reached the position where over one-half of all black and white television sets sold in the United States are imported. Ninety percent of all radios and tape recorders come from abroad. Two-thirds of the sewing machines sold in this country are manufactured abroad and all the portable transistor radios are imported.

The effect of this has been increasing unemployment in the electrical industry. We believe we have lost about 5,000 jobs each month over the last three years, and the trend continues. What "free trade" means today is the export of American jobs for the import of American company products. No economy can survive that kind of international trade for long.

Many of those fighting vociferously against import quotas today were, a few years ago, equally strong advocates of regulated trade. But that was before they became the foreign manufacturer. Even today, because they are anxious to assure a steady flow of their own products back into America, many United States concerns do nothing about the discriminatory trade practices of other nations. Japan has quotas on 6,000 items. A Mustang automobile costs almost \$14,000 in Japan. By 1972 we will be unable to export a computer system to Japan because that nation is protecting its own developing computer industry.

If there is to be free trade, then let it be between free nations, and not between the various subsidiaries of the same international corporation.

It does America no good to have United States corporations open plants overseas and exploit local workers. A few years ago Oak Electronics opened a TV manufacturing plant in South Korea. After a couple of years the workers organized and went on strike for higher wages. They could not live on the 15 cents an hour they were being paid. The American corporation closed the plant down and moved it to Taiwan. Subsequently, the Korean legislature passed a law forbidding strikes against American corporations. Now, that has nothing to do with free trade. It has a great deal to do with old-fashioned wage exploitation.

The flood of American manufacturers moving abroad to exploit low wage rates is very similar to the "runaway" shops of the last decade. Until recently, Northern manufacturers frequently closed down plants to move to the South where wage rates were lower. This caused economic havoc in many Northern communities. Now, as the South is being

organized and wage rates raised to national levels, the same manufacturers look to foreign nations as the next supply of low wage rates.

We in the I.U.E. are not for indiscriminate import quotas. We believe that our foreign trade relations should be based, in large measure, on the trade policies of other countries. We are opposed to giving Japan free license to enter the American market as long as Japan closes her markets to us. We are opposed to the unregulated flow of American capital to build foreign plants to compete unfairly against United States wages. There should be a much higher tax on earnings of these subsidiaries and more careful control of this flow of capital that in itself has had a serious effect on the balance of payments of the United States.

But, most important, we want to protect the growth share of the domestic market. As the defense industry lays off more and more workers, we need growth industries to take up the slack. If all the growth industry jobs are exported, then we will be in serious trouble. Many jobs in our industry are unskilled. It is the kind of work that can be easily taught to almost any work force. As such, it has been of special assistance to the hard-core unemployed and minority groups. As these jobs are exported, the employment possibilities for people in these sectors become limited. And that's not good for America.

Last August, Emerson TV in Jersey City closed down its TV production after entering into an agreement to have sets made by another manufacturer, who has plants in Mexico and Taiwan. Over 1,200 workers were thrown out of work by that decision, including 200 previously hard-core unemployed who had been trained for work through the union-sponsored On-The-Job-Training-Program. Having raised their hopes and aspirations through a job training program they were thrown back into the growing pool of unemployed by a shift to imports.

We propose that import quotas be set based on the foreign nation's current share of the American market. That is, if the Japanese have 25 per cent of the black and white TV market, then we believe it should be pegged at that percentage. As the American market expands, so can the imports. In this way we will maintain a balance of trade that secures jobs for Americans at American wage rates. That's what this economy needs.

A great deal of new thinking needs to be done to assure an orderly growth of international trade. Right now, 95 per cent of all Federal agency contracts for the purchase of heavy equipment are let abroad. That's American tax money being used to take away jobs from Americans.

Using the slogans of the thirties such as "free trade" and "isolationism" does little to the debate of the seventies. Any discussion of this problem must have, as a paramount consideration, full employment and a healthy expansion of the American economy along with fair prices to the consumer. That's why the I.U.E. now supports the intelligent use of quotas in world trade.

THE RISING COST OF PRESCRIPTIONS

HON. CHARLES J. CARNEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1971

Mr. CARNEY. Mr. Speaker, in a letter from Clifton R. Coburn, of Youngstown, Ohio, dated February 1, the writer submits further evidence of the need for immediate assistance to our senior citi-

zens. I believe many of my colleagues will find this letter interesting:

DEAR SIR: I am writing in regards to the rising costs of drugs, which is so popular today, as well as groceries and other items which are necessary to aid people to live.

I just came from Allens Drugtown at the corner of Brentwood and Glenwood Avenue in Youngstown, at which I had a prescription filled for some Hygroton. This drug—I have to take in order to keep alive. Without it my blood pressure would rise too high and eventually would become serious.

The druggist gave me my prescription of 50 pills, and then apologized for the price he had to charge me. The price had risen 20%. The old price in November 1970 was \$4.99—the new price in February, 1971 was \$5.99.

I am almost 75 years old, and these prices of the necessary articles, which we need, such as drugs, food, doctor's bills, etc., is more than the elderly people can take—especially those who desire to maintain and retain their respectability.

I own my home and have always been a good citizen. I pay my taxes and all the utilities connected to owning my home. However, I am seriously becoming alarmed and frightened as to what is going to become of the elderly.

The way I see it, soon there will be nothing for the old people but poverty. Then we will have to sit around in a home for the aged and hang our heads in shame. Mr. Carney, I am very much worried. I don't know what you can do, however, I do know you are not afraid to speak up, and I hope and pray you can get something started in Washington to come to the aid of the elderly. Sir, you know me. I have talked to you a few times in the past. However, you may not remember me. But I sincerely hope you will see and read this letter.

Sincerely,

CLIF COBURN.

GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY
SESQUICENTENNIAL

HON. ORVAL HANSEN

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1971

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, today the only private, nonsectarian university in our Nation's Capital is celebrating the 150th anniversary of its founding. I would like to ask my colleagues in the House to join with me in extending congratulations to the George Washington University on the observance of its sesquicentennial.

When President James Monroe signed the charter for Columbian College, as it was then known, on February 9, 1821, a long tradition was to begin of outstanding service to the Nation and to the Capital City in which it has developed.

The George Washington University, whose student body today totals 25,000 studying within eight degree-granting schools and colleges, grew from a vision by our beloved first President George Washington. In 1795, Washington wrote to Thomas Jefferson:

My mind has always been more disposed to apply the shares in the inland navigations of Potomac and James Rivers towards the endowment of a University in the United States, than to any other object it had contemplated.

He told Jefferson that "in pursuance of this idea, and understanding that

CXVII—146—Part 2

other means are in embryo, for establishing so useful a seminary in the federal city," he was investing the shares "as a means of carrying the plan into effect; provided, it should be adopted upon a scale so liberal, and so extensive, as to embrace a complete system of education."

Washington expressed hope that Congress would offer a "fostering hand" in its establishment.

The financial contribution was quickly lost, but the idea remained and developed into what is today one of the major educational institutions in the United States.

I am proud that I am a graduate of the George Washington University National Law Center, the second largest law school in the Nation, and that I am currently continuing toward another degree at the university.

The school's location in the Nation's Capital, the focal point of both American and international law, provides a unique opportunity for observation and study of the Federal Government—legislative, judicial, and administrative. We in the Congress of the United States have contributed to the National Law Center a place where Federal legislation can be studied as it is considered by committees and as it comes up for debate on the floors of the House and the Senate.

The university has a long record of contributions to the District of Columbia—academically, culturally, and economically. But it is also a great national asset, serving not only this community but the entire Nation. Its students come from every State in the country and from 92 foreign countries for the quality education they seek at George Washington University.

Today, on the occasion of George Washington University's 150th anniversary, I extend my congratulations, my thanks for its long record of service, and best wishes for many accomplishments in the years ahead.

KANSAS' FIELDS, IT APPEARS, WILL
BE CORNIER IN 1971

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1971

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, it is safe to say that most Americans are aware of some of Hawaii's agricultural products. Tropical delights such as pineapples and papayas, important staple crops like sugarcane—these are readily identified with the island State.

Few people, however, realize that Hawaii is a major source of seed corn for all of the corn-growing areas of the United States. Especially valuable to America's Corn Belt are the hardy blight-resistant varieties of corn developed and produced by growers in Hawaii.

Corn, our country's most important food and seed crop, fell 700 million bushels short of the expected 1970 harvest of 4.8 billion bushels, due primarily to a fast-spreading corn-leaf blight.

Blight-resistant seed is therefore in sharp demand for the 1971 planting season. Some farmers, it has been reported, are even planning to shift some of their acreage from corn to other crops to escape potential blight losses, in anticipation of a shortage of disease-resistant strains of corn seed.

Increasingly, mainland seed distributors have been turning to Hawaii suppliers for seed hardy enough to withstand the blight. These suppliers are responding admirably to their challenge, and Hawaii may yet save the Corn Belt of this country. Knowing of the great interest of many of my colleagues in this subject, I offer for the RECORD the following article, which appeared last week in the Honolulu Star Bulletin:

KANSAS' FIELDS, IT APPEARS, WILL BE CORNIER
IN 1971

Kansas may be cornier in August because of Hawaii.

During the past two weeks, Kauai's Metcalf Farms Inc. has shipped 92 tons of disease-resistant corn seed to the Corn Belt to aid in the fight against the Southern corn-leaf blight.

Originally one million pounds of the newly harvested seed from Kilauea was called for.

But Richard Metcalf's latest estimate puts his winter crop total at 3 million pounds.

Bob Nutt, the Metcalf farm manager, said two 23-ton containers went out each week to the Pride Seed Co. distribution center in De Witt, Iowa.

The seed had been bagged and tagged for distribution.

Locally, the blight which ruined some of last summer's Mainland corn crop is of little worry.

There is a good chance that all of the Islands will escape major infection, said Dr. John Thompson, director of the Beaumont Agricultural Research Center at the University of Hawaii on the Big Island.

And on Maui, the Trojan Seed Co.'s research director, Tom Mack, said:

"We have not experienced any problems at all and there was not enough of the disease (here) to frighten us."

Although optimism runs high on Hawaii's two largest isles, Dr. Richard Bergquist, plant pathologist at the Kauai branch experiment station, says Southern corn-leaf blight is a minor problem.

Its main effect, he said, has been to spur the need for producing more disease-resistant seed to replace the highly vulnerable "T" cytoplasm corn strains grown across the nation.

Both Mack and Thompson believe that Hawaii's climate is not right for the spread of the Southern blight.

But Northern corn-leaf blight—a strain which has been in the Islands for four years—causes farmers far more worry here, Mack and Bergquist said, although most seed stock now growing in the State is resistant to both Northern and Southern varieties.

The Big Island has one major commercial corn producer and his fields are free of the dreaded Southern blight, Thompson said.

He said there has been only one "suspicious" case of the disease on Hawaii—at the Volcano University experiment station—and even then he is not sure it was Southern corn-leaf blight.

Trojan Seed Co. expects to double its volume of sales this year because of a big increase in demand for seed corn from Mainland farmers, Mack said.

He also said that Trojan has succeeded in producing single-cross hybrids which have been producing better quality and more uniform corn.

DRAFTEES IN EUROPE: THE POVERTY OF OUR GIs

HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1971

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, much has been written about the effect of selective service on the civilian population, but the cruelest impact of the draft has been on our men in uniform. The ability to compel young men to enter the military has led to a gross neglect of the lower enlisted grades in the Armed Forces.

In several previous speeches, I have described the inequitable military compensation system, which pays low-ranking enlisted men less than half the average wage for unskilled blue-collar work. But the discrimination extends beyond regular pay to the entire structure of allowances and privileges. Officers and senior enlisted men, for example, are provided Government allowances to bring their families overseas, but the first-termers must pay their own bills for family moving.

The result has been to further impoverish the already underpaid GIs in Europe. In a recent film clip, CBS News reported that "the poorest of the poor are Americans, young men in the U.S. Army, and they are poor because they are here serving their country."

The broadcast dramatically illustrated the misery of our servicemen whose pay is so low that some are forced to live in unheated homes, with open sewage running in their backyards. An Army doctor said the situation was so bad that he would "certainly like to see the implementation of welfare, public assistance here, on the same basis as it is in the States, because it seems to me that if someone has the right to get welfare in the States, he should here, and likewise, I would like to see food stamps be brought here to Germany." The proper solution, of course, is not to add to the HEW or Agriculture budgets, but to pay our men in service a living wage.

It is inconceivable that anyone who has seen this broadcast could oppose pay increases for the junior enlisted grades. Regardless of the draft we must implement the recommendations of the Gates commission so that military duty does not impose a financial burden on our men in service. I commend this item to your attention:

CBS EVENING NEWS

MUDD. For years, the Army's policy regarding married draftees who are sent overseas is not to provide expenses for their families to join them. This is because a draftee is a short-term, relatively speaking, and the Army does not consider his stay in an overseas zone to be long enough to warrant the expense. So if a married draftee wants his family to join him, he must pay the bills himself, and the going can get rough. John Sheahan reports from West Germany.

SHEAHAN. The poorest of the poor here in West Germany are Americans, young men in the United States Army, and they're poor because they're here serving their country. Sergeants and officers get along all right; their wives and families are brought to Europe at

government expense. The impoverished are men below the rank of sergeant. They have to pay their families' fares across the Atlantic, and get along without government housing. There's no one to protect them from gouging German landlords.

SP4c. DAVID PEPPE. I don't think—I don't see why a major's wife, or a colonel's wife, or even, you know, an E-7 or an E-8 or E-6s wife is more important than mine. I feel that I was drafted, and I was married when I was drafted, and I don't think there's any reason for me not to be with my wife, unless of course I was in a war zone.

SHEAHAN. We visited Specialist Fourth Class David Pepple and his wife Gayle. He earns \$231 a month and pays \$85 for this apartment. That's about twice the rent a German would pay. Their apartment is unheated except for an oil-fired space heater in the kitchen. The landlord's cesspool is full, so now the sewage is just pumped out into the backyard.

PEPPE. In the summer time it's impossible to even open up the windows to get any air in the house, because all the air is very foul.

Mrs. GAYLE PEPPE: I used to be a social worker, and I couldn't understand how people could be so bitter about the way they lived, and now I can really understand.

SHEAHAN. Inflation and the revaluation of the German mark have combined to knock 10 to 15 percent out of the buying power of the dollar here in the last 15 months. Things would be better if their wives could work, but because of the language barrier the only jobs available are connected with the Army itself, and for most wives those jobs are not available.

Who gets those jobs?

WOMAN. The Germans.

PEPPE. There are—there are—in the hospital, I can speak for the hospital, there are secretaries, and all the secretaries, to my knowledge, are either local nationals or have been brought in from other countries. There are some from Ireland, and some from England, and some other countries, but it seems to me that, you know, the United States is so worried about the gold flow, and they have signs in the commissaries, you know, buy American beer, stop the gold flow, and it seems very ironical, the American people are paying out money and to hire local nationals when our wives are just sitting at home and cannot find jobs.

SHEAHAN. Some GIs have discussed their desperate poverty with Army psychiatrist Major Steve Simring.

SIMRING. I think that people who want work and want to make it should be provided the opportunity to, and I'd certainly like to see more jobs available for dependent wives of American citizens. If the German government won't provide them I think our government should. I'd certainly like to see the implementation of welfare, public assistance, here, on the same basis as it is in the States, because it seems to me that if someone has the right to get welfare in the States, he should here, and likewise, I'd like to see food stamps be brought here to Germany.

SHEAHAN. Nineteen-year-old Army wife Linda asked us to give her a ride home from the military hospital. Doctors told her her nine-week-old baby Mike has pneumonia, but the baby was not admitted. She was told to take him home again. When we got to Linda's apartment we found her home was one of the worst we had seen.

It's good that you were able to borrow—borrow a vaporizer. What did they tell you at the hospital?

LINDA. Well, the doctor in emergency told me—first of all he asked me if I had a vaporizer, and I had no vaporizer. So he told me to put—turn on the hot water, and I told him we didn't have hot water. And next he told me to put him in the shower and put him near the shower and turn on the hot

water so there'd be steam. I told him we didn't have any shower. And so he told me to put him in a bathtub with warm water. We don't have a bathtub. And then he said move his bed next to the heater. And I told him we don't have one, and he said a register, and I said we don't have a register. And I told him we had oil heat, and he said where do you live, you know, and I told him we lived in German housing. He couldn't believe it.

SHEAHAN. It's notable that no one we've talked with has objected to being in the Army or to being drafted. They're proud to serve their country. What they do object to is being poor. And they're disillusioned—they feel that somehow their country has let them down.

COLLEGE LOANS

HON. LARRY WINN, JR.

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1971

Mr. WINN. Mr. Speaker, as we all know, the cost of higher education in this country has skyrocketed placing it out of reach of many of our young people. Congress has reacted by providing additional loan guarantees by the Federal Government. A number of financial institutions in my district have been extremely progressive in this regard, often sacrificing valuable businesses in the process.

However, the loan guarantees are helpful only if a student can find a lender which is often easier said than done. The financial institutions are hesitant because these loans are very nonliquid assets resulting from the fact that repayment does not begin until at least 9 months after graduation.

The Twin City State Bank of Kansas City, Kans., has developed an extremely innovative plan that will help solve this problem and help finance the education of medical students at Kansas University. The February 1 edition of the Wall Street Journal contains the details of this program which I would like to share with you today.

KANSAS BANK PLANS TO FINANCE EDUCATION THROUGH SALE OF NOTES—CAPITAL ISSUES WILL PROVIDE FUNDS FOR MEDICAL STUDENTS AT THE UNIVERSITY OF KANSAS

KANSAS CITY, KANS.—Twin City State Bank plans to finance the education of University of Kansas medical students through sale of two subordinated capital note issues.

The bank serves the university's medical center, which has about 500 students and an equal number of interns, nurses and residents, T. M. Higgins Jr., bank president, said. Currently 325 student loans, totaling approximately \$425,000, are on the books of the \$20 million asset bank. Such loans represent about one-fifth of the bank's total loan portfolio, exclusive of real estate and consumer instalment borrowings.

Although guaranteed by the Federal Government under the 1965 Education Act, Mr. Higgins noted that the student borrowings "are very nonliquid assets, since the students don't begin payment until nine months after graduation, and even this payment is deferred if they enter the service or continue their education."

Students are permitted to borrow a maximum of \$1,500 annually, at 7%, with the total amount that may be borrowed for both

undergraduate and graduate work limited to \$7,500.

To provide funds needed for loans, Twin City State Bank plans to sell \$250,000 of seven-year, 6% capital notes and an equal amount of 6 1/4% notes due in 1981. Maturities of the two issues, he said, "coincide with the expected repayment period of the student loans."

Sale of the issues, currently awaiting clearance from Federal and state regulatory agencies, will permit the bank to more than double the amount of student loans currently outstanding, he added.

"We expect a portion of the notes to be purchased by senior doctors and others affiliated with the medical center," Mr. Higgins said, "thus permitting individual funds to be channeled to the guaranteed student aid loans."

ERNEST GRUENING: EVOLUTION OF A WAR CRITIC

HON. NICK BEGICH

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1971

Mr. BEGICH. Mr. Speaker, Senator Ernest Gruening is one of this Nation's most distinguished citizens. His wisdom and determination have guided Alaska and the country for many years.

Through the years, Senator Gruening guided Alaska to statehood through the difficult and challenging years of the 1950's. Mr. Gruening served as Alaska's territorial Governor longer than any other man and as U.S. Senator for 10 years. His public service spans years of dedication and vision. His wisdom is shared with his friends and countrymen. Many timely and extensive works in the field of politics and history have been authored by Alaska's outstanding statesman.

Many times he saw the future so vividly, retrospect makes men shudder at his accuracy. Before it was fashionable to be opposed to the war in Vietnam, Ernest Gruening was the lonesome voice in the wilderness predicting the agony and tragedy of a misguided foreign policy.

We owe much to Senator Gruening and I wish to express the great pleasure I have in calling Ernest Gruening a statesman, an American, and a friend.

Yesterday in the Washington Post, Jules Witcover, a perceptive journalist in his own right, wrote an article about Ernest Gruening. I think that it captures much of the dynamic character of this great man. Because the article was so thoughtful and perceptive, I include it in the RECORD:

ERNEST GRUENING: EVOLUTION OF A WAR CRITIC

(By Jules Witcover)

Nobody likes to hear "I told you so." And maybe that's why Ernest Gruening, now age 84 but just as lucid as the day seven years ago when he became the first U.S. senator to call on his country to get out of Vietnam, is getting no offers on the lecture circuit.

At a time when much of the nation has swung over to his basic view, the former senator, retired by his Alaska constituents in 1966, is learning what it's like to be a prophet with very little proclaimed honor in his own country. And it bothers him, be-

cause he's even more vehemently against the war now than he was when he made his historic but little-noticed Senate speech on March 10, 1964.

Certainly it's not his advanced age. He looks 84, all right, stooped and wrinkled and his eyes a bit watery, but he moves about his cluttered old house off Rock Creek Park like a youngster of 60. And his views pour out in a flood of names, dates and debater's incisive points, especially on the Vietnam war.

Just down the road from his house is Walter Reed Army Medical center, and the short, balding Gruening tells of visits to the wards of Vietnam veterans who have lost limbs or their eyesight, and of how the sight fans his conviction that the war is all wrong and must be stopped.

But no one is listening anymore, because he has not been in the Senate for four years. So Ernest Gruening gets up every morning and goes to work on his autobiography, into which he is pouring all his thoughts and his arguments against the American involvement in Vietnam he sought to stop almost alone in the Senate in the early 1960s.

The role of peacenik came late in life to Gruening. He was medical student, cub reporter, big city editor, magazine writer, adviser to Secretary of State Cordell Hull, FDR bureaucrat, Governor of Alaska, and a prime battler for its statehood before becoming one of its first elected senators.

In the Senate, he listened from the outset to the claims and promises about Vietnam, and he doubted. He read Indochinese history and he listened some more, and he doubted some more. And then, with only one clearly identifiable ally—Sen. Wayne Morse of Oregon, now also retired by the voters—Gruening began to speak out.

Today, he is still speaking out, even though his views now travel only as far as the sound of his voice. He speaks with a mixture of chagrin and anger as he reflects on the war, on what it has done to American youth, what it did to former President Johnson, "who didn't listen to me," and to the soul of the nation. And his judgment is sharp.

President Nixon, he says, "has no intention of ending the war." Vietnamization, he says, is a formula for prolonging it with Vietnamese instead of Americans. "He wants a military victory," he says. "The only way to win the war honorably is to confess error and get out. It's not easy, but it has to be done."

Of the current My Lai trials, Gruening says: "This not an isolated business. These boys who are being tried now are not responsible. The people who sent them down there are responsible, and should be tried. We are just as responsible as the Germans were in World War II. We're doing all the horrible things the Nazis, the fascists and the Communists did. The only difference is we do it in the name of liberating people, democratizing them, freeing them. It's ghastly hypocrisy."

The former Alaska senator obviously doesn't mince words. What he proposes are war crimes trials, with American political and military leaders in the dock.

"I came to the conclusion about 1965 that we were the aggressors," he says. "It's been perfectly clear that we asked ourselves in, and that we started bombing, North and South. It's hard for the American people to accept that, but it's true. I think Johnson has a terrible burden of guilt."

"After promising never to send American boys to fight in Asia, he has the blood of those 45,000 American boys on his head."

Gruening, as an early independent critic of the war, has lived with frustration for a long time, but he says it is particularly frustrating now because in his view the Cambodian involvement is basically a reply of the Vietnam errors he warned about.

"The whole thing is just incredible," he says, "that the American people could have been bamboozled by sheer mendacity at the top. And that mendacity continues to this day. As inexcusable though understandable as it was earlier, it's more so now. We know now how we've slaughtered innocent non-combatants and made millions of refugees with our bombing."

Unlike some Vietnam critics in the Senate who were persuaded by peace-movement propaganda against the war, Gruening was a do-it-yourself dove.

"When I came here I didn't know anything except what I read in the papers," he recalls. "I began reading everything I could get my hands on. It seemed to me there was no U.S. vital interest at stake. I was a rooting-tooting supporter of American involvement in World War I and I served in it. But I knew this domino theory was absolute bunk, and Nixon years ago saying we would be fighting Communism on the beaches of California—absolute rot."

"If we had stayed out of it, we would have had in North Vietnam the strongest supporter in opposing the Chinese moving south. We should have supported Ho Chi Minh, who was analogous to Tito and not part of the Communist conspiracy."

Gruening made his first open break with Vietnam policy on October 7, 1963, when he charged that the official American position that U.S. Forces in Vietnam were simply "advising," not fighting, was false.

His March 10, 1964 speech calling for a pullout found only one solid ally—Morse—and five months later, when President Johnson sought and got his Tonkin Gulf Resolution from Congress, Gruening and Morse were the only dissenters in the 88-2 vote.

Vietnam hawks in the Senate attributed Gruening's defeat—in the Democratic primary of 1966, by present Democratic Sen. Mike Gravel—to his early and staunch opposition to the war. But Gruening says otherwise. Gravel used a slick television film at the last minute and caught him napping, he says.

Whatever the cause Gruening's voice, though not silenced, has been effectively muted since his return to private life. He hopes to regain some of his old audience around Christmas, 1971, when his book "Many Causes", is published by Houghton Mifflin. In the meantime, he bustles himself with the manuscript, working as a consultant to a Washington committee on the population crisis, and saying to the few who will listen: "I told you so."

NO ONE IS ABOVE CRITICISM

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1971

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, once in a while something occurs in the other Chamber that demands comment even though it may involve some criticism of a Member of that Chamber.

This is a case in point.

Recently, a staff member of the National Security Council, speaking as a private citizen, was critical of Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, hardly an unusual occurrence.

Through a story in the Washington Post, Senator FULBRIGHT learned of this young man's temerity and reacted swiftly.

He summoned him to appear before an executive session of his committee to ex-

plain how it was he dared be critical of such an exalted personage as the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, none of us in either House is above criticism. And to react to criticism by attempting to intimidate your critics through star chamber and kangaroo court tactics is, I believe, unconscionable. The President, quite naturally, has refused to submit one of his men to this kind of inquisition. He is to be commended for it.

I am surprised that some members of the Foreign Relations Committee who pride themselves on their liberalism would agree to resort to this sort of brow-beating. For if one man can be subjected to this, then any man can be. No critical citizen is safe.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that those delegated power by the people should not be capricious in the exercise of that power.

I insert Chairman FULBRIGHT's letter and the Washington Post story in the RECORD at this point:

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS,
Washington, D.C., Feb. 2, 1970.

Mr. JOHN LEHMAN, JR.,
National Security Council,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR Mr. LEHMAN: In the meeting of the Foreign Relations Committee this morning, there was discussion of the Washington Post story (copy attached) concerning your remarks January 27 at an off-the-record meeting of Senate staff members and Foreign Service Officers. It was noted that you were quoted as saying the reports of the discussions had been taken out of context.

The Committee agreed that, in order to clarify this matter further, you should be requested to meet with the Committee in Executive Session tomorrow afternoon, Wednesday, February 3, at 2:30 o'clock in Room S-116 of the Capitol.

The Committee also took note of the fact that the remarks in question were made to representatives of both the Executive and Legislative Branches in a meeting not involving your official relationship to the President and therefore beyond the scope of Executive Privilege.

Sincerely yours,

J. W. FULBRIGHT,
Chairman.

NSC AIDE ATTACKS FULBRIGHT
(By Spencer Rich)

A National Security Council official told a meeting of Senate staffers last week that the Senate Foreign Relations Committee had leaked classified information to the press and that Committee Chairman J. W. Fulbright (D-Ark.) had a "mischievous" attitude toward administration policies, Capitol Hill aides said yesterday.

The charges against Fulbright were allegedly made by NSC official John Lehman Jr. at an off-the-record discussion last Wednesday night for Senate staff members and Foreign Service officers arranged by the Foreign Service Association, which sponsors monthly discussion groups on foreign policy topics.

"Obviously I think he's completely off base," said Fulbright in response, adding that one of his aides had been present and told him of Lehman's remarks.

"He started knocking Fulbright right away," said one of those present, "called him 'mischievous' and took the attitude that the administration could never take Fulbright and the Foreign Relations Committee into its confidence. He said 'there are some people we just can't work with.' When we started

talking he pulled a bunch of quotes from Fulbright dating as far back as 1961 out of his pocket."

Another staff member quoted Lehman as saying that there was a "dereliction of trust and lack of good faith" on Fulbright's part, that as soon as a closed committee hearing ended Fulbright would jump in front of the TV lights and reveal what was said and that a special committee on foreign commitments headed by Stuart Symington (D-Mo.) had repeatedly leaked classified material from NSC and the State Department to the press.

Lehman also reportedly criticized the committee for forcing the withdrawal of the nomination of conservative Robert Strausz-Hupe as ambassador to Morocco. (The nominee was later approved to be ambassador to Ceylon.)

Reached by phone at his office yesterday, Lehman said that reports of the discussions were taken out of context, that he had been asked to speak informally, giving his own personal opinions, on the decision-making process.

"I wouldn't characterize what I said as a harsh attack," he said. "It seemed to me one of the causes of poor communication (between the Executive and the Senate) was some of the actions of Fulbright in his hearings. One of the causes could be that State has suggested that Fulbright has leaked information given in executive session. As long as this kind of mischief-making actions seem as mischief-making—persists . . ."

Lehman specifically denied making any personal attack on Fulbright or accusing Symington subcommittee aides Roland Paul and Walter Pineus of leaking classified information to The Washington Post, but he said, "There was a helluva lot of information leaked."

He said he did come prepared with Fulbright quotes, but just to show a "complete, 10-year, 180-degree swing" by the Senator on some matters.

This is the second recent criticism of Fulbright by the Executive Branch to come to light. Over the weekend a seven-page unsigned Pentagon memorandum blasted Fulbright, William Proxmire (D-Wis.), The Washington Post and Sen. George S. McGovern (D-S.D.).

SUPPORT FOR A GLOBAL EFFORT TO HALT ILLICIT DRUG TRAFFIC

HON. PETER A. PEYSER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1971

Mr. PEYSER. Mr. Speaker, over 200,000 Americans are estimated to be heroin addicts, and over 100,000 of these addicts are estimated to live in New York State. The problem is an extremely serious one, which is growing worse every day.

Meanwhile, the International Narcotics Control Board estimates that there were 1,200 tons of opium produced in the world last year alone. Many of the countries producing this opium received direct or indirect military or economic support from the United States. I find this outrageous and intolerable. These countries should either cease production of these lethal drugs or stop receiving American aid.

Mr. Speaker, I bring to the attention of the Members of the House a recent report that appeared in the Washington Post highlighting merely the special

cases of countries that are producing opium and exporting it:

GLOBAL EFFORT TO CUT DRUG TRAFFIC SOUGHT (By Don Cook)

PARIS, February 5.—The International Narcotics Control Board, in its annual report released today at its Geneva headquarters, called for the creation of a special United Nations fund to finance a global program to reduce illicit opium production and check international drug traffic.

"The gravity of the situation has deepened during the year," the report said.

"The board remains convinced that a global approach is essential for the ultimate elimination of illicit and uncontrolled production of narcotics raw material. The very fact that the difficulties are so formidable and so deep-seated makes it all the more necessary to embark as soon as possible on an overall plan and prosecute it with vigor and determination."

The board estimated that approximately 1,200 tons of illicit opium flooded the world in the past year—which was almost exactly equal to the legalized or authorized production fixed by the control board for necessary world-wide medical use. After a country-by-country review of the drug-growing trouble-spots, the control board concluded somewhat pessimistically:

"Where production is under government control, the closing of loopholes is mainly a matter of improving administrative efficiency and success should be achievable within a relatively short time.

"Where it exists in defiance of government edict or by reasons of fundamental economic handicaps, it would be unrealistic to look for progress except over many years and as a result of united effort comprehensively planned and adequately equipped."

Here, in alphabetical order, are the highlights of the reports on what the control board diplomatically calls its "special cases":

Afghanistan: Production forbidden but the ban is not enforced. There seems to be an abundant supply of both opium and of cannabis. Smuggling a matter of deep concern to countries farther afield. Remedies will not be easy. Underlying social and economic factors now existing in Afghanistan present formidable difficulties and the government will need substantial external aid if it is to be enabled to bring the situation under control.

Burma: Fairly extensive illicit traffic, particularly east of the Salween River converging on the borders of Laos and Thailand. This area is at present virtually beyond the control of the government, and suppression of traffic further hampered by the fact that opium has been the sole cash crop of the inhabitants for nearly two centuries. The government hopes that some reduction may result from regional development programs. Control board trusts that the Burmese government will see its way to invite participation by a United Nations study group.

Iran: Stern punishment has been meted out to convicted traffickers, but concern over the situation is now deepened by reports that authorized poppy cultivation is to be markedly increased in 1971 to about 30,000 acres (12,000 hectares) which is double the area cultivated in 1970. So great an increase will obviously make control more difficult and will intensify the risk of further abusive consumption of opium within Iran and leakage into illicit traffic.

Laos: Legislative authorities are reported to be actively considering a draft law to prohibit poppy cultivation. Another useful step would be to ratify the 1961 International Narcotics Control Convention. Both should begin to be applied as soon as possible.

Lebanon: Government pressing on with green plan for replacing cannabis, reports that 4,500 hectares have been converted to sunflower, but recent illicit seizures illus-

trate measures so far fall materially short of what is needed. Renewed strength and vigilance needed to repair evident breaches in controls system.

Nepal: Board has long sought to establish links with the government of Nepal which is not a party to the 1961 convention. Both cannabis and opium finding its way into illicit channels, which is particularly embarrassing to India, which has one of the best control systems of any producing country.

Thailand: Considerable local uncontrolled production of opium, but also attracts additional supplies from Burma and Laos. Much converted into morphine and heroin which is mainly for local consumption but flows into international illicit channels. Assistance of United Nations has been enlisted in devising and applying remedial measures to diversify agricultural economy and raise low living standards. But already there are signs that international illicit traffickers are turning their attention to Southeast Asia as their accustomed sources of supply in the Mediterranean and the Near East begin to be narrowed.

Turkey: Provinces where production authorized has been reduced from 25 to 7. A certain improvement in efficiency of control, but utmost vigilance needed to consolidate the improvement so far. Draft law now before parliament whereby individual cultivators will be licensed.

The report also discusses problems of coca-leaf production from which crude cocaine is obtained in the South American countries of Bolivia, Peru, Ecuador and Costa Rica.

PUBLIC AID TO PAROCHIAL SCHOOLS EXAMINED

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1971

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an excellent series of articles on "parochialism" from the Christian Science Monitor of February 3 to 8, 1971.

I recommend them to my colleagues.

"PAROCHIALISM"—YEAR OF DECISION—HELP FOR CATHOLIC SCHOOLS?

(By Joanne Leedom)

A silver coin caught the light of the candles as it dropped into the collection plate. The donor—blond, pigtailed—darted a look from face to face, then lowered her eyes in the small parish church. The coin had been for her school.

Twenty-five cents for St. Mary's. Ten cents for St. Joseph's. Coins, dollar bills—hundreds of thousands of them—clink into church coffers each week to run the nation's largest private educational system: the Roman Catholic parochial schools.

Yet those dollars are no longer enough, according to church officials.

Over the last five years in the U.S., the parochial schools have been closing at an average rate of about one a day: 1,500 out of 12,000 have closed since 1965. Many of these schools have consolidated, but many others have simply shut down, leaving their students to find new classrooms.

"VIGOROUS CAMPAIGN"

The parochial system, which educates 4.8 million children (9 percent of the total school population, 85 percent of nonpublic school children) is now calling on the pub-

lic for aid. And the public is beginning to hear—if not heed—the call.

The Nixon administration is in favor of public aid, and is exploring various methods of providing it without violating the Constitution. Exact terms of the Constitution remain a focus of intense controversy between supporters and critics of public aid.

Sparking the present drive for church-school aid are the Roman Catholic bishops. Most recently, some 41 high-ranking Catholic prelates from around the country met for two days in December, 1970, then called for a "vigorous campaign" to obtain public and private aid.

State Catholic conferences and allied organizations have spent massive sums in this drive. Working with equal fervor is a nationwide group of laymen, largely but not exclusively Catholic, called Citizens for Educational Freedom.

COMMUNITY RESPONSE DIVIDED

With more and more parochial students crowding the public school yards, a number of citizens are endorsing aid as a less expensive solution than building new schools and hiring new teachers.

Many others, however, argue that costs in the long run will even out; that aid will violate the principle of church-state separation, and will divert public money from public schools.

In any case, 36 states already have adopted some form of assistance. This ranges from small outlays for transportation and books to substantial supplements for salaries and special services. Campaigns for further aid are expected in at least 42 states this year. Numerous federal programs also offer compensation. The second article in this series will detail types of aid.

As legislatures settle down into their current sessions, the issue of public support to nonpublic schools is at a critical juncture. The Supreme Court of the United States, for one, will be making a landmark decision this year on aid programs in Pennsylvania, Connecticut, and Rhode Island.

In these states, the legislatures have adopted purchase-of-services plans which authorize the state to pay a certain percentage of lay teachers' salaries in secular subjects as well as to purchase textbooks and some teaching materials in these subjects.

Aid opponents—including the American Civil Liberties Union, the American Jewish Congress, and Americans United for Separation of Church and State—have challenged this legislation. In Rhode Island and Connecticut, the state supreme courts have declared the programs unconstitutional; in Pennsylvania, the state court has upheld the legislation.

OPINION POLLED

American public opinion, based on available polls, is divided, with a majority against aid.

A 1969 Gallup poll indicated that, while those interviewed strongly endorsed the continuation of private and parochial schools, 59 percent opposed giving them direct public aid. Only 38 percent said they favored such support.

A 1965 Catholic Digest-Gallup survey and an earlier 1952 Gallup poll showed fewer persons opposed to such aid than in 1969.

Of those questioned by Gallup in 1969, 59 percent said that if tuition were free they would choose to send their children either to private or parochial schools. With 88 percent of all pupils now in public schools, aid opponents have good reason to be concerned at what substantial private-school aid would do to the public schools.

PARISH SCHOOLS IN THE CENTER

Where voters have had an opportunity to make their views known, they have con-

firmed the Gallup Poll results that a majority oppose state aid to church schools. In recent referenda in Nebraska and Michigan, the voters rejected attempts to move toward substantial government aid to parochial schools. And in 1967, New York voters by a 3-to-1 margin turned down a new state constitution which would have eliminated the long-standing provision designed to keep state moneys from flowing to church schools.

Though other religious and nonpublic schools are implicated by aid decisions, the Catholic system, because of its size, is the focus of the national debate.

Supported primarily by moneys collected in the individual churches, the parish school is the heart of the Catholic system. Though there are also diocesan schools (run by area-wide dioceses) and order schools (run by private orders such as the Jesuits), it is mostly the small parish school that is feeling the economic crunch.

Causes for the parochial school plight are found (1) within the church itself and (2) within the economy as a whole.

The most frequently cited cause is the decline in the number of teaching nuns. Parochial schools run at a fraction of public school costs largely because they employ religious personnel. Where a sister might be paid \$1,200 a year, a lay teacher would receive \$5,000 to \$7,000.

NEW NOVICES FAR FEWER

Over the last 5 to 10 years, however, there has been a significant drop in the number of women entering religious orders.

"Where there were 50 novices entering an order 10 years ago, now there are only 5 or 10," noted Patrick Toole of the Institute of Educational Development. The institute is a private educational research organization which has done feasibility studies for many states, including Rhode Island and Pennsylvania, on aid to nonpublic schools.

And of those women who are entering orders, many are seeking assignments other than the usual parish teaching.

At the same time, however, many parishioners are still giving the same to the collection plate as they did five years ago, so the parish coffers are ringing up comparatively less revenue.

Adding to that, enrollment in the parochial schools is on the ebb. One million students have dropped from enrollment figures since 1965. School closings have been partially responsible for the drop, but just as significant is the fact that fewer and fewer parents are enrolling their children in the parochial schools.

In big-city dioceses, the decline is often caused by the move of families to the suburbs where parents are more willing to send their children to the public schools, according to the Rev. George Elford, research director of the National Catholic Education Association.

School costs for operation, maintenance, and construction have shot up in the last five years. Cost of living has also risen rapidly and with it teachers' salaries for both religious and lay.

The margin usually saved by employing religious teachers also is shrinking as nuns seek closer parity with lay salaries.

Developments have all forced a rise in tuition fees.

DEFICIT FORCED TUITION BOOST

The Archdiocese of Chicago, as a result of a \$2 million deficit, increased its tuition ceiling this year by 20 percent—from \$100 to \$120.

Though tuition costs are still comparatively low, many church officials fear enrollments will slide as fees rise.

However, Dr. Ernest J. Bartell, Economics Department head at the University of Catholic Notre Dame, asserts: "It should not

be concluded that enrollment would respond negatively to large increases in tuition. There is simply no evidence for it."

While the causes for the parochial plight are in the main economic, they also reflect a new direction in Catholic priorities and education. As the public makes its decisions on public aid, it will also be playing a role in the future of Catholic education.

"PAROCHIAL"—YEAR OF DECISION—NIXON TO CATHOLIC EDUCATORS: "YOU MUST NOT RETREAT"

(By Louis Garinger)

Addressing top Roman Catholic educators whom he had specially invited to the White House, President Nixon said: "If you retreat from the field, I see only a vacuum.

"You cannot retreat, you must not retreat. We must find ways to get public opinion behind you."

There is a marked contrast between these words of Mr. Nixon in February, 1970, and those of John F. Kennedy in his 1960 presidential campaign: "I believe in an America where the separation of church and state is absolute . . . where no church or church school is granted any public funds or political preference. . . ."

KENNEDY STAND RECALLED

President Kennedy, politically vulnerable on this question because of his Catholic religion, carefully avoided recommending any aid for nonpublic schools.

But a fierce battle over the issue was fought in Congress at the time. Those seeking aid for nonpublic schools, unable to get any, managed, nevertheless, to block aid for the public schools as well.

Then President Johnson gave strong backing to aid for both public and nonpublic schools. The Federal Council of Churches and the National Education Association modified their position and formed an uneasy alliance with the Catholic Church to seek aid for all schools.

As a result, the impasse of the Kennedy days was broken. Major aid bills benefiting both public and private schools were passed, the most important being the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.

TRICKLE MAY BECOME TORRENT

But this was to be just the beginning. President Nixon has since opened some doors through which trickles of aid could eventually turn into torrents.

In the 1968 campaign Mr. Nixon said that, if elected, he would urge—in accordance with the Republican Party platform—the providing of "federal funds in support of state-prepared, state-administered aid plans for private-school pupils." This is essentially in accord with what he had advocated eight years before in the 1960 campaign.

And he promised to establish a national task force for religious-affiliated schools. "In many cases," he contended, "religious schools are performing indispensable community services and would seem to merit public support."

In February, last year, the President extended his unprecedented invitation to top Roman Catholic educators to meet with him at the White House to discuss their school problems.

PRaise FOR PRESIDENT

Afterwards, the Rev. C. Albert Koob, president of the National Catholic Education Association, expressed appreciation of Mr. Nixon's "remarkable understanding of Catholic education problems."

He later recalled in an interview appearing in the National Catholic Reporter that the President "said several times to his aides, these people are not in education for what they can get out of it, they are here to give something and I want to see that they stay alive."

In March, 1970, in his education message the President cited an impressive number of

parochial-school closings and then repeated a frequently advanced but hotly contested economic argument for parochial.

He said, "If most or all private schools were to close or turn public, the added burden on public funds by the end of the 1970's would exceed \$4 billion a year in operations, with an estimated \$5 billion more needed for facilities."

SPIRITUAL VALUE CITED

As an "equally important consideration," he maintained that these institutions "often add a dimension of spiritual value giving children a moral code by which to live. The government cannot be indifferent to the potential collapse of such schools."

On the same day Mr. Nixon wrote Fr. Koob and also Bishop Joseph L. Bernardin, general secretary of the United States Catholic Conference, to inform them personally of his message and to assure them that he was moving in the direction they had suggested when at the White House.

He wound up, "Your suggestions were deeply appreciated; and, as you can see from the message, many of the ideas and thoughts we discussed are reflected here."

COMMISSION ESTABLISHED

Mr. Nixon also announced in his education message that he was establishing a President's Commission on School Finance that would consider "the specific problem of parochial schools."

Then in April the President announced formation of a four-member Panel on Nonpublic Education to work within the framework of the school-finance commission. The composition of this panel quickly came under fire since three of the four members are staunchly committed advocates of public aid to church schools while the fourth is thought to favor private-school aid.

The chairman, Clarence Walton, is president of Catholic University in Washington, D.C. Members include Bishop William E. McManus, director of education for the Roman Catholic Archdiocese of Chicago and for many years a key parochial lobbyist on Capitol Hill.

Also: Ivan E. Zylstra, administrator of government-school relations for the National Union of Christian Schools and an ardent parochial lobbyist; and William G. Saltonstall, currently at the Harvard Graduate School of Education and formerly headmaster of Phillips Exeter Academy.

VOUCHER-PLAN SUPPORT

In yet another action to strengthen private and parochial schools and encourage more competition with public schools, the Nixon administration, through the Office of Economic Opportunity, is supporting experimentation with the voucher plan.

Under this plan parents would receive from the government tuition vouchers good for use by their children in any cooperating school—public, private, or parochial. Local, state, and federal funds would then be used to reimburse the school for education vouchers it had received.

Schools without a sufficient number of applicants simply would not survive. Seeing the threat that this revolutionary plan poses to the public schools, an informal coalition of educational, civil rights, and religious groups in Washington was formed in opposition.

ADVOCATE APPOINTED

Mr. Nixon's recently appointed U.S. Commissioner of Education, Dr. Sidney P. Marshall Jr., is not only an advocate of public aid to nonpublic schools but also favors voucher-plan experimentation.

In October 1970 Mr. Nixon directed Attorney General John N. Mitchell to file a friend-of-the-court brief with the Supreme Court of the United States in support of Pennsylvania's 1968 parochial law.

This purchase-of-services law, already im-

tated in several other states, proved to be the biggest breakthrough for parochial advocates to date. But its constitutionality is being contested in the courts.

It has been suggested that the explanation for Mr. Nixon's ardent support of public aid to church schools lies in Republican Party commitment to a strategy resembling that suggested by Kevin Phillips in his book, "The Emerging Republican Majority."

The view is, in short, that support of aid to private schools has an obvious appeal to racially conscious Southern Protestants and an equally obvious appeal to Catholic Democrats in the industrial North.

GOVERNMENT SUBSIDIES—AID TO CATHOLIC SCHOOLS GAINS

(By Joanne Leedom)

A Roman Catholic parish school door snaps shut, and 420 students land on the public doorstep. Multiply this school after school, and the shutdown is leaving the public in charge of the parochial school child.

Many public systems can handle the influx of parochial students. But in cities with large parochial enrollments—like Detroit, Philadelphia, Boston—a rush through public doors threatens to leave school personnel spinning and school budgets toppling, according to a number of city officials.

For this reason public aid to Catholic schools has been increasing. Once restricted to small outlays for transportation and textbooks, this year aid from states may total more than \$100 million. The federal government also will pour many million dollars' worth of services into parochial schools.

This aid takes multiple forms. In Philadelphia, Zedic Tuggle, a senior, goes to Roman Catholic High School. Zedic, who wants to be a veterinarian, is taught by a science teacher paid by the state, studies from state-owned science books, and uses state-purchased lab equipment. His math, language, and gym teacher also are on the state payroll. Several of his friends at other parochial schools ride the public school bus to the stop nearest their school.

SUBSIDIES APPEAR OFTEN

Near Zedic's home in the center city is Most Precious Blood School. There children from kindergarten to eighth grade come early in the morning for a 7-cent, federally subsidized breakfast; at noon they eat a government-subsidized hot lunch. During part of the day they are taught by lay teachers whose salaries are partially state-subsidized.

At Most Precious Blood School, students are offered a special service: psychological counseling. Financed by Title 1 of the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act, a psychologist, and community consultant come in to work with children who have learning and emotional problems.

For Most Precious Blood, the state aid for salaries alone equals about \$5,000 out of a \$50,000 budget.

Though there are no precise figures for the total amount of aid given to Philadelphia parochial schools, the Rev. Paul Curran, assistant superintendent, estimates the figure represents about 10 percent of total parochial budgets.

Philadelphia and other Pennsylvania cities represent a vanguard of sorts in the move for public aid. Ever since 1968, Pennsylvania has been operating under a "purchase of services" plan which pays salaries of lay teachers in four secular subjects: math, science, language, and physical education.

It also purchases texts and some learning materials in these courses.

Total costs for the state this school year will be \$20 million.

While Pennsylvania is used as an example for forces favoring aid, it also is a chief target for aid opponents. The Pennsylvania aid plan, along with similar programs in Connecticut and Rhode Island, is currently

under challenge in the Supreme Court of the United States.

In most states where aid has been extended, court challenges have followed closely behind. There are at least 27 active cases in 14 states, according to the American Jewish Congress, one of the major challengers.

"The basic question right now is money," asserts Joseph B. Robinson, director of the Commission on Law and Social Action of the American Jewish Congress.

"Those supporting aid to parochial schools are no longer interested in fringe benefits such as texts and busing. They want cash as it's been provided in purchase of services and salary supplements."

Though the move may be for more aid, only a few states have adopted legislation as remunerative as that being challenged in the Supreme Court.

Louisiana, Michigan, and Ohio have passed similar purchase of services plans. However, in Louisiana, the State Supreme Court recently struck down the legislation, and in Michigan, voters passed a constitutional amendment banning all assistance. Ohio, however, does have one of the more generous aid programs, offering \$50 per student for books, teachers' salaries and auxiliary services. The state also provides free transportation.

HIGH COSTS IN NEW YORK

In New York a "mandated services" bill which reimburses parochial schools for record-keeping also wears one of the highest price tags: \$28 million.

Should the whole parochial system collapse—and most officials say this is unlikely—some educators estimate that \$3.5 billion would be added to public school operating budgets.

In Philadelphia, parochial schools will receive \$5.5 million from the State of Pennsylvania this year. The money will still leave the schools in the red, but will rescue them from major trouble.

In Detroit, where supporters of parochial aid failed in a bid to have voters approve an amendment to the Michigan constitution to permit such aid, a large-scale shutdown of parochial schools is threatened.

In turn, this means potential trouble for Detroit public schools, it is said.

"Even now we're facing a deficit budget," said Charles A. Wolfe, executive deputy superintendent of Detroit public schools. "Given an impact of this sort [parochial closing], we could be in real trouble."

A different view—that at least some public schools could absorb large overflows from ailing parochial schools—comes from other sources.

"We can absorb parochial students," said Dr. Robert Denny, assistant superintendent of public schools in Des Moines, Iowa. "We don't have the large numbers of parochial students that many Eastern cities do. With the shift of people to the suburbs, we actually have a declining urban school enrollment."

As states weigh the dollars and cents of public aid vs. public charge, many have sought a balance with modified aid programs and offer limited services directly to the child. Most federal aid, including lunch programs, visual aids, and books, comes to the schools under this "chief benefit" theory.

Through the Office of Economic Opportunity, the federal government is also exploring the possibility of granting tuition vouchers. Under the tuition-voucher plan, parents would be granted a stipend for their child's education, and they could spend this at a public or nonpublic school.

ONE PLAN SHARES TIME

A program which benefits parochial schools, but usually delivers neither money nor services directly to the school, is called "shared time" or "dual enrollment."

This plan, used extensively in New Hamp-

shire, allows parochial students to take some of their classes in the public schools. The students spend part of their day in each school or in some cases on different floors of the same school. In New Hampshire, the state pays the public sector \$680,000 for educating the parochial students.

"We can't be indifferent to the potential collapse of the private-parochial system," President Nixon has said.

John W. Swomley Jr., professor of social ethics and philosophy of religion at St. Paul School of Theology (Methodist), counters this assessment. "It seems to me . . . that the parochial school system is in no danger of collapse but is merely sloughing off inefficient units," he writes in "The Christian Century."

In either case, the public is faced with the question: Will it take public charge of the students, give public aid to the schools, or both?

"WE'RE AT THE END OF AN ERA"—ROMAN CATHOLIC SCHOOLS MERGED TO EASE MONEY CRISIS

(By Joanne Leedom)

Roman Catholic schools—squeezed by scarce money and a changing society—are taking their own hurried steps to meet a growing financial crisis.

The church is consolidating existing schools and, as some schools close, expanding alternate forms of religious instruction.

What is emerging is a new direction in Catholic education.

Traditionally the parochial system has been decentralized. Splintered into individual parish parts, each school has set up its own curriculum, purchased its own materials, paid its own teachers.

CONSOLIDATION PURSUED

Over the last few years, however, the move has been to consolidate finances and planning.

In Buffalo, N.Y., five elementary schools recently slated for closing will move into a single educational center next fall. Into the center will come the 1,100 students and the five staffs trimmed down to one.

Several large cities such as Detroit and Philadelphia completed consolidation plans a year or two ago. In smaller cities like Buffalo, the consolidation is just now getting under way.

In economic terms this centralization means lower costs, broader financial bases, and more equitable distribution of resources among rich and poor parishes. For some systems, however, the move has been only a temporary balm, and the schools are looking to the state for additional help.

"We stabilized our situation over the past three years by consolidation and other re-districting to the extent that we wanted to keep it as it was," reports Fr. John Swers, diocesan superintendent of Detroit schools. "State aid would have stabilized us for the present fiscal year. But now without aid over 100 schools will probably close by June."

IMPACT ASSESSED

(In Michigan a recent constitutional amendment banned all public aid to non-public schools.)

In educational terms the consolidation has led to more total diocesan educational planning and an upsurge of parochial boards of education, according to Dr. Edward R. D'Alessio, director of the division of elementary and secondary education at the United States Catholic Conference.

The boards of education, which are run by laymen as well as religious leaders, tend to place greater emphasis on secular education and on education within the entire community, say many churchmen.

"We're at the end of an era for the parochial school," notes Fr. George Elford, re-

search director of the National Catholic Education Association.

"We are going to see many more inter-parochial and diocesan schools. There will also be more concentration on out-of-school programs and alternate approaches to religious education."

PRIEST ELABORATES

"The parochial system started out to educate immigrant children, but now we are living in a very different urban community," elaborated Fr. Paul McHugh, director of the New England Catholic Education Center.

"The nonpublic schools have been successful in meeting the traditional goals of religious education, but now they must adapt to new needs of a broader community."

The trend is toward more ecumenicalism, and the shift within Catholic education is to more out-of-school programs. There will be more Christian-Confraternity Doctrine classes (after-school sessions) and more released-time programs within the public schools when children take off for religious classes, according to Dr. D'Alessio.

There also will be more adult education and new emphasis on education in the inner city.

In Philadelphia one inner-city school, Our Lady of Mercy, lacked the finances to expand and improve, so it looked to the business community for help.

The school's pastor, the Rt. Rev. Msgr. Martin J. McDonough, went to bankers, to businessmen, and to local foundations and interested them in his ideas. He managed to raise enough money, added to state aid and parish revenues, to renovate the school and start a special program for high achievers from four inner-city parishes. He also brought in new equipment and set up special programs for his own parish children.

"We [he and the rectors from three other inner-city schools] saw so much waste in terms of children, we decided we had to do something about it," explained Msgr. McDonough. "These kids in the first grade were the dropouts; they had no great motivation for learning."

"I believe there are enough people interested to sustain and implement the concern of community people," he said. "My community's desire to have this kind of education offers a mandate to me, to business, and to private sector."

Within the Catholic church there is a move by some to disband the entire parochial system. The National Association of (Catholic) Laymen is urging a gradual phasing out of all schools. In their place NAL would establish parish community centers which would not only teach religion but offer counseling and other programs for the entire community.

NEW DIRECTIONS MAPPED

More than one-third of the dioceses are now in the midst of studies to map out the new directions for the future, according to Fr. Elford.

Whatever happens, the parochial system is changing. And the rate of that change and the percentage of schools shut down will, in large part, depend on the future of public aid.

"There is going to be a Catholic school system," affirmed Dr. D'Alessio. "The Supreme Court decision on public aid will be important, but we have to look beyond it. The Catholic schools are here to stay, but they may be different kinds of schools than we are used to."

"PRAGMATISM" VS. "FIXED PRINCIPLE"—IS U.S. WALL OF SEPARATION "BENDING WITH THE TIMES"?

(By Louis Garinger)

Two issues stand out in the current struggle in the United States on whether public funds should be used to support parochial schools.

One: sharp division over the meaning and intent of key phrases in the United States Constitution.

Two: certain recent trends in religious thinking that tend to favor a move away from strict separation of church and state.

Proponents of public aid maintain that refusal to grant aid deprives them of the free exercise of their religion and of equal protection of the laws.

They contend that refusal of government to aid church schools places a peculiar burden on religion, prohibiting its free exercise. They say that citizens must violate their conscience to share public benefits—in this case, free schooling. This they find discriminatory.

Aid opponents, on the other hand, see such aid as clearly ruled out by constitutional restrictions, especially the explicit prohibitions of aid to church-related schools in a number of state constitutions and in the "no establishment" clause of the First Amendment to the United States Constitution.

They see separation of church and state as an absolute constitutional principle firmly embodied in the "no establishment" clause. They contend that it must be strictly interpreted to protect the people from an unholy alliance—or even unholy warfare—between church and state.

PRAGMATIC GROUNDS URGED

Supporters of parochialism say church-state separation is by no means an unalterable principle or an absolute to be strictly and narrowly interpreted but rather a policy adopted on pragmatic grounds. It must be reinterpreted to meet today's needs, they say.

They maintain that the "no establishment" clause, moreover, is subordinate, tributary, and instrumental to the religious liberty clause of the First Amendment. If in the case of parochialism the two are deemed to be in conflict, they argue that the religious liberty clause automatically prevails over the "no establishment."

Those against public aid argue that the "no establishment" clause stands on the same level with the "free exercise" clause. In the case of parochialism the free exercise provision wholly reinforces "no establishment."

Proponents say that the Constitution prohibits aid only to explicitly religious functions of church-related schools, not to their primarily secular activities. Thus, compensation to lay teachers for the teaching of secular subjects such as languages, mathematics, the sciences, home economics, and vocational training is constitutionally permissible.

The state, proponents continue, can purchase secular services from nonpublic schools since these services have a secular legislative purpose and a primary secular effect. In judging such aid the court properly considers "the philanthropic nature of the activity, not the organizational structure or philosophical orientation of the sponsoring institution."

PERVASIVE ATMOSPHERE SEEN

Those against public aid say the argument that church schools can constitutionally receive aid for teaching the "secular" portions of their curriculum is fallacious since in a typical church-related school, secular and religious subjects cannot be so easily distinguished and separated. They say religious indoctrination is all-pervasive and that a sectarian point of view and atmosphere permeate the entire curriculum and define the school's reason for being.

Purchase of service contracts, voucher plans, and other proposals being advanced to procure aid are simply devices, legal niceties, or gimmicks clearly designed to

evade the "no establishment" clause and similar state constitutional provisions, they say.

Meanwhile, certain trends in religious thought appear to observers to be working in favor of some kind of public aid to parochial schools.

One such trend has been the unthawing, the opening up, that has been going on within the Roman Catholic Church since the Second Vatican Council. As this Catholic renewal has made headway in spite of much foot-dragging in certain quarters, many non-Catholic observers have come to feel less threatened by monolithic Catholic power, less defensive in the face of Catholic demands, more willing to listen sympathetically to their pleas for school aid.

OPPOSITION SOFTENED

The growing cooperation among the churches, the much closer personal contacts between Protestant and Catholic clergy, and the whole ecumenical spirit of the times have pointed in the same direction—lessening the opposition to aid for Catholic schools.

The increasing welfare activities of government coupled with the higher level of social concern within the churches have led to government and church cooperation—government providing the funds, churches furnishing the services.

Partly because of these trends Protestant opposition to public aid for parochial schools has lessened considerably in recent years. But there are other reasons as well. Once Protestants began to seek public funds for their own hard-pressed church-related colleges and for their social welfare institutions, many of them felt they could no longer stand so adamantly against tax support for Catholic schools.

Jews tend to give strong support to constitutional provisions protecting minority rights. The greater the separation between church and state, the more secure they feel.

As a minority in a dominant Christian culture, they are understandably anxious about undue influence of religion on government, especially of the largest and most cohesive Christian church in the country—the Roman Catholic. But even among Jews support of aid has gained ground.

POLITICAL VIEWS CHANGING

Political figures, both in legislatures and in executive offices, have been modifying their church-state separation views. Many of them have been under enormous pressure to provide some aid to hard-pressed church schools.

In view of this, those who oppose such aid find that they must look primarily to the more or less politically immune courts if they are to stem the tide that has been running against church-state separation in the schools.

A considerable body of precedent would enable the justices to make a strong case against such aid. But they also have important precedents available whereby they could build a case in support of aid to church schools.

Thus opponents of aid cannot be sure that even the courts will come up with a favorable decision. Consequently, they are reluctant to put all their eggs in the court basket and continue to fight a rear-guard action in the other two branches of government and in the arena of public opinion.

There, as in the courts, they have suffered serious setbacks. Yet they say they are by no means discouraged, having stemmed the parochial school aid tide in a remarkable number of instances, especially in 1970.

One thing is certain—both sides will be contesting the issue in every possible forum and at every level during the coming year.

THOSE WHO DO NOT LEARN FROM HISTORY ARE DOOMED TO REPEAT IT

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1971

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, history might be defined as what a people did, and what happened to them because of what they did.

It has been said before that those who fail to learn from the lessons of history are doomed to repeat them. This maxim applies to nations as well as to individuals.

The Korean war provides a good example from recent history. The greatest and most powerful nation on earth fought a stalemate with a small underdeveloped fifth rate colony. In that war, our Armed Forces fought a no-win war "for peace" rather than freedom and the enemy, through the Under Secretary General for Political and Security Affairs of the United Nations, was kept informed of our activities.

Today, two decades later, our men are engaged in Vietnam because we did not fight for freedom in the Korean war. Those controlling the decisions of this still great Nation either did not study their history lesson or are not dedicated to the interests of freedom. Wars not fought for freedom are not won and never end except in defeat.

A patriotic attorney and constituent of mine, Mr. Jack Rogers, recently delivered an excellent speech entitled, "A History Lesson."

I urge all Americans to read Mr. Rogers' speech, which I insert following my remarks along with the full text of a message from the President of Vietnam to his people:

A HISTORY LESSON

(Delivered to Baton Rouge High 12 Club on Jan. 29, 1971, by Jack N. Rogers)

The facts of this story are assembled from various eye witness accounts.

On the 1st day a little over 600 men started out. They marched from mid morning until sundown with no food. The little water some carried was confiscated by the guards and used to water the horse of an enemy officer. Many, including the patients from a bombed hospital, were walked to exhaustion, beaten, slugged with rifle butts, bayoneted in the stomach and left to die in agony. These became so numerous that by the end of the day they were commonplace to where all had lost count of their numbers. The march continued until midnight, without food or water. At that hour they were crowded into a rice paddy and permitted to fill what canteens they had from a stagnant and foul buffalo wallow. They all drank this water because there was no other.

The second day they were kicked awake at dawn. There was no food and no water. At about 1:00 p.m., in 100° heat, they were allowed to fill their canteens from a dirty pool beside the road. They marched until 3 a.m. the next morning. Many men reached the end of their endurance during the late hours of this night march. They fell exhausted with groans or in the silence of unconsciousness. Curiously, the guards ignored them, but then the survivors heard following the column

a crackle of rifle and pistol fire from a clean-up squad who shot all those stragglers still living and left their bodies on the road where they lay. The rest walked on through the night.

At the hour of 3 a.m. on the 3d day they were herded into a compound already overcrowded with some 1,500 other American and Allied soldiers. Human waste and maggots covered the ground. The sun rose and the heat increased. Many men died right there and the rest were ordered to dig trenches for graves. The dead and even some yet alive were rolled into these trenches and covered with a shallow layer of dirt. One dying American soldier revived when the dirt landed on him and tried to climb out of the grave. The guards put bayonets at the throat of a comrade in the burial detail and drew blood when he hesitated. He raised his face to the sky in supplication and brought his shovel down on the head of the dying man who fell back in the grave and was covered with the rest. That afternoon, still in the compound, they were allowed to fill their canteens at a well for their first good water. There was no food.

On the 4th day they were given about one-half cup of rice per man, about 10 a.m. The temperature again, as every day, was over 100 degrees. They sat in the open, under the sun, all day. All headgear of any kind had been taken away the first day. At twilight the march resumed. About midnight a rain came for some 15 minutes, refreshing them somewhat. Later, men began falling out of line and the shots of the buzzard squad were heard again. They marched until daybreak.

On the 5th day, after two hours rest, they were prodded up with bayonets and the march began again without food or water. About 3 miles down the road they passed a bubbling artesian well. Six men, tortured by thirst, broke ranks and ran to the well but as they got near, all the guards fired at them. They were left lying where they fell. The survivors by now were stumbling and detached from reality. Two miles farther they were shocked to awareness again by the sight of the mutilated and disemboweled corpse of an allied soldier hanging on a barbed wire fence beside the road. As they passed through towns, the people tried to help them with food and drink. The guards savagely beat both the givers and the receivers and the people passed the word ahead to stop, lest more men be killed. All day more men were beaten, clubbed, shot and bayoneted, and the buzzard squad was busy behind the column. In the late afternoon they were herded into another barbed wire compound where the conditions were the worst yet of their journey. It was already jammed with several hundred more sick, dying and dead Americans and allied soldiers. They lay on the ground amid filth and maggots. Almost all had dysentery. Malaria and dengue fever were running unchecked. At dusk a few men near the gate were given a little rice. The rest were ignored. After darkness fell some of the guards charged in, yelling and laughing. They bayoneted several men at random and left them to die.

At dawn of the 6th day, only about 570 men of all those in the compound were able to move. They were shoved into boxcars, 115 men in each, and the doors locked shut. There were only narrow slits at each end for ventilation and the heat was like an oven. All stood up, jammed too close to sit or lie down. Most of the men suffered from dysentery and as the heat rose, some fell, and died, in the filth on the floor. In mid-afternoon the train stopped and the survivors dismounted. They were marched to a bare plot of ground where they sat for two more hours of sun treatment. There was no food and no water on the 6th day. After the sun treatment they marched another 7 miles to the North. On this last stretch the people

had put a few cans of water beside the road for them. Most of these were kicked over by the guards as they found them. As evening fell, they reached a large prison camp and entered the gate. Most of them never came out again.

When, where and why did this happen to American men?

The time was April 10 to 16, 1942. The March was from Mariveles, Bataan, P.I. to O'Donnell prison camp some 130 miles to the north in Tarlac Province. The reason that it happened exists again in our nation today. We were complacent and unprepared. We had failed to keep our country strong and ready and we had failed to recognize the clear dangers of our times. Dupes and fools among us told us we could "negotiate" peace with enemies who hated us. In 1939 and 1940 there were Americans marching, meeting, shouting and posturing in the uniforms and trappings of a foreign ideology, proclaiming their treasonous loyalty to an alien and totalitarian philosophy. We were all saying "it can't happen here."

Could it happen now? Why not? Why were Americans in the Philippines in 1942? We were fighting there to protect other people's freedom as we may have to fight someday to protect our own. If it should happen here, who will come here to fight for us?

Those who fail to heed the bitter lessons of history, gentlemen, are doomed to repeat them. The nature of war today brings Pearl Harbor to Washington, Kansas City, Dallas, and Baton Rouge. If the freedom we have is worth so little to us that we are unwilling to fight to protect it, we deserve to lose it, and God in his infinite wisdom and justice will see to it that we do lose it. Who among us should we send on the next death March? your son?

Thank you for your kind attention.

MESSAGE BY PRESIDENT THIEU

(NOTE.—Following is the full text of President Nguyen Van Thieu's message to the Vietnamese people, soldiers and cadres on the operations carried out by the ARVN on Laotian territory on February 8, 1971.)

MY FELLOW COUNTRYMEN, SOLDIERS AND CADRES: Today, February 8, 1971, I have ordered the Armed Forces of the Republic of Viet-Nam to attack the Communist North Vietnamese bases on the Laotian territory along the Viet-Nam-Laos border, in military Region I. This operation is called Operation LamSon 719. This is an operation limited in time and in space, with the clear and unique objective of disrupting the supply and infiltration network of the Communist North Viet Nameese in Laos, which territory has for many years been occupied by the North Vietnamese Communists and used as a base to launch attacks against our country.

Today, I solemnly confirm that the Republic of Viet-Nam always respects the independence, neutrality and sovereignty of the Kingdom of Laos. I also solemnly confirm that the Republic of Viet-Nam does not entertain any territorial ambitions whatsoever concerning the territorial integrity of Laos, nor do we ever seek to interfere in the internal politics of the Kingdom of Laos. I also pledge that when the above-mentioned limited operation ends, the Armed Forces of the Republic of Viet-Nam will completely withdraw from the Laotian territory.

My fellow countrymen, soldiers and cadres, it is a well-known fact throughout the world now that for many years, the North Vietnamese Communists themselves have openly violated the neutrality and territory of the Kingdom of Laos and blatantly violated the 1962 arrangements on Laos, just as they have blatantly violated the 1954 Geneva Agreements on Indochina in order to wage a war of aggression against the Republic of Viet-Nam.

It is also known throughout the world that the Communist North Vietnamese have openly occupied one important part of the Laotian territory, they have built the Ho Chi Minh Trail there in order to move in the South countless soldiers, weapons, ammunition and military materiel, and they have established in that part of the Laotian territory vast military and logistic bases in order to wage the war of aggression against the Republic of Viet-Nam. If this situation is allowed to continue, the North Vietnamese Communists will stubbornly go in with their war of aggression against the Republic of Viet-Nam, Laos and the Khmer Republic.

In the particular case of the Republic of Viet-Nam, we have shown maximum goodwill at the Paris talks in view of a negotiated settlement, in order to solve this war through serious negotiations. The Allied nations have also withdrawn a great part of their troops and are continuing to withdraw from the Republic of Viet-Nam. In the case of North Viet-Nam, on the contrary, they still continue to infiltrate troops, weapons, ammunition and military equipment while preparing themselves to launch fresh attacks in the forthcoming months. For this reason, the attacks by our armed forces against the North Vietnamese Communist troops along the border within Laotian territory do not constitute an act of belligerence on our part, they are merely and solely a necessary act of legitimate self-defense on the part of the Republic of Viet-Nam against the North Vietnamese Communist aggressors.

This is not an act of aggression of the Republic of Viet-Nam against the friendly nation of Laos. On the contrary, this is an action designed to stop the North Vietnamese Communists from expanding and perpetuating their aggressive potential.

Finally, this is not an expansion of the war by the Republic of Viet-Nam, either. On the contrary, it is an action taken to help end soon the war in Viet-Nam and restore peace in this part of the world.

COMMENTARY ON THE SIXTH ANNIVERSARY OF AMERICA'S MASSIVE INTERVENTION IN VIETNAM

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1971

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, as public opinion has steadily swung against the Vietnam war, most of us in the Congress find it rather easy to denounce the decision to escalate as a tragic mistake. The following article from the New York Times recalls for us some of the harsh realities surrounding that decision. For those of us who now point out so casually the dimensions of the mistake, the article reminds us of the complexity of events and causes us to wonder about the course of events in Asia had the "mistake" not been made.

I include the article as follows:

WHY WE ESCALATED

(By Arnold C. Brackman)

Tomorrow marks the sixth anniversary of America's massive intervention in Vietnam, a decision which was signalled by the bombing of the North, a decision which ultimately cost Lyndon Johnson a second term and shattered his dream of creating a Great Society.

Today that decision is almost universally

characterized as a "mistake." If Vietnam alone was at issue, it would be hard to fault the popular assessment. But the stake six years ago was more than Vietnam. Indeed, one of the extraordinary features of the Vietnam war is that despite the continuing and deepening debate about Vietnam most Americans have either forgotten or, worse, are unaware of the compelling circumstances which prompted Mr. Johnson's decision.

Many aspects of the Vietnam war may be faulted—and devastatingly so—from political strategy to military tactics. But it is a misleading oversimplification to write off the decision to intervene when we did as simply a "mistake."

There are, at a minimum, 42,000 reasons why we should not disregard the sequences of events in the 100-odd days preceding Mr. Johnson's fateful decision. A replay, however delayed, is the order of the day on the eve of what, for all practical purposes, marks the anniversary of the massive American intervention in Vietnam.

In October and November the military situation in the South was desperate. District capitals and villages were falling. For the first time since the creation of the South Vietnamese National Liberation Front in 1960, Hanoi introduced its first regular Army units into the South.

Against their will, Laos and Cambodia were being turned into North Vietnamese supply corridors. Indonesia's Sukarno conferred with the Peking leadership and his aides confirmed that the rapidly developing

alliance between Jakarta and Peking was aimed at a division of Southeast Asia into respective spheres of control. Sukarno quickened the pace of his armed forays against the Malay peninsula Singapore and the northern Bornean states.

Britain assembled 80 warships off Singapore, perhaps the last major naval concentration of the Royal Navy and, together with Australia and New Zealand, rushed to the defense of the Islamic Federation of Malaysia. Australian and Indonesian warships clashed off Singapore, the largest port in the Commonwealth after London.

Indonesia bolted from the United Nations and worked with China to lay the groundwork for a rival organization. At a New Year's day diplomatic reception in Peking, Field Marshal Ch'en Yi, the Chinese Foreign Minister, boasted, "Thailand is next." In January China and Indonesia concluded a pact which both later called the "Jakarta-Pnompenh-Hanoi-Peking-Pyongyang Axis." Each of the "Axis" powers except Cambodia was outside the United Nations. Sukarno, in a candid moment, said the "Axis" strategy for defeating the United States and its Asian-Pacific allies was for China to strike a blow against the Americans in Vietnam from the north while Indonesia struck Malaysia and Singapore from the south.

LOGIC OF HISTORY DEMANDED AMERICAN BOMBING IN 1965

Dr. Ismail bin Abdul Rahman, then Malaysia's Home Minister, publicly felt that "if the nutcracker with one prong stretching

southward from Hanoi and the other northward from Jakarta [succeeded], it would have been difficult for Malaysia, Thailand and Singapore to preserve their independence."

President Diosado Macapagal of the Philippines warned that if the United States abandoned Vietnam at that time, "how much more impatient would Sukarno's Indonesia be to bring the Philippine archipelago into its orbit." His Australian counterpart, Prime Minister Sir Robert Menzies, openly held that if Vietnam were abandoned at the outset of 1965 "in the long run, and not so very long at that" Australia would be menaced "almost at our doors."

As Clark Clifford, the former Defense Secretary and critic on Vietnam later observed, American indifference toward Vietnam in 1965 may have had a "disastrous" impact on the region.

Clearly, if the United States had not intervened when it did, the Commonwealth position to the south would have become untenable. A consolidation of the "Axis" would have confronted the United States and its allies with a line of hostile, militant and authoritarian states from Korea to New Guinea.

If the United States went to war to forestall control of the Korean-New Guinea perimeter by hostile forces twenty-five years before, then the logic of history demanded the same in 1965. If this strategic perspective is faulty, then the United States intervention in 1965 was, indeed, a "mistake"—and so was the war with Japan.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Wednesday, February 10, 1971

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

The Lord shall preserve thy going out and thy coming in from this time forth and even forevermore.—Psalm 121: 88.

O God and Father of us all as we leave for our recess keep us aware of Thy presence wherever we go or wherever we stay. May our steps be ordered by Thee in all wisdom and in all good will. Grant that the work we do, the trips we take and the speeches we make honoring the Father of our Country and the savior of our Nation may add to the unity of our Republic and to peace in our world.

During these days be unto us and unto our people a tower of strength. Let Thy power support us, Thy mercy keep us, Thy grace guide us and Thy love redeem us. So may we live with faith and hope for the good of our land and the glory of Thy holy name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Without objection, the Journal stands approved.

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 135. Concurrent resolution providing for an adjournment of the House from the close of business on Wednesday, February 10, 1971, until noon on Wednesday, February 17, 1971.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S.J. Res. 31. Joint resolution extending the date for transmission to the Congress of the Report of the Joint Economic Committee.

The message also announced that the Vice President, pursuant to Public Law 754, 81st Congress, appointed Mr. Larry A. Herrmann to the Federal Records Council.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 601, title 6, Public Law 250, 77th Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the Committee To Investigate Nonesential Federal Expenditures the following members of the Committee on Ways and Means: Mr. MILLS, of Arkansas; Mr. WATTS, of Kentucky; and Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin.

And the following members of the Committee on Appropriations: Mr. MAHON, of Texas; Mr. WHITTEN, of Mississippi; and Mr. Bow, of Ohio.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF BOARD OF VISITORS TO THE U.S. AIR FORCE ACADEMY

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of 10 U.S.C. 9355(a), the Chair

appoints as members of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Air Force Academy the following members on the part of the House: Mr. FLYNT, of Georgia; Mr. SIKES, of Florida; Mr. RHODES, of Arizona; and Mr. BROTZMAN, of Colorado.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF BOARD OF VISITORS TO THE U.S. COAST GUARD ACADEMY

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of 14 U.S.C. 194(a), the Chair appoints as members of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Coast Guard Academy the following members on the part of the House: Mr. MONAGAN, of Connecticut; and Mr. STEELE, of Connecticut.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF BOARD OF VISITORS TO THE U.S. MERCHANT MARINE ACADEMY

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of 46 U.S.C. 1126c, the Chair appoints as members of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy the following members on the part of the House: Mr. WOLFF, of New York, and Mr. WYDLER, of New York.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF BOARD OF VISITORS TO THE U.S. MILITARY ACADEMY

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of 10 U.S.C. 4355(a), the Chair appoints as members of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Military Academy the following members on the part of the House: Mr. TEAGUE of Texas; Mr. NATCHER, of Kentucky; Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin; and Mr. PIRNIE, of New York.