

Uberuaga, David A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Umdenstock, James R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Vachula, Mark S., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Valdez, Stephen M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Valentine, Richardo L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Vander, Laan John C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Vaughan, David C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Vines, John R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Vivaldelli, James, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Vivatson, Robert D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Voreis, Robert D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Vrazel, Gary J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wade, Raymond F., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wade, William M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wagner, Frank H., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Walker, Doak H., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Walker, Richard L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wallen, Louis, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wallenbrock, Gleyon F., III, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Ward, William E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wardrop, William J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Warwick, Gerald T., III, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wasnik, Michael A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Watson, Charles V., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Webber, George A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Weeks, Bruce D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Welander, Steven M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Welch, John O., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Welles, John S., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Welter, Richard F., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wentreck, Roy C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Whately, Thomas L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wermert, James F., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wheat, Ronald G., xxx-xx-xxxx

Wheatley, David U., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Whitaker, Daniel S., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Whitlock, James M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wilczynski, John M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wilderman, David J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wilkes, Robert W., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wilkinson, William C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Williamson, Gary N., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Willenbacher, John R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Williams, Emmett F., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Williams, James A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Willis, James H., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wilson, Delmer, Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wilson, Jerre W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wilson, Vernon C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wimbish, Calvin B., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Winkelman, Colin K., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Winslow, Richard L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wockenfuss, Clark H., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wozny, Alexander B. H., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wonson, George H., III, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Woo, Thomas N., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Woods, John B., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Woodward, Robert L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wozny, Stephen L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wright, Christopher G., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wright, Robert L., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Yatsko, Larry W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Youmans, Robert D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Young, Alan R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Young, Drew M., II, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Youngblood, Richard A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Yurchak, Andrew, Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Zuelke, Gordon S., XXXX

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 10 (legislative day of January 26), 1971:

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
 The following-named persons to be Assistant Administrators of the Environmental Protection Agency:
 Thomas Edmund Carroll, of Maryland.
 John R. Quarles, Jr., of Virginia.
 Stanley M. Greenfield, of California.
 Donald Mac Murphy Mosiman, of Indiana.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE
 George Bush, of Texas, to be the representative of the United States of America to the United Nations with the rank and status of Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary, and the representative of the United States of America in the Security Council of the United Nations.

Kenneth Franzheim II, of Texas, now Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to New Zealand, to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Western Samoa.

SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION
 Thomas S. Kleppe, of North Dakota, to be Administrator of the Small Business Administration.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

WHY SPACE?

HON. LOWELL P. WEICKER, JR.

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 10, 1971

Mr. WEICKER. Mr. President, last Friday I had the honor of addressing the U.S. Savings Bonds Luncheon at the Hotel Sonesta in Hartford, Conn. Since Alan Shepard and Edgar Mitchell were walking on the surface of the moon at the time I spoke, I thought it particularly appropriate that I should discuss the accomplishments and future perspectives of the space program. Because of the interest the program holds for all Senators, I ask unanimous consent that the text of my speech be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

SPEECH BY HON. LOWELL P. WEICKER, JR.

Since Alan Shepard and Ed Mitchell landed on the moon this morning and began walking on the dusty surface of our nearest celestial neighbor about 4 hours ago, it is hard to believe that the entire concept of the Space Program is under severe attack across the country.

Yet while these brave men walk on the moon, certain people who substitute cliches and noise for thought and far sightedness continue to undermine them. They question the expense, the aims and the results of space exploration; and, incredible as it may seem at this moment, and despite having all the arguments of logic against them, these doubters have succeeded in having the program cut back drastically.

The few minutes I spend today will be the first round of this Senator's counter attack in support of our space exploration program. First of all, I want to make it clear that I would never claim we should go

on with a "damn the expense, full speed ahead" attitude. As with everything else, we must continue our exploration in an orderly manner, gaining maximum knowledge and effectiveness from our efforts. But it is in the very basic nature of man to explore, to be adventurous, to challenge the unknown, and when this urge is stifled, man himself dies a little. As Alfred North Whitehead said, "The vitality of thought is in adventure. Ideas won't keep. Something must be done about them. When the idea is new, its custodians have fervor, live for it, and, if need be, die for it."

This country was born, and raised to maturity on the strength of hopes and dreams, on the urge to explore and expand man's horizons. We opened the frontier; we found new ways to produce food, to cure disease, to house and cloth our people. We are great because we are a nation of explorers and problem solvers. Space is the new frontier, the new challenge, and if we deny ourselves the opportunity to explore it, we may deny our own heritage at the same time.

Between moon shots, the average American tends to lose interest in the space program. But, like today, when American men are out there 250,000 miles from earth, our hearts beat faster, our chests expand with pride—and perhaps a little envy—and suddenly all our worldly problems seem smaller and more surmountable. At moments like this, we are all uplifted a bit; we are all up there on the moon. We are all vicariously fulfilling the need to explore and thus living up to our heritage. We are at our best at times like this.

More and more, as I observe the workings of our society—from the individual family up through the many institutions of industry and education to our governments small and large—I am struck by the truth of the old saw: strategy is left to the lieutenant colonels—because the generals are so enamored of tactics. In this age of Aquarius, this age of a "greening America," we see more and more emphasis on instant gratification of immediate desires, on shrugging off responsibilities with the feeling that "someone else" will take up the burden, on trying

to settle vital and complex issues with two-dimensional slogans that rapidly degenerate into cliches.

We have become used to our apparent national wealth and power, without questioning its basis, or understanding whence it came, or recognizing its fragility; we therefore grow individually lazier and greedier. We are surfeited by the magnitude of our accomplishments, taking extraordinary events as commonplace and refusing to delve deeply into their meaning or implication. We don't like to face the fact that the modern world—and life within it—is extremely complicated and will—must—grow more so. We don't like to think strategically, which implies adequate consideration of our alternate futures, usually at some expense to our present.

I want to talk today about just that: about national strategy, and, more specifically, about national strategies in space exploration and exploitation.

Space has come to mean many things to us Americans, some good and some not.

Unfortunately, many people fail to realize that the direct benefits of the program to all of us are literally endless:

Photographs from space can pinpoint sources of air and water pollution precisely in minutes instead of months—

The T.V. cameras developed for Apollo are being used to monitor complicated industrial processes.

Sensors used to record the bodily functions of our Astronauts are now used in the Intensive Care units of hospitals—

Moon dust has been proven to make plants grow faster in ordinary soil and the artificial reproduction of its chemical properties may provide a revolutionary new fertilizer.

Perhaps the nation's space program has been too successful—and too anonymous—to warrant the attention that our more visible failures seem to attract. We have had routine operational satellite services in communications and meteorology since 1965 and in navigation since 1968; we have been monitoring the sun's activity from space since 1962; we have been doing precise satellite geodesy since 1965; we have been in-

vestigating the stars and the space between them since the inception of the space age.

We are, today, at this moment, further exploring the moon. For the third time, two Americans have landed on a new part of our neighbor 250,000 miles away.

Today, the U.S. is "operational" in space, both with men and machines, depending on the task to be done.

But now we hear the clamor on every side: it ranges from the cries for immediate termination of all space activities—to allow the money to be spent "on earth"—to the urging that we reorient the efforts of our space institution toward the problems of the cities. It ranges from the false sophistication of believing all space exploration can be by machine to the emotional concern that all technological progress is dangerous.

There are many different viewpoints expressed across the negative side of the spectrum—and, I believe, most of these voices are ill-informed.

Every family, every business, every government understands that a dual responsibility lies upon them: to provide for daily life, current operations, immediate needs—that is where most of the gross national product, most of the tax revenue goes. But every element of our society also recognizes the concept of investment, of building for the future, of maintaining a competitive edge, of creating a national estate for the generations to come.

You remember the parable of the talents; you will recall that the "worst case" was the servant who buried his talent and returned it without increase. Compare that to the situation we are beginning to face in space today. We made an investment during the 1960's in people, in facilities, in technology—in short, an investment in the dynamics of real national power. We have drawn down that account. We have not replenished it. We are, in essence, spending our last talent, not even burying it. And when the account is used up, we become a second-rate power. Not just the number two superpower; really a second-rate nation.

Because we will have ignored the facts of life, the continuing progress in the world beyond our own shores, we will have permitted that most subtle of destructive forces—erosion of the will—to lead us to dismantle one of the few successful productive institutions we have created.

What are some of the measures of success and productivity? The relentless push for technological progress manifested in our space activities has stimulated hundreds of industries:

And what is a better measure of success than human lives saved? In Hurricane Camille alone, it is estimated that 50,000 people would have died if satellite early warning and storm tracking had not permitted the timely evacuation of 70,000 persons.

There is another, more subtle measure of success: do any of us remember how we felt when Sputnik I showed us in unmistakable terms that the Soviet Union was a real technological competitor? And how we felt when Gagarin's earth orbital flight underlined their technological lead? I wonder how we would feel today—and how we would be looked upon by the world at large—if it were the fifth and sixth cosmonauts who were looking at the Moon's Fra Mauro hills and it was the U.S. that had to be content with a small robot tractor. In truth, our space investment has been in ourselves, in our political system, in our own sense of purpose.

But it is wrong—dangerously wrong—to look upon the U.S. space program as a race with the Russians. A race, after all, has an agreed-upon course and a predetermined finish line; the winner can stop running. When Soviet and American national interests are so structured that a small loss for one can be interpreted as a great victory for the

other, there is no race—and there is no resting. Remember that the Soviet Union has been progressively increasing its annual R&D aerospace investment for fifteen years; their total research and development effort equals or exceeds ours today—and represents twice as large a percentage of their gross national product. Their goal is clearly to reach—and maintain—a position of scientific and technological preeminence in the world.

If we are not careful, we will help them achieve their goal. Our technology lead is shrinking simply because we are not being farsighted enough to make and follow through on sound investment decisions.

As I said, I do not advocate crash programs—or even large programs *per se*. I do advocate programs in our own best interests, programs that develop the power of the future and pay off with scientific and technological values in the interim. We cannot afford to be trapped into expensive reactions to the success of others. We have, now, a capability in existence—trained manpower in our laboratories and industrial plants—upon which we can build sensibly and substantially—if we do not dismantle it first.

Already you can see the reduction in space activities that the budgetary decline from 1965 has caused: stretchout and gaps and slowdowns are already built into the program. It takes five to seven years to mount and execute a major space mission; and if you don't start one, you certainly never complete it. After 1973 there is a long, now unavoidable gap of many years before United States manned space flights can resume; we have let the economic and technological pipeline run dry. It is hard to believe that the competition will be unaware of this, or unwilling to take advantage of it. I am certain it suits their purpose to decry our lunar accomplishments, to urge a turn-down in our rate of progress; it is good strategic thinking to take advantage of the opposition's deceleration to accelerate into the lead yourself.

The Soviets are not "nine feet tall", but neither are we. The Soviets, however, are growing, and we are not. I fully expect them to have one or more manned space stations in orbit within the next few years; with their closed society, it would be some time before we discovered just what threat was posed to our way of life by the technical capabilities that such missions would demonstrate.

This does not mean we should move pell-mell into the development of our own space station, just to be first; it does mean, however, that we must keep open the realm of space to all men and not permit it to become the inland lake of a single great power whose interests are not ours.

The U.S. program, diminished as it has been, still holds the elements that can keep space open to us. An experimental space station, Skylab, will be in orbit during 1973. Here we will learn two critically important things: *first*, how man interacts with his equipment to improve its performance and to make use of man's unique judgmental and manipulative skills; and *second*, how man reacts to the environment of space over the long haul. In Skylab, the crew are both experimenters and operators in their own right as well as being, themselves, the subjects of experiments and investigations on man. Only with this kind of information under our belts can we confidently determine the proper mix of man and machine in future space activities.

The other post-Apollo program we must have to hold open the door of the future goes by the prosaic name of "space shuttle". This concept represents a major step forward in technological and economic maturity: a piloted aircraft that can reach space, stay there to place or recover payloads in orbit, and let the crew carry out research or operational tasks, and then return to earth under its own power. After refueling and refurbishment, it is ready for another mission.

Once in being, we can stop throwing away our launch vehicles, each of which represents thousands of thousands of hours of skilled labor and engineering, and millions of dollars. We can reuse our payloads. We can have the same flexibility of travel in space as the airplane has provided us near the surface.

Without it, of course, the economics of space exploration do not change, and the politics of technological progress are against us.

Unless we recognize—and act upon—the premise that substantive progress requires continuing investments, we will replay the story of the grasshopper and the ant; I, for one, do not relish the prospect of the long winter of discontent that would follow an imprudent policy of letting our aerospace capability erode.

The President said in his State of the Union Message two weeks ago that the United States is in the midst of a profound revolutionary change. Our concepts and methods in the areas of housing, transportation, health care, conservation, pollution control, nutrition and communications must change, must advance to meet the challenge of the decades ahead. The advances of the past hundred years have, to a great degree, come from science, and we must focus the huge scientific resources of the space program on our earthly programs of today. Of course, it is easy to ask why not spend the money going to NASA directly on our problems here on earth. The answer goes back to my original point: As human beings, and as Americans specifically, we are best at solving problems when they are bigger than life. The higher we aim, the more we accomplish. If we aim at space, we solve our problems on earth; but if we restrict ourselves and aim simply at making a better mouse trap—a somewhat less than edifying task—we may end up with nothing.

T. S. Elliot said: "We shall not cease from exploration and the end of all our exploring will be to arrive where we started and know the place for the first time."

This, I think, is the real aim of the space program; to go above and beyond ourselves so that we will be able to better see and know ourselves. I hope that when our hearts jump a bit at the realization that Shepard and Mitchell are walking on the moon at this very moment, we will see the broader significance of what they are doing, and that we will realize the full spiritual and technical value of the space program for all of us.

FUTURE OF THE AMERICAN FARMER

HON. JAMES ABOUREZK

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1971

Mr. ABOUREZK. Mr. Speaker, when one speaks of revolution today, images of campus unrest, underground bomb factories and the like immediately spring to mind. But last November, we saw another kind of revolution—revolution at the ballot box by the American farmer. In district after district, in many cases in larger numbers than ever before, the farmers came to the polls to register their dissatisfaction. This was protest in the accepted American tradition, and protest to which we must listen.

In order to understand this protest and to provide a program that will meet its demands, we must look to the cause. That cause is found in dissatisfaction with the farm legislation of 1970. While

this legislation is now the law of the land, such clear unrest among those most directly affected suggests that we should look to revising and amending that law.

In looking to the future of agriculture and what might be done, I would recommend for your reading an article by the junior Senator from South Dakota. This article appeared in the Aberdeen American-News, one of the outstanding newspapers of our State:

McGOVERN LOOKS AT FARM PROBLEMS,
ANSWERS IN 1971

(By Senator GEORGE McGOVERN)

In order fully to understand the future of agriculture for the 1970's we must be aware of what transpired last year.

The Agricultural Act of 1965 expired at the end of calendar year 1970. Early in 1969 we formed a group of farm organizations and commodity groups to work out the details of a new farm program. Eventually, there were over 30 of these concerned agri-business associations involved in this common purpose. The result of this effort was the introduction of the Coalition Farm Bill.

Despite the nearly unanimous support of agricultural interests, we were unable to enact the bill, chiefly due to the opposition of urban interests and the administration.

We will now have to work within the framework of a bill which, for the first time since its inception, marks a clear retreat from the time-tested parity concept. I don't feel this is a good bill. Some 35 senators joined me in an effort to send it back to conference for improvements. But it is the law on the books now.

Although the outlook is not promising without administration support, a number of us are making plans to introduce corrective amendments in the 92nd Congress, to reestablish the parity goal and resume progress toward it. All of us know that better farm returns are the best possible remedy for the economic ills of rural America.

At the same time, farmers and rural residents have cause for keen interest in the discussion of national priorities going on now throughout the country.

The problems of the cities cannot be divorced from those of rural areas. Much of the migration of rural people to metropolitan centers has been caused by the lack of an enlightened farm program and the deterioration of employment opportunities in rural states, and that trend is damaging at both ends.

It was amplified during the depression of the 1930's. We saw the disruption of family life during World War II when millions of our rural youth went into service and, eventually, made their homes elsewhere. The result has been an older farm population with few incentives for the young folks to take over.

The problem has been variously defined, but basically it is based on an insufficiency of farm income as compared with the individual capital investment and labor required to keep a farm operational. There is no other economic group in America that receives so little return for what they do.

What can we in South Dakota and the upper great plains do to meet this problem.

As consumers continue to demand more specialized and sophisticated packaging and processing of the food and fiber produced by American agriculture, an increased share of the food dollar will continue to flow to the processor, rather than the producer.

Those of us in rural areas must capitalize on this trend by developing more of the marketing procedures for the products we produce. There is no reason why we cannot capitalize on the potential for fully preparing the abundance of our land for market. This will require considerable expansion of our present capabilities together with the de-

velopment of the new techniques that are in demand by American consumers.

New or additional land uses must constantly be considered, not only in terms of ways to increase the income of farmers, but also for the purpose of making rural communities better ones in which to live.

Local participation and cooperation can often succeed in developing recreational areas, artificial lakes and reservoirs or the better utilization of a national body of water, parks game preserves and many other public and private developments that use land for other than food production.

It should be kept in mind that the aggregate effect of expanding output of many farm products is to reduce product prices and total income from such products. Thus, new noncrop uses for land can, on balance, help farmers, at least until such time as public policy catches up with the need for the volume of food production of which we are capable.

Farms will continue to increase in size, they will basically continue to be family farms, although we will also see a continuing tendency toward specialized large scale enterprises along certain lines such as specialized hog feeding operations, large feed yards for beef cattle, egg producing facilities, etc.

We can expect to see a continued flow of new technologies into farming. There is available in our agricultural research stations enough new knowledge to feed the present rate of technological advance for 15 years or more. These things include improved grasses and grass production practices, improved wheat varieties, water management practices to reduce losses and to increase utilization by plants, improved feeding practices and improved strains of livestock.

Another development will be the continuing improvement of farm management. We can expect to see electronic farm accounting become common as well as the use of electronic farm budgeting.

They make it almost impossible for young people to start without family backing unless we innovate further with respect to farm finance. We might have a greater coordination between local credit agencies who are willing to "place their chips" on a limited number of well-qualified young men without requiring much security other than the managerial potential of the boys themselves.

We may also see more two-man or multi-family farming operations. The livestock share-lease is used in this way presently, as is the grazing association concept. Lending agencies will probably tend more and more to lend to farmers on a specialized basis, employing farm management specialists as loan supervisors, and their loans will be set up on longer term, revolving capital basis.

Transportation technology has revolutionized the concept of the farm community. As a result the largest towns will continue to grow and will absorb certain of the economic activities given up by small towns as farmers shift their orientation and their trade.

We can look for improvements in rural housing and improved rural services—roads schools, telephones and power.

We can anticipate an increased demand for all forms of recreation—public golf courses, tennis courts, parks, picnic areas, hunting, fishing and boating. People will lose patience with inadequate medical and hospital facilities and will participate in more planning and action to consolidate redundant services and expand needed ones.

It will not be surprising to see pressure towards consolidation of county governments and similar adjustments in township and other local government units.

There is no fundamental reason why the plains area cannot be as viable economically and as satisfying socially as any other area. Whether it is or not depends on the balance

between resources and people, the state of the arts, the institutional arrangements that bind people together, and the willingness of our citizens to influence our future course. My basic feeling is one of optimism; if we accept the challenge to take a positive hand in controlling our destiny.

MODERN MIRACLE MEDICINES

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 10, 1971

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, the Washington Post of January 31 contains an article entitled "Digest Beats the Drum for God's Medicine," written by the distinguished reporter Mr. Morton Mintz. The article deals with the over-enthusiasm of the Reader's Digest in writing about the discovery and promise of new drugs. The conclusion to be drawn from this timely article is that a healthy skepticism is needed in dealing with modern miracle medicines. This point of view was recently reinforced by responsible Government officials.

On January 18, 1971, FDA Commissioner Dr. Charles Edwards told the Senate Small Business Committee's Monopoly Subcommittee, presided over by the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. NELSON), that—

No one would question that the discovery and development of new drugs and new antibiotics over the past three decades have contributed enormously to the eradication and control of disease and to the relief of patient suffering.

However, over this same period of time, drug misuse has become a national problem. I speak not just of drug abuse in the conventional sense, but of the promotion, prescribing, and use of drugs of limited or no value, and equally important the consumption of too many drugs, often for no purpose or for the wrong purposes. Few things are more tragic than the prescribing and administration of a drug of no proven effectiveness followed by a serious or even fatal reaction.

In a speech delivered on September 10, 1970, Dr. Henry Simmons, Director of the FDA's Bureau of Drugs stated that—

The American people are being dosed with approximately two billion prescriptions per year. This excludes the use of over-the-counter drugs which, as you know, is even greater. It is common knowledge that much drug therapy avails little or nothing in terms of patient benefit and that a large number of these prescriptions have been for ineffective or only partially effective drugs. In fact, Americans spend nearly a half billion dollars a year for prescription drugs for which there is at present no valid proof of efficacy.

Mr. Mintz is to be commended for his perceptive and timely article. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Extension of Remarks.

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

DIGEST BEATS THE DRUM FOR "GOD'S MEDICINE"

(By Morton Mintz)

The Reader's Digest, conservative in its approach to manners, mores, labor unions, government and politics, is frequently radi-

cal in its approach to medicines: If they're new, they're better.

But although the magazine contains some admirable and responsible medical reporting, the files of the Digest itself sometimes argue that its enthusiasm over modern drugs is, to say the least, overdone.

Like other advocates of radical ideas, the Digest often gets carried away, which can be of consequence, since its immense circulation (17.7 million in the United States and another 11 million abroad) gives it the potential to carry a lot of people along with it.

Three years ago, the Digest got carried away by the Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association and an advertising agency, which together had worked out a plan to offset the adverse publicity from some Senate hearings by producing a series of quarterly eight-page advertisements for trade-named prescription medicines.

The gimmick—a familiar one in many publications—was to present the ad in the regular editorial format of Digest articles. And somehow the Digest failed to tell its readers the first time around that the eight articles were in fact advertisements.

A close look at the Digest's files shows that over the years even "straight" articles have often bordered on advertising with their promotion of the use of prescription drugs.

"L-Dopa Has Set Me Free," said a headline in the Digest last August. The subheadline, referring to the author, Floyd Miller, said, "He was a guinea pig for a powerful new drug, a drug that can now bring blessed relief to two out of three victims of Parkinson's disease."

For the most part, the piece is a testimonial, complete with a free plug, by name, for the two suppliers, and an observation that one of them offers L-Dopa "without charge to indigent patients of physicians in private practice."

Toward the end, the article does acknowledge that little is known about the toxicity of L-Dopa in long-term use, that it doesn't work for one patient out of three, that side effects are frequent and that these effects sometimes are severe.

But this disclaimer, dropped as it is into the sea of tranquil praise, is not likely—nor was it intended—to reverse the thrust of the proclamation from one victim of Parkinson's disease to his fellow sufferers: a new drug "set me free."

In the normal course of events, the good news about potent new drugs comes first, usually with a lot of hoopla. The bad news usually comes later, usually piecemeal and usually unwanted by physicians and patients who have put their hopes and money into them.

There is at least a possibility that this may be the case with L-Dopa, if a letter from three researchers in the Aug. 31 Journal of the American Medical Association is an indicator.

After studying L-Dopa for 15 months in 60 severely disabled patients, the scientists, who initially had been fairly hopeful, said they had found the benefits to be "of limited duration" and to have been followed "in all cases by adverse effects, the latter often progressive, sometimes serious and occasionally dangerous . . . we therefore have reservations about the release of the drug at this time." (Italics theirs.)

THE "EXPERT" SYNDROME

Regrettably, the Digest's use of credentialed experts as authors often has produced results as questionable as, or more so than, the proclamations of victims.

The most impressive recent case of the Digest commissioning an expert to say news-better was a piece entitled "The Pill in Perspective." The article appeared in the issue of last October—at just about the mo-

ment the Food and Drug Administration was disclosing that two brands were being taken out of production because they had caused an abnormally high number of growths in the breasts of beagles.

The writer of the article, which was mainly an attack on hearings on the Pill held by Sen. Gaylord Nelson (D-Wis.), is a physician who is herself a member of the FDA's advisory committee on contraception. She is Elizabeth B. Connell, an associate professor of obstetrics and gynecology at Columbia University who also directs family planning research and development at its International Institute for the Study of Human Reproduction.

Dr. Connell acknowledged in an interview that she had received research grants from all of the manufacturers of birth control pills. She was unable to recall the amounts but said the net for herself was "very little."

Similarly, Dr. Edward T. Tyler, associate professor of obstetrics and gynecology at the University of California and medical director of the Family Planning Centers of Greater Los Angeles, who coauthored a piece much like Dr. Connell's in the June 30 Look magazine, has been getting grants from all of the manufacturers since 1958.

Neither Dr. Connell nor the Digest, in its biographical note about her, mentioned her connection with the companies. Neither conceded any need to do so. A Digest spokesman said the editors knew the industry had financed her work, but noted that this is true of most contraceptive researchers. He added that the editors were unaware either of the identity of her sponsors or of the content of her studies. The editorial judgment was that disclosure would not have been "especially pertinent," the spokesman added.

The editors of Look said that the failure of the magazine to mention Tyler's industry grants did not violate "any code of ethics." They said that the grants were for research "on virtually all methods of contraception" and that his "qualifications or objectivity" as a "recognized expert" were in no way affected.

PAVLOVIAN REACTION

Sen. Nelson, who held his hearings in January and February to find out if women were being adequately informed of the Pill's known and suspected hazards, said that disclosure by Look and the Digest would have been proper. He also said the Digest and Look had reacted to the hearings as had others in a pro-Pill "establishment . . . automatically, like Pavlov's dog."

Nelson pointed out that it was at these hearings that the FDA said that women were being inadequately informed and announced that it was going to require inclusions of a cautionary message to the user in every package of the drugs.

The Digest and Look attacked the hearings on the principal ground that they panicked women to no purpose and produced no new information.

Nelson faulted the magazines for not having written "the other side . . . a largely untold story that the public is entitled to know" and that fills "three printed volumes" of his Senate Subcommittee on Monopoly.

The Digest, which prints no letters to the editor, said it would be "happy to consider" other articles on the Pill.

Although the Digest did not note it, Dr. Connell was a witness at the hearings, along with Dr. Alan F. Guttmacher, president of the Planned Parenthood-World Federation. In his prepared testimony he was very hostile to the hearings, as were Dr. Tyler in Look and Dr. Connell in her article and prepared testimony. But under questioning by Nelson, Guttmacher conceded that the hearings "served a useful purpose in making the doctor more careful."

In an exchange Dr. Connell had with the senator, she did not dispute two of his key points:

That for a decade the Pill had "an almost unqualified endorsement in the lay press."

That most physicians did not know of views such as that of Dr. Philip Corfman, a top scientist at the National Institutes of Health with key responsibilities for research on contraception: that the Pill "should be monitored and restricted to women who cannot use other methods effectively."

Dr. Connell complained to Nelson that the hearings were marked by "a lack of balance." But Nelson disputed this, saying that several advocates of the Pill were yet to be heard.

Dr. Connell admitted to the reporter that, contrary to what she said in her article, the hearings actually had developed new information—the testimony of a famed cancer surgeon that cancerous breast tissue from users of the Pill differed from that of non-users. The significance of this, if any, has not been established.

Dr. Connell also acknowledged that her article was open to numerous factual challenges. She said in the Digest, for example, that the diaphragm has a failure rate of 15 to 20 per cent. She said in the interview that this rate does not apply to an individual who uses it reliably and properly, but only to "large groups of women."

She said in the magazine that the Pill "has released in many women a sexuality they never before experienced." She acknowledged to the reporter that other women become depressed and have a reduced libido on the drugs.

The article said that "there have been no statistical reports of increase in breast or uterine cancer" in users. Dr. Tyler contradicted this in Look. He cited a widely reported survey of New York women "that indicated more cancers of the cervix occurred in females using the Pill than in those who relied on the diaphragm."

His point—carried under a headline making the unqualified claim that "The Pill Is Safe"—was simply that the survey did not establish a cause-effect relationship.

That is precisely the view held by the FDA and its advisory committee about the Pill and cancer anywhere in the body: the evidence is insufficient either to prove or disprove a cause-effect association.

Dr. Connell did not mention this position. Nor did she point out that the advisory committee, before she joined it, said that studies to determine if there is or is not a cause-effect connection merit urgent federal financing.

One of the Digest's most widely read medical writers, Paul de Kruif, author of "Microbe Hunters," has done some of the most upbeat prose of all, often under a species of headline that is unexcelled in its stylistic perfection—"Taming the Wild Hormones," for example.

In the June, 1946, issue, de Kruif wrote about a painkiller called Demerol (the Digest failed throughout to capitalize the trade name, thus distracting attention from the possibility that profits might be involved for the manufacturer, Sterling Drug).

"A new chemical, demerol, is ready to comfort millions of pain-racked human beings," de Kruif began. "Till now, morphine has been the one weapon against extreme pain, but morphine's mercy is tempered by the danger of drug addiction. Demerol is very nearly as effective as morphine, and among many thousands eased by its magic in hospitals throughout the country, not a single sufferer who had not previously taken opiates has been recorded as becoming addicted to it."

Even if one were to assume that de Kruif had hunted the possibility of addiction down to the last microbe, the headline was a breath-taking affirmation of faith: "God's Own Medicine—1946." The headline was

faithful to de Kruif's scripture. "Demerol need not be disguised," he said. "It is God's own medicine, 1946 model."

But among medicine's handful of agnostics is Dr. Walter Modell, a Cornell University pharmacologist. In 1962—16 years after the de Kruif article—he told the American Association for the Advancement of Science that the claim that meperidine (the generic name for Demerol) was not addictive was based on "shoddy" research, "... yet use of the drug was vigorously promoted. Experience soon proved that meperidine was highly addictive, and that in this respect it certainly had no advantage over morphine."

Mosell added that the Digest and other promoters had made so many converts that "few physicians seem to accept the fact that meperidine is highly addictive."

"The medical profession uses morphine with great respect and, as a result, a very small number of patients become addicted to it as an accident of therapy," he continued.

"But this is not the case with meperidine. As a result, many more victims are admitted to the hospital for addicts at Lexington as a result of meperidine therapy than are admitted because of morphine therapy."

In April, 1968, the Digest got around to making an implicit admission that "God's Own Medicine—1946" had caused one devil of a problem in the preceding 18 years. The medium for the Digest's message was a condensed piece that George A. W. Boehm had written for Today's Health, an American Medical Association magazine for laymen.

"The drugs most effective as painkillers have also been highly addictive," the Digest said in an introduction to the article. Boehm said that with Demerol (now capitalized by the Digest), "addiction did develop... When meperidine was introduced in the United States in 1943, reports of its addictiveness were disregarded." He did not say by whom the reports were disregarded, but went on:

"Many reputable scientists were skeptical about the test procedures then in use, which were not nearly as convincing as today's. Moreover, the Bureau of Narcotics could not exercise control over meperidine because the Harrison Act was limited to natural opiates."

"When a new law was passed in 1944 to include synthetic compounds, meperidine went under narcotics control. But many people, including some doctors and nurses, paid the penalty of becoming addicted."

The Digest's pitch, in the introduction to the article, was for "a promising new drug" which "offers hope that sufferers can have relief without the risk of narcotics."

The medicine was pentazocine, tradenamed Talwin. The manufacturer was, again, Sterling Drug. Boehm said that Talwin "passed the trials for addictiveness" at the Addiction Research Center at Lexington.

In addition, the Committee on Drug Addiction and Narcotics of the National Research Council certified the drug to have a potential for addiction "so low as not to constitute a risk to public health, and not to warrant any degree of narcotics control."

In July, 1967, the Food and Drug Administration, Boehm added, approved Talwin for the analgesic market "after reviewing 15,000 cases, and 45,000 pages of data..."

Sterling's Winthrop Division launched a massive promotional campaign for pentazocine, claiming it to be "the first non-narcotic analgesic in the morphine range of potency." By February 1968, the manufacturer was saying it was "available in 39 countries."

But a descent from the high on Talwin was foreordained, just as it had been on Demerol. On May 16, 1969, the Medical Letter, a nonprofit drug-evaluation newsletter for physicians who seek education from sources other than drug companies and the Reader's Digest, said:

"The earlier belief that pentazocine was

nonaddicting has proved false; advertisements for the drug no longer describe it as 'non-narcotic,' though they do state that it is not subject to narcotic controls."

Winthrop medical director Monroe E. Trout said that the Medical Letter report was "distorted" and grossly inaccurate. He said there had been 34 cases of addiction among five million users—not enough to constitute "many cases of addiction."

But in September, 1969, the FDA took a step toward the Medical Letter position when it required Sterling Drug to send a letter to the medical profession warning that the injectable form of Talwin had been linked to "psychological and physical dependence" in patients with a history of drug abuse.

Since then, Rep. John S. Monagan (D-Conn.) has tried to get the Justice Department to exert tighter controls over Talwin. Last January, for example, he protested to Attorney General John N. Mitchell that the department had failed to include pentazocine on a list of drugs subject to controls despite indications that in some users it has hallucinogenic effects similar to LSD's, producing "a variable euphoria."

Currently, the department's position is that it is "aware that there's a problem," but that despite a continuing study, instances of abuse "have not been scientifically documented."

For what it's worth, the Digest was making this claim last summer in promotional ads headed "Number One Remedy":

"Last year, drug and remedy advertisers invested more than 7½ million dollars in the pages of The Digest. That's nearly more than 3½ million more than Life and Look combined. What's more, The Digest has been the leader since 1962—further proof that a schedule in The Digest is the kind of prescription that works."

But it could be a grave mistake to assume that an appetite for advertising dollars alone, or possibly even significantly, explains the Digest's record in promoting medicines. Surely the Digest turned its back on huge amounts of revenue when it refused cigarette advertising and campaigned against smoking.

The fundamental problem may be one that affects everyone in the media and, indeed, everyone with a responsibility to report to others: Whether to indulge in gimmicks to promote the idea that new developments are by definition better ones, or to maintain a more pedestrian but healthy skepticism.

STATE TRAFFIC SAFETY COUNCIL FIGHTS FOR SAFER HIGHWAYS AND FOR SAFER ROADS

HON. JOHN H. TERRY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 10, 1971

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Speaker, the Finance and Advisory Committee of the State Traffic Safety Council—New York recently held its annual Governor's luncheon at the Union League Club in New York City. The purpose of this annual meeting with the council's honorary chairman, Gov. Nelson A. Rockefeller, was to review the progress of the council's traffic safety programs in New York and to urge the business and industrial leadership of the Empire State to continue its generous support of this important work. The meeting was chaired by C. W. Owens, executive vice president of the American Telephone & Telegraph Co., and council president. The financial report was given by Charles F. Luce, chair-

man of the council's finance and advisory committee. Mr. Luce has since succeeded Mr. Owens as president and Mr. Owens will continue his association with the council as chairman of its executive committee. The principal address, commending the council on its strong and efficacious programs designed to reduce highway accidents and losses, was given by Governor Rockefeller. The Governor also praised the business and industrial leadership of New York for its generous support of the council.

Mr. Speaker, having been closely associated with the State traffic safety council for the past 10 years, I would like to reinforce the generous comments made by Governor Rockefeller relative, not only to the solid pioneering efforts of the council in traffic safety which have set a national example for the rest of the country to follow, but I also would like to pay tribute to its leadership under the inspired direction of Messrs. Owens and Luce. These men, along with the members of the board of directors and the finance and advisory committee, have given generously of their time and of their treasure.

Those who support this work represent some of the largest and most progressive corporations in the United States. They support this work not only as a matter of corporate and civic pride in making our highways in New York among the safest in the Nation, but also because the nature of the pioneering achievements of the council, deserve their support and leadership.

Alone among all the councils in the Nation devoted to safety, New York's Traffic Safety Council has trained upward of 10,000 police and other public officials, in sound business-management techniques applied to traffic control and efficient operations. They have spread the gospel of sound traffic engineering techniques and trained thousands of police and other officials in this vital science. Their legislative recommendations have bolstered and meshed with the Governor's own solid stance in this important area of safety. Their work in driver education has been outstanding. Along with the New York State Department of Motor Vehicles, they have set up an entirely new concept in the use and maintenance of a sound accident records system currently adopted by 95 police agencies in the State. And in this noble crusade to safeguard our families on our highways, they have enlisted the solid support of my State's newspapers, television, and radio stations. Their work in the field of drinking, driving, and drugs has received nationwide attention. The success of their efforts in this field has recently resulted in a 263-percent increase in arrests, on a statewide basis, for drunken driving. These results were documented recently by a study conducted by the council in cooperation with police agencies throughout New York. I not only commend the council but also the police for their stepped-up campaign against such drivers.

Mr. Speaker, with your permission, for these reasons and many others, I would like to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the tribute paid to the council

by Governor Rockefeller and the report made by Mr. C. W. Owens.

In addition I would like to insert the names of those whose presence honored the work of this fine organization for they are deserving of recognition and praise. The guest list was as follows:

GUEST LIST

Leon Avery, Crouse-Hinds Company.
Richard E. Berlin, President, The Hearst Corporation.
Burdell Bixby, Dewey, Ballatine, Bushby, Palmer & Wood.
Arthur H. Brockie, Assistant Treasurer, Allied Chemical.
Lew L. Callaway, Jr., Vice Chairman of the Board, Newsweek, Inc.
Cecil K. Carmichael, Director of Public Relations—New York, Association of American Railroads.
William H. Chafee, Vice President of Public Affairs, American Standard, Incorporated.
S. E. Charlton, Manager, Humble Oil Refining Company.
Rocco F. DePerno, President, New York State Teamsters Local #18.
Bernard Eiting, Minnesota Mining & Manufacturing Company.
William M. Ellinghaus, President, New York Telephone Company.
J. Frank Forster, President, Sperry Rand Corporation.
Thomas J. Fratar, Partner, Tippetts-Abbott-McCarthy-Stratton.
John T. Harrison, Jr., Vice President, Marsh & McLennan, Incorporated.
James Herron, Senior Vice President, Dun & Bradstreet, Incorporated.
Walter E. Hollenbeck, Secretary, Metropolitan Life Insurance Company.
Hobart Lewis, President, Reader's Digest.
William J. Lippincott, President, Lord & Taylor.
Baldwin Maull, Vice Chairman of the Board, Marine Midland Bank, Inc.
James O'Hara, Allstate Insurance Company.
Kenneth W. Richman, Vice President, The Home Insurance Company.
Edward R. Rowley, Chairman of the Board, National Lead Company.
A. C. Seymour, Executive Vice President, Royal Globe Insurance Companies.
Levon Soorikian, Director of Physical Distribution, International Telephone & Telegraph Company.
John A. Spencer, former Regional Vice President, General Electric Company.
Peter A. Spina, Mobil Oil Corporation.
Neil W. Talling, Chrysler Corporation.
Austin J. Tobin, Executive Director, The Port of New York Authority.
Vincent Tofany, Commissioner, Department of Motor Vehicles.
Paul W. H. Trevor, Lord, Abbett and Company.
Huntington M. Turner, President, Turner, Koster & Company, Inc.
Steve C. VanVoorhis, Regional Vice President, General Electric Company.
Leo White, Vice President, Chemical Bank.
David H. Winton, Vice President, Johnson & Higgins.
David L. Yunich, President, R. H. Macy & Company.
John O. Zimmerman, President, General Motors Acceptance Corporation.

EXCERPTS OF REMARKS BY GOVERNOR NELSON A. ROCKEFELLER, PREPARED FOR DELIVERY AT THE NEW YORK STATE TRAFFIC SAFETY COUNCIL GOVERNOR'S LUNCHEON, UNION LEAGUE CLUF, NEW YORK, N.Y., THURSDAY, DECEMBER 17, 1970

Up in Orangetown, Rockland County, the police are using a new system for pinpointing accident trouble spots. Thanks to this system, they've been able to document their need for new radar equipment.

They convinced the Town Board to change the local landscaping ordinance to improve visibility at intersections. And they've convinced the whole County to adopt this simple, inexpensive punch-card system for zeroing on accident trouble spots.

Orangetown is just one of 95 communities in New York that have adopted the system. Many of them have done so thanks to the efforts of this State Traffic Safety Council working with the State Department of Motor Vehicles.

Today, I want to credit two men who have done an outstanding job of helping to direct the activities of the State Traffic Safety Council. The first of these men is, of course, your president—Neil Owens, Executive Vice-President, American Telephone and Telegraph. In spite of his demanding duties as an executive of one of our leading communications companies, Neil has found time to communicate the urgent need for traffic safety. He has been ably supported in this effort by your veteran secretary—Jack Spencer, former Regional Vice-President, General Electric Company. Jack Spencer is another business executive who has helped to make safety progress one of our most important products. We regret Jack's decision to retire from this important post. But he can feel deep satisfaction in having set a high precedent of service for those who will follow him.

I am delighted, therefore, to present these plaques on behalf of the State Traffic Council to Neil Owens and to Jack Spencer for distinguished service in the cause of traffic safety. As your council's honorary chairman, I know that it takes men like these, and all the council members, to make an organization like this work.

I've already mentioned your key role in getting the trouble-spot program adopted. Let me also thank you for your invaluable help in getting the State Police Academy approved. This Academy is the only place in the East today providing communities with courses in traffic management science at no charge.

I compliment you on the "Department of the Year" competition you sponsor. Half the police departments in the State are vying for this safety distinction. And that's a competition whose rewards are measured in human life.

Your efforts were also enormously valuable in getting the drinking driver bill passed which takes effect January 1. Anyone caught driving after that date with a blood alcohol content of 15 hundredths of one per cent or more, will be considered intoxicated and subject to immediate arrest and prosecution. This measure should strike right at the heart of one of the major causes of serious traffic accidents in the Nation today.

I refer, of course, to problem drinkers—including full-bloom alcoholics—who are involved in well over 40 per cent of all fatal highway crashes. National statistics and New York State studies indicate that the real problem lies, not with the 80 to 90 per cent of social drinkers, but rather with the 2 to 5 per cent of drivers who are alcoholics.

We can expect the law to provide our courts and law enforcement agencies with an effective tool for getting these potential killers off the road.

Looking to the future, I'd like to mention two legislative actions the administration will take next year. One involves preventing accidents. The other involves reducing human suffering after accidents happen.

The terrible bus tragedy that took seven young lives in Pennsylvania last summer sharpened our concern over school bus safety. That bus and the driver were licensed in other states, but the lives of children from our State were lost. Fortunately, New York State has an excellent record of school bus safety. But this is an area where the only permissible standard is the highest level of safety we can achieve.

Consequently, I will be submitting legislative recommendations calling for strengthened training and controls over school bus drivers in this State in the next session. I will also recommend again passage of no-fault auto insurance.

The no-fault system can give us a faster, fairer, fuller system for compensating accident victims than the present outdated system of proving fault.

I am grateful to have all of you at my side, thinking, working and doing something about highway mayhem—this chronic plague of modern life. But those with the most reason to be grateful for your work may never know you and you may never know them.

But they are out there: the breadwinner supporting his family; the young woman in the prime of motherhood; the child with a promising future before him, who have been spared crippling injury or had their lives saved—because of the work you are doing.

On behalf of all of them, I thank all of you.

THE PRESIDENT'S REPORT

(By Mr. W. C. Owens)

I would like to welcome you to our 11th annual Governor's Luncheon and meeting of our Finance and Advisory Committee. It is a pleasure to see you here. Your response to our invitation is most encouraging to all of us associated with this important task.

Now, all of you should have before you a copy of our annual report. That report contains all of the information about all the work we have done in New York during the past year. Therefore, if it is agreeable, I would like simply to summarize some highlights for you.

About 11 years ago Governor Rockefeller asked a group of prominent business leaders to activate what has since become known as our State Traffic Safety Council. Traffic Safety at that time was in a state of limbo. Many professionals were concerned about the wreckage on our roads but not too alarmed about what was being done about it. The Federal Government was concerned but not involved. The National Highway Safety Bureau was a dream and some years coming from reality. The Nation as a whole was troubled but for many years was unable to break out of its lethargy in order to cope with the disorder on our roads. The Governor was ahead of his time, and many areas in which we have pioneered, seemed rather removed from our daily concerns. Since that time, many of the things we have done in New York have become national policies and national programs. We still have a long way to go but at least today we know where we are going and what needs to be done. Many of the programs chartered in New York are now being developed at the national level.

Our police training programs, our traffic engineering seminars, our legislative efforts, and our campaign against the drinking driver have all become part of the Federal Government's highway safety standard and requirements.

This year for example we trained approximately 1400 police and other officials in traffic engineering and how to manage a balanced traffic safety program. We conducted 17 workshops which ranged from Watertown to Buffalo and from Albany to Farmingdale. Enroute we held seminars at Syracuse, Rochester, Binghamton and Valhalla. When your accidents run into the hundreds of thousands and your injuries and fatalities into the thousands, you simply cannot attack the problem piece-meal. We instructed these officials how they must work hand-in-glove with other agencies of government at the local, county and state levels. Enforcement cannot be separated from the courts, from prosecution, from engineering or from the Department of Motor Vehicles. It is all part

and parcel of the same process of accident prevention and traffic control.

For this reason some years ago we launched a statewide campaign in cooperation with the Governor's Inter-Departmental Traffic Safety Committee to establish Traffic Safety Boards. These are official boards associated with various levels of government. Currently 41 such boards exist in the State. Some are doing an outstanding job and some are having organizational difficulties. Most suffer from a common ailment, the recruitment of competent professionals skilled in several disciplines; government, management, legislation, education, and enforcement. Nevertheless progress is being made and we are quite encouraged about their future efficacy.

One of the more serious problems we have encountered in New York relates to the study and analysis of just where our accidents are occurring. If the average police agency knows where these accidents are happening within their jurisdictions, then obviously it is in a good position to take countermeasures. You may recall that a few years ago we launched a program to upgrade accident analysis systems on a statewide basis. This was done under the leadership of the Department of Motor Vehicles and with a substantial grant to our Council from that agency. In my report last year I informed you that some 65 police agencies had adopted a new records system to keep abreast of where these accidents were taking place. This year I am happy to report that 93 agencies have adopted what we refer to as the key-sort accident analysis system. This is truly a milestone. New York is one of the few states in the country, if not the only one, which has made so much progress in the adoption of such a unified system on a statewide basis.

While we have literally trained thousands of police in traffic control work in the last decade, we must confess we have neither the staff nor budget to do a more comprehensive job. Nevertheless we have inspired hundreds of departments to send their men to community colleges where they can obtain a more thorough knowledge of their craft. This slack is now being taken up by the New York State Police Academy at Albany which opened its doors in September. You may recall that we played a major role in support of Governor Rockefeller's request for funds to establish this facility. It is the finest in the East and one of the best in the nation. It is now possible, for the first time in the history of this state, for a police officer to obtain a thorough grounding in police traffic sciences, without having to go outside of New York State to obtain it.

One area where we have been very active deserves special mention. That area encompasses the drinking-driving problem. Drinking is involved in at least 50% of all fatalities on the road. We also have reason to suspect that the increasing use of drugs is not only becoming epidemic but also accounting for a disproportionate number of accidents and fatalities. We have conducted intensive training programs dealing with both problems. With regard to the use of drugs, we have neither adequate research nor adequate laws to deal with the situation. And frankly, until we do come with some hard core research, it is going to remain difficult to come up with adequate laws. This is not true of alcohol and the driver. A recent upsurge in the enforcement of the drinking-driving law in New York has been nothing short of phenomenal.

Statewide in 1969 there was a 263% increase in drinking-driving arrests. The State Police alone have increased arrests by 100%. Nassau and Suffolk County arrests have jumped from a low of 400 in 1967 to 3,400 in 1969. The Nassau County conviction rate has been running at 97%! Smaller departments throughout the state have been

equally diligent in their pursuit of these offenders.

While obviously we cannot take full credit for this development, it remains a fact that we have periodically conducted training workshops on this problem. We have constantly urged police to increase their enforcement, and we have constantly urged the use of breathalyzers and other scientific tools to support such arrests and obtain convictions.

We also strongly supported Governor Rockefeller's tougher-antidrink driving bill. Effective January 1, 1971 anyone caught driving with .15% alcohol in his blood, will be considered intoxicated and subject to immediate arrest and prosecution. We don't plan to rest here. There is much that needs to be done including more vigorous enforcement and prosecution. Our police can do a much better job here and we plan to encourage them to do so. But we must remember that the police are only willing to do as good a job as we are willing to support. They are reluctant to arrest these offenders when they know by experience that prosecution will be desultory and the courts lenient. We must and we will implement our efforts in this field.

May I say that none of these achievements would have been possible without your financial support. None of this would have been possible without the complete cooperation of the Governor and his administration. And finally, without the drive and leadership displayed by Chuck Luce and his Committee, we would not have had the funds to carry out all of these projects.

I would like to thank Charles Luce, Chairman of the Board of Con-Ed and our Financial Chairman for all the help he has given us.

THE 19TH ANNUAL NATIONAL PRAYER BREAKFAST

HON. J. CALEB BOGGS

OF DELAWARE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 10, 1971

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. President, the 19th Annual National Prayer Breakfast was held on Tuesday, February 2, at the Washington Hilton Hotel. It was attended by the President of the United States, the Chief Justice of the United States, members of the Cabinet, members of the Judiciary, members of the diplomatic corps, Governors of the various States, and members of the executive and legislative branches of the Government.

Before I enter the proceedings of the Prayer Breakfast in the RECORD, I should like to express a note of deep appreciation on behalf of the Congressional Planning Committee to all those who came from great distances to attend this annual event.

I think of men like the outstanding delegation from the Canadian Government comprised of 12 Members of Parliament: The Honorable William Basil McIvor, Member of Parliament from Northern Ireland; The Honorable Emmanuel Kothris, from Greece. The Honorable Hector Valenzuela Valderrama from the House of Deputies in Chile; our many friends who traveled from Central America especially for the breakfast, and a delegation of men from Italy including several Members of the Italian Parliament.

From Asia: several Members of the Korean National Assembly; Mr. Baey Lian Peck from Singapore; Mr. John K. C. Liu from the Republic of Free China; and the only lady Senator from South Vietnam, Madame Pauline Nguyen Van Tho. Also, Ato Ibo Noumair from Ethiopia, and Mr. Graham Sinclair of New Zealand, World President of Junior Chamber International, heading a delegation of national organization presidents.

It is impossible for me to mention by name all those who came from over 100 nations, but we do want to take this occasion to express our profound appreciation to them.

From within the United States, delegations from every State representing leadership from business and professional life, Government, labor, students, churches, and many other organizations, combined to make up the nearly 3,000 persons in attendance.

In addition, an estimated 200,000 men in military service around the world, participated by means of the Armed Forces Radio Services.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the program and proceedings of the National Prayer Breakfast be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

THE 19TH ANNUAL PRESIDENTIAL PRAYER BREAKFAST, WASHINGTON HILTON HOTEL, FEBRUARY 2, 1971

(Invocation by the Honorable J. D. Hodgson, Secretary of Labor)

May we pray?

Our Gracious Father, on this inspiring occasion, in this illustrious gathering, we would this morning reflect for a moment on the subject of bridges. The bridge is indeed wondrous, both as a structure and as a concept. As a structure, the bridge transcends trouble and shortens distance. It links separated points, spans dangerous chasms, surmounts hazardous currents—all this with serene and purposeful utility.

As a concept the bridge constitutes one of the great hopes and needs of our time. Ours is a world much in need of bridges—bridges of communication, of understanding, of good will, bridges anchored in compassion and buttressed by a fullness of spirit.

How then shall we succeed better in building bridges to span the gaps among nations, groups and men? Here, Our Father, we need the insight and direction that flow from an understanding of Your will. We pray that all men may achieve such understanding.

Particularly, we pray that You inspire and guide our esteemed President, our public officials, the men of our Congress, to enhance their role and skill as builders of bridges among men.

And may we all understand the greatest bridge of all—the bridge between man and the source of strength and spirit he reflects—the bridge to faith and Your guidance. Amen.

Presiding:

THE HONORABLE B. EVERETT JORDAN

Thank you very much, Mr. President, Mr. Speaker, distinguished guests and all gathered in this fellowship of national concern, we greet you warmly and extend to you a special welcome to the 19th Annual National Prayer Breakfast.

This occasion which brings us together is truly unique. People from all backgrounds and many nations, as well as men representing various viewpoints, are actually meeting

together this morning in a fellowship made possible by the spirit of Jesus Christ.

We're honored in having the President of the United States to meet with us. It is also our pleasure, indeed, to greet the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Chief Justice and members of the Court, members of the diplomatic corps, members of the executive branch of Government, more than half of the members of Congress, distinguished leaders in the field of business, labor, education, and in fact, 35 university presidents are here this morning, members of science groups, campus leaders and a host of others who represent a vast cross-section of our national life.

I would like especially to welcome those distinguished citizens who have come from other countries to grace this occasion. It is noteworthy that these friends, along with members of the diplomatic community, represent over 100 countries around the world this morning.

However, the magnitude of this annual event is not confined to the ballroom today. Around the world, soldiers, sailors, marines and airmen are joining the Commander-in-Chief in giving expression to these moral and spiritual values which undergird our national life. Chaplains have arranged similar breakfasts and observances on more than 1,400 bases, installations, on ships at sea, remote sites including all units in Southeast Asia. In these breakfasts, our servicemen will hear pretaped messages from President Nixon, Secretary Laird and members of both the Senate and the House. In addition, the 453 stations of the American Armed Forces radio and television are broadcasting these proceedings live, with the entire program being repeated in eight hours from this time. It is anticipated that 200,000 servicemen are in this way participating with us in this Prayer Breakfast observance.

Historically, the leadership of our nation has ever turned to Almighty God for strength and guidance. In this spirit the nation's Prayer Breakfast was inaugurated by members of Congress especially to seek Divine guidance and strength as well as to reaffirm our faith in the dedication of our nation and ourselves anew to God and to His plan.

This annual event grew out of the inspiration of the prayer breakfast groups which meet weekly in the U.S. Senate and in the House of Representatives. It is a continuing influence nationally and throughout the world in thus publicly recognizing the privileges and responsibilities of a nation under God. In its wake there has developed in every State of the Union Governors' Prayer Breakfasts, most of which are also on an annual basis. More than 1,000 mayors have prayer breakfasts and they hold them annually—a result of literally hundreds of small groups of concerned citizens who meet weekly in the spirit of Christ to foster faith and freedom in this land and around the world.

And so, some form of this idea has spread to 70 countries and to every continent, with similar small weekly groups meeting regularly in 50 nations and in such cities as London, Stockholm, Paris, Madrid, New Delhi, Tokyo, Ottawa, Canberra, Brasilia, San Jose, Addis Ababa, Seoul, Jakarta and other leading cities throughout the world. Some of these nations are also holding National Prayer Breakfasts once a year.

I am delighted to remind you this morning that at home and around the world there is a growing appreciation on the part of many for the value we gain when leadership meets in the spirit of prayer, recognizing that our ultimate hope and trust is in the Lord.

It is now my pleasure to present those at the head table who will not participate in the program. I'm going to ask those distinguished guests to stand as I call their name and remain standing. And I'm also

asking that we withhold our applause until all have been introduced. I'm going to start at the table on my extreme left:

The Honorable Linwood Holton, Governor of Virginia.

Mrs. Holton, wife of the Governor of Virginia.

The Honorable Russell W. Peterson, Governor of Delaware, and his wife, Mrs. Peterson.

Mrs. Washington, wife of the Mayor of Washington.

The Honorable Walter E. Washington, Mayor of the District of Columbia.

The Honorable George W. Romney, Secretary of Housing and Urban Development.

Dr. Richard C. Halverson, Pastor of the Fourth Presbyterian Church, related to the prayer breakfast movement for many, many years.

Mrs. Halverson, wife of Dr. Halverson.

The Honorable Morris H. Stans, Secretary of Commerce.

Dr. Victor Esquivel, Minister of Public Health of El Salvador.

The Honorable Jean-Pierre Coté, Minister from Canada.

His Excellency Herrera, Foreign Minister of Guatemala.

The Honorable John C. Connally, Secretary-designate of the Treasury.

Mrs. Connally, wife of the Secretary-designate.

Now the table to my extreme right:

The Honorable Robert W. Scott, Governor of North Carolina.

Mrs. Scott, wife of the Governor of North Carolina.

Mrs. Carter, wife of the Governor of Georgia.

The Honorable Jimmy Carter, Governor of Georgia.

Mrs. Volpe, wife of the Secretary of Transportation.

The Honorable John A. Volpe, Secretary of Transportation.

The Honorable Elliot L. Richardson, Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare.

Mrs. Hardin, wife of the Secretary of Agriculture.

The Honorable Clifford Hardin, Secretary of Agriculture.

The Honorable John N. Mitchell, Attorney General.

Now at the speaker's table on my extreme left:

The Honorable Rogers C. B. Morton, Secretary of the Interior.

The Honorable Winton M. Blount, Postmaster General.

The Honorable David M. Kennedy, Secretary of the Treasury.

Mrs. Kennedy, wife of the Secretary of the Treasury.

The Honorable Melvin R. Laird, Secretary of Defense.

Mrs. Luger, wife of the Mayor of Indianapolis.

The Honorable John Stennis, United States Senator, leader of the Senate prayer group.

Mrs. Hansen, wife of the Senator from Wyoming.

His Excellency Mr. Sevilla-Sacasa, Dean of the Diplomatic Corps.

Mrs. Burger, wife of the Chief Justice of the United States.

Now to my extreme right, please:

Dr. Orlando Montenegro, President of the Executive Committee of the National Congress of Nicaragua.

Mrs. Montenegro, wife of Dr. Montenegro.

The Honorable William P. Rogers, Secretary of State.

The Rev. Dr. Billy Graham.

Mrs. Rogers, wife of the Secretary of State.

Mrs. J. W. Timms, mother of Congressman Montgomery of Mississippi.

The Honorable Frank Carlson, retired member of the United States Senate and one

of the leaders of this prayer group in the Senate.

Mrs. Hodgson, wife of the Secretary of Labor.

Mrs. Jordan, my wife.

Mrs. Nixon, wife of the President of the United States.

At this time, we'll have greetings from the House of Representatives Breakfast Group, Prayer Group. The Honorable G. V. Montgomery will now speak to us.

GREETINGS FROM HOUSE BREAKFAST GROUP:
(Hon. G. V. MONTGOMERY (Democrat-Mississippi))

Good morning, Mr. President, Mrs. Nixon, my colleagues in the Government, and guests of the 1971 National Prayer Breakfast.

It is my pleasure to bring you warm greetings from the House of Representatives Prayer Breakfast Group. Our meetings each Thursday morning while the Congress is in session, which is most of the time, are quite informal, nondenominational and bipartisan. In fact, we do not even maintain a membership roster. The meetings are open to all members of Congress, former members and elected officials of foreign governments.

Seeing Mrs. Mendel Rivers in the audience brings to mind the contributions made to the prayer group by her late husband, Congressman Mendel Rivers of South Carolina, as well as the late Congressman Bob Watkins of Pennsylvania. Both of these members are deeply missed by our group.

At each meeting following our opening prayer, a fellow member who has volunteered to do so delivers the remarks. A general discussion concerning the topic presented follows, and the meeting concludes with prayer. The remarks are excellent. Some are thought-provoking and soul-searching, some amusing and some sad, but all sincere. Topics range from personal testimonies to politics and religion to the subject that prayer and religion bring men together mentally and physically.

Messages from the members generally have a common factor. With a great deal of affection and feeling, each refers to the spiritual guidance provided him by his parents in his early years. One member recalls that his mother would go into the closet, close the door and ask God for strength during family crises.

There are many benefits to be derived from the Prayer Breakfast Group, and one of these is contact with people of good will in other parts of the nation and other countries of the world. Our Capitol prayer groups have helped start similar organizations among government leaders in well over 70 countries. Because of the prayer breakfasts, Thursday is the best day of the week for me. I have a great feeling of personal renewal, because I have been provided an opportunity to experience religious fellowship with my colleagues that would not be possible in any other situation, especially on the House floor during some of our heated debates.

We who attend the prayer group know we are better Congressmen and individuals because of the meetings. Congressman Dan Kuykendall of Tennessee has often remarked that the prayer breakfast is the only meeting in Washington for which he does not mind arriving 15 minutes early and staying late. However, to our friends who are thinking of starting a prayer group in your area, we would certainly recommend that you start on time and that you stop on time.

We have some good laughs at our meetings, and in fact the prayer group is my best source of jokes. Mr. President, suitable for telling at home. Congressman Wilma Mosell of North Carolina enjoys telling the story about his church during one of its regular meetings. The Board of Deacons had recommended that the church buy a chandelier. Everyone was in agreement but one man who stood up and said he was against buying a

chandler for three reasons. First, no one could spell the word. Secondly, no one could play it. And thirdly, what the church really needed was more light.

There is a brighter light on Capitol Hill today because of our weekly prayer breakfast meetings.

OLD TESTAMENT READING (ISAIAH 1:10-20): THE HONORABLE JOHN H. WHEELER, PRESIDENT, MECHANICS AND FARMERS BANK

Mr. Chairman, Mr. President and Mrs. Nixon:

It has been suggested that before reading the Scripture assigned for this morning that we quote from a speech by Abraham Lincoln delivered in 1861, because of its appropriateness to this occasion.

"It is the duty of nations of men to owe their dependence upon overruling power represented by God, to confess their sins and transgressions in humble sorrow, yet with assured hope that genuine repentance will lead to mercy and pardon and to blessing. We have grown in numbers, wealth and power, as no other nation has grown, but we have forgotten God. We have forgotten the gracious hand that preserved us in peace and multiplied and enriched us and strengthened us. We have vainly imagined that all these blessings were produced by some superior virtue and wisdom of our own. It behooves us then, to humble ourselves, to confess our national sins, and to pray for clemency and forgiveness."

The passage selected for the Scripture lesson this morning is from the first chapter of the Book of Isaiah, the tenth through twentieth verses, and we are reading from the New English version of the Bible:

"Hear the word of the Lord, you rulers of Sodom. Attend, you people of Gomorrah, to the instruction of our God. Your countless sacrifices, what are they to mean, says the Lord. I am sated with whole offerings of rams and the fat of buffaloes. I have no desire for the blood of bulls or sheep or of he-goats. Whenever you come into My presence, who asks you for this? No more shall you trample My courts. The offer of your gifts is useless, the reek of sacrifice is abhorrent to Me. New moons and sabbaths and assemblies, sacred seasons and ceremonies I cannot endure. I cannot tolerate your new moons and your festivals. They have become a burden to Me. And I can put up no longer with them. When you lift your hands outspread in prayer, I will hide my eyes from you. Though your offer may be of countless prayers, I will not listen. There is blood on your hands. Wash yourselves and be clean. Put away the evil of your deeds, away out of My sight. Cease to do evil and learn to do right. Pursue justice and champion the oppressed, give the orphan his rights, and plead the widow's cause. Come now, let us argue it out, says the Lord. Though your sins are scarlet, they shall become white as snow. Though they are dyed crimson, they may yet be like wool. Obey with a will and you shall eat the best that earth yields. But if you refuse and rebel, locust beans shall be your only food. The Lord Himself has spoken."

GREETINGS FROM SENATE BREAKFAST GROUP: THE HONORABLE CLIFFORD HANSEN, REPUBLICAN OF WYOMING

Mr. President, Mrs. Nixon, distinguished guests:

It is a great honor indeed to bring greetings to this distinguished assembly from the United States Senate Prayer Breakfast Group.

For four years I have been privileged to attend most of the meetings which are held each Wednesday while the Congress is in session. It was during the dark and confused days following the bombing of Pearl Harbor that a few Senators joined together with David Lawrence to seek divine guidance. From that experience grew the idea of members of the Senate meeting each week to hear

a spiritual message by a member, followed by responses and discussion.

From that time forward, the Prayer Breakfast has been a source of inspiration and strength to many Senators. The intimate and personal character of the meetings demonstrated spiritual values and philosophies. It encourages a deeper understanding of others and an appreciation for every man. Not infrequently, it helps each of us to view ourselves and our actions somewhat more objectively.

But more than that, it causes us to reflect upon the infinite Being.

This nation has a rich religious heritage. Its greatest patriots were not ashamed to confess their belief in Almighty God. They prayed for God's guidance. For nearly 200 years, our republic has reflected this strong religious influence.

We are proud of our country. America is a great and strong nation. Freedom and opportunity are not meaningless words to most of us. But we know, too, that there is still injustice, there is suffering and want, inequalities do exist.

So as we gather weekly, we recognize our weaknesses, our lack of knowledge and understanding and our need for divine guidance.

Despite the temporal importance that we sometimes attach to ourselves, the words of the psalmist ever serve to remind us of the eternal truth that "blessed is the nation whose God is the Lord." (Psalm 33:12)

Unless we earnestly try to serve God, to do his will, we are bound to fail. Benjamin Franklin urged that the constitutional convention be opened with prayer. Wisely he observed, "God governs in the affairs of men. And if a sparrow cannot fall to the ground without His notice, is it probably that an empire can rise without His aid?"

As we set about our daily tasks, I know that most of us recognize the force of the Almighty as each of us, often following different courses, strives to improve and serve this nation under God. More than a century ago, Bishop Bailey said: "The greater thy business is, by so much the more thou hast need to pray for God's good speed and blessing upon it."

The Senate Prayer Breakfast gives us the opportunity better to understand, more clearly to comprehend and appreciate the good motives and earnest desires of those with whom we work—men with whom we sometimes disagree, but men deserving our respect and admiration. Thus I believe we are better prepared as we seek to do God's will.

NEW TESTAMENT READING (ST. MATTHEW 25:31-46): MRS. JOHN DELLENBACK, PRESIDENT, CONGRESSIONAL WIVES PRAYER GROUP

I'm reading from the New English version, the 25th Chapter of Matthew, beginning with the 31st Verse:

When the Son of man comes in his glory and all the angels with him, He will sit in state on his throne, with all the nations gathered before Him. He will separate men into two groups, as a shepherd separates the sheep from the goats, and He will place the sheep on his right hand and the goats on His left. Then the King will say to those on His right hand, "You have My Father's blessing. Come, enter and possess the kingdom that has been ready for you since the world was made. For when I was hungry you gave Me food, when thirsty you gave Me drink, when I was a stranger you took Me into your home, when naked you clothed Me. When I was ill, you came to My health when in prison you visited Me."

Then the righteous will reply, "Lord, when was it that we saw You hungry and fed You, or thirsty and gave You drink, a stranger and took You home, or naked and clothed You? When did we see You ill or in prison and come to visit You?"

And the King will answer: "I tell you this. Anything you did for one of My brothers here, however humble, you did for Me."

Then He will say to those on His left hand: "The curse is upon you. Go from My sight to the eternal fire that is ready for the devil and his angels. For when I was hungry you gave Me nothing to eat, when thirsty nothing to drink. When I was a stranger you gave Me no home, when naked you did not clothe Me. When I was ill and in prison you did not come to My help."

And they, too, will reply: "Lord, when was it that we saw You hungry or thirsty or a stranger or naked or ill or in prison, did nothing for You?"

And He will answer: "I tell you this. Anything you did not do for one of these, however humble, you did not do for Me." And they will go away to eternal punishment, but the righteous will get eternal life.

PRAYER FOR NATIONAL LEADERS: THE HONORABLE CARL ALBERT, SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE

Mr. President, Mr. Chief Justice, and Mr. Chairman:

May I suggest that we all bow our heads for a brief moment of silent prayer in our own hearts for the leaders of the nation and the world? (Moment of silence.)

Eternal God, our Father through the centuries, Thou hast been completely sovereign in Thy reign over the nations of the world. We rejoice to claim Thee as Sovereign Lord of America and sing "How Great Thou Art." Through the wisdom of Isaiah, may we discover Thy wisdom for our land in the 1970s. In our day, as in his, Thou hast not been impressed with what is seen on the outer surface of people through words and ceremonies which fail to ring true. May we hear and heed Thy Word, cease to do evil, learn to do right, pursue justice and champion the oppressed. Thus, may our nation be saved from suffering, the tragic rebellion which Isaiah saw in his own beloved country.

Through Matthew's faith of all nations responsive to Thee as Sovereign Lord, guide us among the nations which outreach to human suffering of poverty, disease and uselessness. This is so helpful that Christ will be honored, so helpful that our nation be judged by Thee as righteous and loyal. We lift up our nation before Thee, Sovereign Lord, and seek Thy blessing. We turn to Thee with a petition for Thy involvement with our nation's leaders—men with honored responsibilities in the judicial, legislative and executive areas. To each leader, give Thou vision and a compassion akin to Thine, and that Thou dost carefully and deeply care for individuals young and old, in poverty and in luxury, of every race—so may we.

Let no geographical distance ever separate us from these persons and their fundamental needs. May this nation's leaders envision that noblest goal—the goal motivating Moses to lead his people from bondage; the goal central to Jesus' mission—release from the bondage enslaving the human spirit. We lift up our leaders before Thee, Sovereign Lord, and seek Thy blessing.

We turn to Thee with deep appreciation for the President of the United States. Continue with him to be Thou a Lamp unto his pathway. May Thy entirely adequate love and strength be with him day by day. We lift up before Thee, Sovereign Lord, and seek Thy blessing.

Oh, Thou Lord of the Universe, so guide all nations of this planet. Be Thou so close to their leaders that a golden age of peace will come upon this earth. Help us to be a part of Thy answer to this petition. In the Name of Jesus Christ who prayed, "Not my will, but Thine be done," Amen.

MESSAGE: THE HONORABLE WARREN BURGER, CHIEF JUSTICE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Mr. President, and Mrs. Nixon, Mr. Speaker, distinguished guests:

These gatherings have been held in Washington and elsewhere in time of peace and in time of war. And I have had the privilege of attending some of them in the past. They have afforded the men and women who bear heavy public responsibility a brief respite from the confusions and the burdens of the day.

Only a few days ago, the President spoke to the Congress and to the nation, and I use his words, of "the great feeling of frustration that has crept across the land." And on Sunday, only day before yesterday, at the historic Red Mass at St. Matthew's Cathedral here in Washington, judges and others gathered there heard His Eminence Cardinal O'Boyle speak of the great need in these times for the public leaders of the countries of the world to find support outside themselves by seeking divine guidance.

We know, of course, that the forces and influences which disturbed the tranquility of a whole people begin with the individual. We know, too, that the frustration and unrest of this last third of our century is a pervasive thing and touches every nation on earth. It is no comfort to us, and should be no comfort, to read and to know of the troubles that beset other nations, whether they are friends or otherwise.

Indeed, it is more disturbing that this unrest is so pervasive throughout the world. Yet, in many ways, we may be more fortunate than some other nations, not because of our wealth or power or position, but because we can gather here, as we do today, and acknowledge without fear or reticence, that we need—each of us needs—a higher power than any one of us possesses and a higher power than all of us together possess.

We can readily think of other great nations in the world where this kind of gathering could not be held, not simply because those nations reject the idea of a divine power, but also because their leaders would fear—would literally fear—a public acknowledgement of their own fallibility and dependence on something, some power, outside themselves and outside the people as a whole.

But it has been, as Sen. Jordan and others have noted, a national tradition, beginning 183 years ago, and through the years of the harsh struggle that preceded the beginning of this country, and right down to this very hour and in this room, that American leaders are free to acknowledge their dependence upon divine guidance.

For that reason perhaps, at this particular time of history, the most important single factor about this meeting, this gathering, is that all who are present here acknowledge freely and openly, simply by being here, that without divine guidance we are lost.

The terrifying magnitude and complexity of the problems within our own country, and our responsibilities over the world, is such that our national response sometimes tends to be complex and even confused. In this respect, notwithstanding all of the sophistication, all of the education and learning, and all of the technology of our age, we are relatively in not very much better a position than the simple peasants of centuries ago who first heard the message of Our Lord in parables and psalms.

The world of that day may seem to us now as small and simple. But in truth, those who inhabited that tiny area on the shores of the Mediterranean Sea so long ago were, in their day and time, overwhelmed by their troubles and their problems and their burdens, as we are today. Our relative capabilities, to borrow a term from our modern age, are much the same.

In the last few days, I have been trying to recall some of the experiences of my youth, when, as a boy in my teens, I worked for a YMCA camp on the high hills overlooking the beautiful stretches of the St.

Croix River that divides Wisconsin from Minnesota.

It was a setting that inspired not only the adult leaders but the boys who were there. And I've tried to recapture from the pockets of memory some fragments of the discussions of those gatherings now so many years ago.

One of them that I tried to recall related to one of the great prayers of the Judaeo-Christian heritage—the Twenty-third Psalm.

This psalm and prayer was familiar in our home, and it was a daily exercise at this YMCA camp. Now, 45 years later, in this time of tension and confusion and frustration the President spoke about just a few days ago, when few men are really bold enough to think or to proclaim that they have all of the answers, the real meaning of the Twenty-third Psalm and its magnificent simplicity and its great power comes back to me frequently. It can give us comfort and assurance—the comfort and the assurance we need to surmount the pressures and the burdens of each day. And this is true especially if we think of it in the terms of what it meant to those who first heard it so many centuries ago.

We know the words. Few things in our teaching are better-known to a greater number of people than the words of the Twenty-third Psalm. But before I turn to those words, I would like to recall, with you, that the psalmist was speaking to a very simple people of that time in a day when reading and writing were confined to a handful of scholars and priests. The setting is important, also. It was in a harsh land, largely arid and rocky, with very few places of the biblical milk and honey. Life in that day was sustained from small fields, with very little water, sparse vegetation. Just as Our Lord later spoke to the people—these same simple people—in parables cast in the common terms of seeds and roots and branches, of trees and birds and fish, the psalmist here spoke in words and form his listeners could grasp. He had to do this. He had to use words that would evoke familiar images in the minds of these fishermen and shepherds, for modern scholars tell us that, in that day, the vocabulary of most people was limited to a few hundred words for basic communication.

The listeners for whom the psalmist was making this psalm and poem and prayer knew that his people were not able to deal in abstractions. Only simple and concrete words related to daily life and common experience had meaning for them. And yet those words today are rich in meaning and imagery. The passage of time has not altered the inner needs of men and women. You recall those lines:

The Lord is my Shepherd,
I shall not want.

Every farmer, every fisherman, every peasant, even the children, knew what that meant. They knew that a shepherd was the guardian and the protector and the guide of his flock. They knew the intimate 24-hour relationship of the shepherd and his flock. The psalmist wanted his listeners to understand what God could be to them and for them if they would accept Him and follow Him as their Shepherd.

And so it was, I'm sure, that he cast the psalm, the song, in these simple and beautiful image-creating terms that depicted the Lord as a Shepherd in the same relationship to people as the earthly shepherd to his flock.

"I shall not want," certainly meant to them that the Lord, like the earthly shepherd they knew so well would sustain them and supply their daily needs.

Later, the Gospel would record more of these same concepts in terms of whether we can gather grapes from thorns or figs from thistles.

These, as I said, were the terms that the farmers and the peasants and the people of that day could understand.

These messages needed no gloss for them, needed no theologian.

The next lines:

He makes me to lie down in green pastures,
He leads me beside still waters.

Here, again, the song is cast in the same poetic imagery. And what did these words mean to those listeners? They must have meant that God, the Shepherd, was offering a promise through the psalmist that He would act for men in the way that shepherds acted for the sheep. The "green pastures," like bread, were the staff of life. Everyone knew—even the children—that without new and green grass and fresh pastures, the sheep would die.

The simplest of them knew, as we know today, that sheep tend to crop every green blade to the very earth, that when a pasture is grazed out, the wise and protective shepherd guides and leads the sheep to newer and greener pastures.

The psalmist had no need to enlarge or expound on that. His listeners knew what water meant in their lives, in that rocky and arid land. They knew that still waters meant something even more than water. In that harsh country, rocky and hilly, with some mountains and only limited foliage available, green pastures were difficult to find. Water was as scarce and as essential to life as the fresh, green grass to the sheep.

So the promise of green pastures and water were closely related and well understood. But the promise of the psalm is more than just water. Every peasant knew that a foaming and rough stream meant a rocky bed, in which the sheep, were they to plunge into it to drink, might well break a leg and have to be destroyed, or be carried off by the swift currents. On the other hand, still waters meant either a slow-moving stream, with a sandy bottom, or a spring-fed reservoir.

When the shepherd found these still waters, he could probe with his long staff, his rod, and since few streams in that arid country were very deep, the flock would be safe in those still waters. It would be safe to enter the stream for drinking, and it would probably be safe for crossing.

Now the psalm changes, and I suspect that the purist or the literary critic of today might readily be able to find fault with the change from shepherds and green pastures and still waters and the imagery that these words evoke. There is an abrupt change to man and his problems. We can only guess that the psalmist believed that, with these first images relating to the common experience of daily life for these people, the listeners would be able to grasp the change and understand the message that was meant for man and his life.

That next line, with the change, is:

He restores my soul.

The listeners probably recognized that man had a soul, probably thought, in that day, as now, that sheep did not.

So the change relates the message of the shepherd and the sheep to man and his God. When the psalmist offered the promise to restore the soul, even the simplest peasant could grasp that it was now God as a Shepherd that was referred to, and that God, like the earthly shepherd, would provide and protect, and He would do so in a way that was something more and beyond what animals needed.

Still speaking directly now of men and not sheep, the psalmist offers another promise:

He leads me in paths of righteousness.

For His namesake.

Sheep and shepherds were, of course, concerned with the right path—the safe path, the safe journey. And the message had already made clear the duty of the Shepherd

to find safe paths through the rugged and rocky hills and gullies of that country. So the transition is persuasive—it is clear. It is clear as a promise to men and women that those who will follow this Shepherd in simple faith, as the sheep follow blindly and in trust, will be led into safe paths—paths of right and paths of righteousness.

The next lines are mixed imagery, valid for both sheep and men:

Though I walk through the Valley of the Shadow of Death,

I will fear no evil.

Remember that the shepherd was constantly involved in moving his flocks through streams and valleys and gullies where dangers were present, from predatory animals, from rockslides and even from sudden floods at certain seasons of the year.

So here we find the promise again—one that the shepherd and the peasant could understand, because they had often, themselves, walked through the dangerous valleys with their sheep, where death and injury lurked.

Though I walk through the Valley of the Shadow of Death,

I will fear no evil.

Thy rod and Thy staff comfort me.

Here, again, the mixed imagery of that beautiful poem. The shepherd's staff, as we know, his rod, was used to rescue a lamb that had fallen beyond reach into a gully or into a stream, or to guide the flock away from dangerous paths, wrong paths, into safe passage, or to defend the flock from wild animals that might attack.

These listeners understood that. These people, no less than more sophisticated people of later centuries, to whom the psalmist was also speaking over the ages, could understand these images and these problems.

For my part, in treating the Twenty-third Psalm as a great prayer, I prefer to end it at this point, on a positive note, with the promise of protection and comfort rather than with the image of a feast on the table in the presence of enemies.

Now, I skip over many centuries from the time of the psalmist to the time that Alfred Tennyson wrote his moving description of the death and burial of King Arthur. You will recall the setting in that great poem, when Sir Bedevere has taken his king, his dying king, to the shore of the lake. Sir Bedevere was the last of all his knights. And as he was placed on the funeral barge, the dying King Arthur tells Sir Bedevere:

"Pray for my soul. More things are wrought by prayer than this world dreams of.

"Wherefore, let thy voice rise like a fountain for me, night and day.

"For what are men better than sheep or goats that nourish a blind life within the brain, if, knowing God, they lift not hands in prayer—both for themselves and those who call them friend."

There is a span, of course, of many centuries between the time the psalmist wrote and the time when Tennyson wrote of Arthur's death.

The problems of men and women, and their world, have changed very little. And they have changed very little from the time of King Arthur and Tennyson to the present day.

Perhaps in our confusion and frustration, and faced with the complexities and the burdens that baffle—stagger—the mind, we have forgotten the simple faith and the simple prayers which sustained men and women for thousands of years.

The psalmist here has given us this simple and beautiful and rich prayer. And if we add to it the realization of Tennyson that more things are wrought by prayer than this world dreams of, perhaps some of the solutions we seek may come.

I have said our capabilities have increased as our burdens have increased over the centuries, and that, according to the Gospel, is

the Lord's way. But one thing has remained constant: the power of prayer.

So let me close with that psalm, as a prayer:

The Lord is my Shepherd,
I shall not want.

He makes me to lie down in green pastures,
He leads me beside the still waters.

He restores my soul.
He leads me in paths of righteousness.

For his namesake.
Though I walk through the Valley of the Shadow of Death,

I will fear no evil,
For You are with me.

Thy rod and Thy staff,
They comfort me.

PRESIDENT RICHARD M. NIXON

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Chief Justice, Senator Jordan, all of the distinguished guests at the head table, and all of the distinguished guests in the audience:

When Senator Jordan indicated those who were present at this breakfast, I was reminded of a letter I received right after the state-of-the-union message from a very disturbed listener who had viewed it on television. He did not comment upon the content of the speech, but he commented upon the fear of what might have happened had some madman, or somebody equally disturbed, come into the chamber and detonated an explosive, because, as he very properly pointed out, all of the power of Government was there—as far as the national Government was concerned: the Congress, the Cabinet, the Supreme Court, with, of course, a few listeners in the very, very limited space provided in the galleries.

As I heard the list of those who were present at this breakfast this morning, I thought, "What would really happen if an explosive were detonated in this room?" because we have virtually all of those who were present at the state-of-the-union. This audience is four times as large. But not only four times as large, but 100 countries are represented here, many cities, many States with their Governors, many representatives of great private institutions, of educational institutions, representatives of all segments of American life.

Perhaps it would be impossible to find any audience in America in which more power in the best sense of the word was gathered in one room than here at this prayer breakfast this morning.

This tells us something, it seems to me, about the strength of America. All of us are talking these days, and thinking these days, a great deal about what America will be like when we celebrate our 200th birthday just five years from now.

We know, as one of the previous speakers indicated, that America will be the richest country in the world then. We know that America, if it wants to be, can be the strongest country in the world then. And we also know, if we have listened carefully to the theme that has run through the prayers and the remarks this morning, that wealth and strength alone does not measure the greatness of this country, or of any country, for that matter.

The question of whether America on its 200th birthday will be the hope of the world as it was at the time of its birth will depend not on our strength or on our wealth, because then we were very poor and we were very weak. But America was a good country, America stood for spiritual and moral values that far transcended the strength and the wealth of the nations of the old world. And that's what we all want America to be on its 200th anniversary—not just big, not just strong, and not just rich, but a good country in every sense of the word: Good at home, good in our relations with other nations in the world.

That's why we're gathered here. That's why these prayer breakfasts here in the na-

tion's capital and all over this nation tell us something about America that the cynical observers would overlook sometimes—and that is there is a great deal of goodness in this country, a great deal of moral strength and fiber still left in this country. And in the end, that's what really matters.

I was trying to think, after the eloquent words of the Chief Justice, what prayer I could leave with this very distinguished audience, and with those who are listening on television and on radio all over the world. And I was reminded of one of the favorite stories from the Old Testament. You will recall that when King David died and when Solomon ascended to the throne, God came before him in a dream and asked him what he wanted. And Solomon did not ask for power, and he did not ask for wealth. He said: "Give Thy servant an understanding heart."

And, so, let that be our prayer. Let us have an understanding heart in our relations with other nations, an understanding heart in our relations between races and religions and parties and generations, and in our relations with each other. And if America can have an understanding heart, in the very best sense of the word, on that 200th birthday, we will be very rich and very strong, but, more important, we will be truly a good country and the hope of the world still.

CLOSING PRAYER: THE HONORABLE RICHARD G. LUGAR, PRESIDENT, THE NATIONAL LEAGUE OF CITIES

Mr. President, Mrs. Nixon, and honored members of this prayer breakfast meeting: I have two privileges—first of all, of delivering the closing prayer, and, then, with heads bowed, would you join me in unison in repeating the Lord's Prayer. May we bow our heads?

Almighty God, throughout the ages You have searched for us. You have given us freedom to choose, to love other human beings, to enjoy beauty, to create new forms of worship, to express our unity with You and Your world. Our choices have become complex, our love often measured out cautiously, our senses dull deliberately as we try to escape too many dazzling images of challenge or suffering. And we are frightened to seek unity with one another, because we fear insult, loss of status and property, physical pain, untimely death. Here and now, You find us with defenses lowered for just an instant. Deep is our hunger for eternal life, but strong are those hopes that our appetites and sometimes our wills might be Your will, that we would not have to suffer surrender of our own works and our own ways and take up a cross to follow You.

For just this moment, God, we know Your relentless love, we feel Your grip and we are prepared to cease our flight, to stop and to kneel, to pray for forgiveness and to ask for salvation. Death and pain and indignity and anxieties shall have no power over us if we accept Your will, Your promise, Your strong and ever-loving arms that reach out to embrace us now. Do not let us go, dear God, do not let us go from this moment of truth, do not let us go ever again. In Jesus' Name we ask this, Amen.

(The Lord's Prayer is recited by all.)

KOSCIUSZKO FOUGHT FOR FREEDOM IN TWO WORLDS

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1971

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, although February 12 is a red-letter day, because it is the birthday of Abraham

Lincoln, it has a double significance for lovers of liberty. Next Friday will be the 225th anniversary of the birth of Tadeusz Kosciuszko, who fought for freedom on both sides of the Atlantic.

Tadeusz Andrzej Bonawentura Kosciuszko, who was born February 12, 1746, came to the United States in August 1776, while the infant nation was engaged in a bitter fight for independence from Great Britain. He promptly put his engineering skill to good use by constructing fortifications at Saratoga and other points. The victory at Saratoga in 1777 led France to recognize the new republic as an independent nation.

Kosciuszko spent 6 years in the American Army. His "long, faithful, and meritorious service" was recognized in 1783 when the Congress made him a brigadier general.

Besides aiding the United States in its long and difficult struggle for independence, he also led the Poles in their wars against Czarist Russia. Unfortunately the happy results in America were not duplicated in his native land. As the lamp of liberty was being lighted in the new world, it was being extinguished in the old.

Poland, which was being gobbled up by Austria, Prussia, and Russia, had suffered its first partition in 1772. Two later partitions, in 1793 and 1795, erased it from the map of Europe for a century and a quarter.

Mr. Speaker, as we pause next Friday to honor the memory of Abraham Lincoln, who saved the Union during the Civil War, let us also pay tribute to the gallant man who helped us win our freedom almost a century earlier—Tadeusz Kosciuszko.

SST RESEARCH COULD AID ENVIRONMENT

HON. ROBERT TAFT, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 10, 1971

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, as we are all aware, there has been a great deal of debate as to the effects of the SST on the environment. For this reason, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues an article published in the January 7, 1971, issue of the Cincinnati Post & Times Star showing how research on the SST can assist us in resolving other pollution problems.

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

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

WORK ON SST HERE COULD CUT FUMES FROM AUTOS, TRUCKS

(By William Styles)

It's ironic, but the ecologically maligned supersonic transport may some day lead to reduced air pollution from auto, truck and train exhaust, thanks to engine development work being carried out by General Electric at Evendale.

Improved methods of introducing and mixing fuel and air in the engine combustor, developed by GE engineers, have eliminated

visible smoke from engines for both the SST and the tri-jet DC-10.

In a report for a Boeing Co. publication on SST technology benefits, GE says application of its new methods "can improve the efficiency and reduce the exhaust emission level on other types of combustion engines and combustion heating devices.

"This means the total quantity of exhaust released into the atmosphere can be reduced as a result of the improved technology," the report says.

An additional benefit is development of an exhaust measurement index to which GE was a major contributor.

The index, which is related to visibility of the jet engine exhaust plume, is suitable for use with any type of turbine engine and adaptable for use with other types of power plants as well, GE says. Its use has already been extended to a number of marine and industrial turbine engines.

GE also has come up with air-cooled turbine blades for the SST jet engine that last two to five times as long as present blades in much higher temperatures.

"The automotive industry is interested in these advanced concepts because of the importance of developing high turbine temperatures in proposed automotive turbine engines," the report notes, adding that "the use of turbine power in land transportation can improve efficiency and reduce pollution and noise."

There's plenty of room for such improvement.

GE tests show that an internal combustion engine auto emits approximately 52 pounds of pollutant per 1000 seat miles while the SST puts out little more than one pound.

AID TO THE ENEMY

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 10, 1971

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, an editorial appearing in the February 5, 1971, edition of the Peoria Journal Star presents the other side of the picture in the controversy which blew up all out of proportion last week with regard to the "embargo" placed on news reports from Vietnam as to the movements of American and South Vietnamese troops.

The editor, Mr. C. L. Dancey, is a veteran who fought with the Marines and has first hand knowledge of the difficulties which our foot soldiers can encounter if the enemy is alerted to our battle plans prematurely.

I include the editorial in the RECORD at this point:

AID TO THE ENEMY

(By C. L. Dancey)

The editor of the Portland Oregonian, a World War II vet, was called up during the Korean War and worked in headquarters there with the news handling operations.

When he got back, he wrote a book virtually itemizing the way in which we killed American soldiers by reporting where they were and what they were up to.

He was ashamed of his lifelong profession as a journalist, after the excesses made from ignorance by a new crop of reporters there.

(Sometimes the news radio broadcasts reached the enemy in the midst of actions where our boys were still exposed to their artillery counter-action! Our broadcasters might as well have been enemy "spotters.")

Every man who has been shot at by an enemy has the same feeling about broadcasting information to that enemy in the midst of operations.

People in a democracy have a "right" and a need to know what goes on. But nobody is entitled to risk the lives of soldiers of his country in the field, in order to instantaneously exercise that "right."

It is irresponsible politics to attack "secrecy" when an army commander imposes a temporary blackout on information while movements go on in an area where the enemy has made huge buildups—and there are some millions of us who cannot view it as an expression of morality.

We've been there, and we know we didn't want the other guy to know too much!

And the fact that the enemy's allies make wild and exaggerated public charges in an attempt to "flush out" such information is a damned sure proof that the ending of the blackout is in the enemy's interest.

PROVIDING FOR FUTURE NEEDS: U.S. SAVINGS BONDS

HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 10, 1971

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, as we in Government consider our financial problems and our citizens concern themselves with providing a certain kind of security, I would like to pose a question about the economics of freedom. What would the inveterate enemies of "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness" be willing to pay us for our stake in the future of freedom—for our factories and stores; our homes and office buildings; our stocks and bonds; our bank deposits and insurance policies?

Cannot you just see them settling something of value on your libraries, museums, parks, stadiums, theaters; on our clinics, hospitals, laboratories—on all the good things of our whole way of living?

What we as a nation have achieved to date is only a promise of what can be accomplished tomorrow under our priceless free enterprise system. And, Americans everywhere are providing for the needs and conveniences of their future environment—by the regular purchase of U.S. savings bonds—through the payroll savings plan, where they work, or the bond-a-month plan, where they bank.

When they invest in U.S. savings securities, Series E and H, they do not give a dime of it away. It is still their money. If anything serious happens to them—they can always get their money back—and never less than the full cash value that they paid out. That, plus accrued interest, which is now at the bonus rate of 5½ percent, when held to maturity of 5 years, 10 months. It is a certain kind of security.

Savings bonds are dollars on loan to the Government. They are needed now—to help turn back the forces of inflation; to protect the value of the dollar; to increase our personal stability. But, remember, the urge is to do no more than save our money—by loaning it to the

Government—with the rate and return guaranteed.

It is a comforting, safe and certain way for both employees and the self-employed to put something aside as shareholders in the best years of our lives.

INTERNATIONAL NARCOTICS PEDDLERS AND THE WORLD COMMUNITY

HON. JOHN G. SCHMITZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 10, 1971

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, the question of the admission of Red China to the United Nations is again on the agenda. We should all recognize that the United States has the power to either ease the way for Red China into the U.N. or to forestall it indefinitely. It is vain to talk about some mysterious irresistible trend which is propelling this outlaw nation into the organization which was supposedly going to bring collective sanctions against just such plunderer regimes.

Trends can change, have changed in the past, and will change in the future. For Federal representatives the question is what actions should be taken to either facilitate the direction in which events are tending, or to prevent changes which are not in the best interests of the United States. Let us not prostrate ourselves before the myth of inevitability.

The groundwork is being laid to relieve the internal distress of mainland China's totalitarians by injecting economic and diplomatic juice into the withering cadre organization of the Communist Party of China. There can be no good purpose for this. To betray a large segment of the world's population for the second time in 20 years is not a gesture worthy of a free nation.

It is not only the Chinese people who will suffer from an ill-timed gesture of recognition toward the Communist ruling class of Red China.

We should also be aware of the fact that, according to Dr. Stefan Possony of the Hoover Institute on War, Revolution and Peace, in the last 15 years Red China has doubled its opium poppy production. Mao Tse Tung and his comrades now receive up to \$100 million annually from sales of this product, a substantial amount of which finds its way into the veins of American youth in the form of heroin. Facilitating access to U.S. markets for a product which is destroying a substantial number of young people is obviously counter to all standards of decency. To bring the world's largest narcotics peddlers into the "world community" would not seem to be in the best interests of that community.

The following two articles, the first of which appeared in "Military Review" published by the U.S. Army Command and General Staff College, Ft. Leavenworth, Kans., and the second of which appeared in the *Elks* magazine of November 1969, form a good basis for evaluating the efficacy of boosting the Communist Party of Red China.

I include the articles as follows:

CHINA: THE ARMY, THE PARTY, AND THE PEOPLE

(NOTE.—This article was condensed from the original, published in the *Journal of the Royal United Service Institution* (Great Britain) September 1970, under the title, "The Army, the Party and the People: (2) China.")

(Mr. Candlin, a graduate of Edinburgh University in Scotland, is President of Otran Research, Incorporated, in Massachusetts. He has taught at the Northampton Institute of Advanced Technology in London, at Jacksonville University in Florida, and at the Hudson Institute in New York. During 1968-69, he was a Fellow Scientist performing amphibious warfare studies with the Westinghouse Advanced Studies Group in Massachusetts. His article, "Mao and the Battle for Communist Power," appeared in the March 1970 issue of the *Military Review*.)

The Ninth National Congress of the Chinese Communist Party of April 1969 was primarily an attempt on the part of Mao Tse-tung to regain the ground which he had lost to his rivals Liu Shao-chi and Teng Hsiao-ping after the "hundred flowers" episode and the dismal chaos of the Great Leap Forward. It was also an occasion on which Mao could designate his successor Lin Piao, and capitalize on the mandate which he claimed to have acquired by completing the program of building revolutionary committees in all provinces. That these committees were largely ineffectual, providing only a cover for a power bid by a faction of the People's Liberation Army (PLA), was obvious to many. This did little to allay the widespread disaffection toward the regime, leading to growing turbulence and disorder throughout the country.

Although the new government has been able, to a large extent, to conceal this situation from the outside world where many countries continued to recognize a government in Peking, daily growing less legitimate, they could conceal the real facts of the situation neither from the Soviet Union nor from themselves.

PARTY STRUCTURE

Periodically, the old Magus himself would appear on special occasions with Lin Piao, a singularly uncharismatic figure who would deliver what purported to be the inimitable thought of his master. Mao remained inarticulate. This was not altogether surprising because, for a good many years, the principal author of his words had been Chen Po-ta whose position as confidant and speech writer had been critically affected by the new situation with the advent of Lin.

The formalized party structure, laboriously constructed by Lin Shao-chi and Mao, was in shreds at the time of the Ninth Congress as a result of the Red Guard depredations and the savage proscriptions and humiliations experienced by thousands of victims. Yet the affairs of government had to be transacted somehow in areas where the military establishment had little competence.

Most of this burden fell on a trimvirate consisting of Chou En-lai whose capacity for survival seemed endless, Chen Po-ta in a newfound alliance with him, and Kang Sheng. The last of these is an Argus-eyed secret police chief whose position, earlier improved by the liquidation of Lo Jui-ching, has lately been threatened by moves which the organs of military intelligence have been making toward the control of domestic affairs.

GROWING REVOLT

Many competent foreign observers have been unduly impressed by the evidence of reconstruction and unity which has been sedulously promoted. Often, their sources have been translations of newspapers, periodicals, or monitored broadcasts, and a whole demonology has been based on this.

They tend at times to read into the *Peking Review* a quality of revelation which would certainly gratify its publishers if they were able to follow these auguries. The fact is that a situation of growing revolt and anarchy continues.

Mao has said often that "Power grows from the barrel of a gun," and, in installing the Lin Piao faction of the PLA in the saddle, he has been trying to insure that the gun is aimed right. In order to gain insight into the complexities of army politics and the prospects for the future, it is necessary to examine some of the military background of the *Risorgimento* which brought Mao back to Peking and the Ninth Congress.

REASONS BEHIND PURGES

While there has been much confusion, and the interpretations of the analysts vary, there seems to have been a fairly broad consensus that the recent purges and upheavals which began with the removal of Defense Minister Marshal Peng Teh-huai were connected with:

A serious dispute about the status and doctrines of the People's Liberation Army. This, in broad terms, reflected differences between backers of a revolutionary army which would be closely connected, in its development and armament, with an industrial base underwritten by the USSR or by outright supply from Soviet sources.

Aspects of the Sino-Soviet schism which have had an impact on the leadership, organization, and doctrine of the PLA.

An attempt by different factions within the People's Liberation Army and the Chinese Communist Party (CCP) to define the position of the PLA within the state: in short, a struggle for supremacy.

The large-scale governmental crisis brought about by censure directed at Chairman Mao himself because of the failure of his "Three Red Banners" program. This involved the communes, the Great Leap Forward, and the "Every Man a Soldier" movement.

As yet there seems to have been relatively little attention paid to a number of issues which may already be influencing the course of events in China in a manner likely to result in new foreign and defense policies. At the root of these lie the kind of army Lin Piao would like to be able to build, the exact position which this would occupy within the Chinese policy, its interactions with the population, and its suitability for the missions with which he or his successors would seek to entrust it.

One of the most important of these questions, and little noticed by outside observers, has been that of morale. It is highly important to be able to understand the methods of indoctrination and training so far favored by the political branches of the PLA in their relationship with the command and the status of troops.

UNRELIABLE SOLDIERS

It will be remembered that, during the Algerian war, as a result of French military exposure to the Chinese doctrine of *la guerre révolutionnaire*, a large section of the French Army became politically unreliable and a possible threat to the state. By an unexpected turn of military events, Peking—or at least a reflection of it—was arriving in Paris.

Behind much of the army building in China has lain a realization among the military leaders that there could be a similar reverse process closer at hand than Algeria, and that their own manpower, swollen by the "Every Man a Soldier" concept, could become unmanageable. The present military factionalism, sometimes called "mountain-topism" by Mao, would seem to bear out this apprehension.

Mao's *Problems of War and Strategy* contains one of the most definitive pronouncements on the kind of warfare and armed forces which Mao and his followers believe in:

According to the Marxist theory of the state, the army is the chief component of the political power of a state. Whoever wants to seize the political power of the state and to maintain it must have a strong army. Some people have ridiculed us as advocates of the omnipotence of war; yes, we are the advocates of the omnipotence of the revolutionary war, which is not bad at all but good and Marxist. With the help of guns, the Russian Communists brought about socialism. Experiences in the class struggle of the era of imperialism teach us that the working class and the toiling masses cannot defeat the armed bourgeois and the landlords except by the power of the gun; in this sense we can even say that the whole world can be remoulded only by the gun.

PHASES OF DEVELOPMENT

The theory by which the Maoist concept of war and politics has been developed can be categorized by a number of phases:

Initial Phase. This early period was synonymous with the time of the Kiangsi Soviet when, under the influence of Chu Teh and Mao Tse-tung, the first and different characteristic Red Army raised on a new model became a large and effective force.

In this "Chinkangshan" period after the foundation of his revolutionary army by Mao in 1927, the Communist forces grew in size from about 5,000 (the survivors of the Autumn Uprising) into 13 corps. They would have amounted to about 80,000, a prodigious number of trained guerrillas. The armies of the Kiangsi Soviet thrived on opposition, but could not sustain their positions after the Fifth Annihilation Campaign mounted by Chiang Kai-shek. There were a considerable number of other substantial formations elsewhere.

By 1932, these were in the form of four Front Armies, and, in 1934, they were all in retreat toward Yen-an. In spite of the fact that there were only about 25,000 survivors and a most intensive process of indoctrination, thought control, and training imposed by the Military Academy of Yen-an, rather surprisingly, individual traditions and provincial and personal loyalties have persisted to this day which have resulted in the formation of a number of cliques within the PLA.

The Yen-an Period. This can be divided into two phases. The first ran from 1935 until 1937, the time of the official outbreak of the China war. This was a somewhat parochial period during which the movement was largely confined to a small area in Shensi engaged in a period of defensive recuperation.

The second phase signaling the rebirth of Chinese Communist power ran up to the end of World War II. This was to be achieved by the process of re-forming the United Front which had been broken by Chiang; allowing the Kuomintang armies to be weakened by Japanese attrition; and then waging an offensive people's war, placing the Red forces in frontier regions—guerrilla base areas—which could be consolidated by the masses.

During this second phase, the strength of the Communist armies in terms of effectives grew from about 40,000 to about 500,000. They were able to perfect a system of sanctuaries, guerrilla bases, and areas of military jurisdiction whose methods still have much influence in other regions such as Southeast Asia.

Postwar Preaccession Period. During this period, the people's war was put into practice as an instrument of civil war and as a means of gaining supreme power for the party. Mao told the Chinese Communist Party Seventh National Congress:

This Army is powerful because it has such a large component of the organized forces raised from the masses as the Peoples' Self Defense Corps and the Militia fighting in

cooperation with it. In the liberated areas of China, all young and middle-aged men and women are organized in the Anti-Japanese Peoples' Self Defense Corps on a voluntary and democratic basis and on the principle that they do not quit their civilian occupation. . . .

Moreover, this army is powerful because it is divided into main forces and regional forces; the former may be sent to operate in any region, at any time, while the latter make it their specific task to defend their own regions or attack the enemy in their neighborhood in coordination with the militia and the Self Defense Corps.

Then, as now, much attention was paid by the Chinese Communists to propaganda and political warfare abroad so as to curtail support which their opponents might otherwise receive from outside. Ho Chi-minh and General Vo Nguyen Giap have also been adept in applying this doctrine.

The essential meaning of the new doctrine of warfare, which has been found so intractable in recent years, is that, by a process of strategic inversion, forces, which by ordinary or conventional military powers would be regarded as irregular or auxiliary forces, have been chosen as the main instrument, with the conventional or regular forces cast in a supporting role. The latter can be augmented to carry out conventional missions on the larger scale but the decision according to the Maoist military canon is achieved by the irregulars. To the orthodox military mind, this is heresy of a high order.

Postaccession Period. This may be subdivided into: the phase of army building up to the Lushan Conference (1958), the post-Teng Teh-hual phase up to the cultural revolution, and the cultural revolution and revolutionary rebel phase, 1966-69.

During this period, the vital question of the choice to be taken by the PLA—as a revolutionary army rather than a regular army—came to a head in the course of a monumental crisis in which the whole process set in motion by Mao during the Great Leap Forward came into question. He was forced into a position in which he would need to enlist the preponderant elements of military power and overthrow the political power of the Chinese Communist Party or to seize it in order to survive himself—hence, the cultural revolution.

The impulse to modernize the PLA as it was seen in the early 1950's was succinctly described by Lo Jung-huan, Director of the Political Department of the People's Liberation Army, on Army Day, 1 August 1955:

Our army has come to the new stage of military build-up along modern and regular lines. This is the highest stage in our army construction. . . . We have something brought over from the time of the Red Army. They were needed at that time. However, now that we have reached the higher stage we must, gradually and consciously, give up those things so as to make our army more centralized, unified and better disciplined. In other words, we must regularize our army. Any attempt to impede progress in this respect is harmful and disadvantageous to large-scale operations.

DIFFICULTIES ENCOUNTERED

Construction on these lines only proceeded for about a year after this statement before grave difficulties began to be encountered. These were very clearly set out by Tan Cheng—then Director of the Political Department but now purged—in a report which he delivered to the Eighth Plenary Session of the Chinese Communist Party. He criticized what he considered to be ill-advised efforts to modernize on the following grounds:

Disregard for traditional unity between officers and men, and between all superiors and subordinates, even among the officers.

Disregard for the functions that democracy has performed in the army with the result that political, military, and economic democracy were entirely overlooked.

Excessive stress on administrative orders, disregard for ideological work, failure to follow the mass line, divorce from reality, and separation from the masses on the part of the leadership.

Existence of impracticable dogmatism and formalism, and mechanical introduction of foreign experience in school education and troop training.

Estrangement of the army from the people, relations between local government and party organizations not so close as before, and utter disregard for the interests of the masses.

An inability of the national defense industry, even when supplemented by Soviet military and economic aid, to meet the requirements of a modern and regularized army because of the strained economy.

Tan Cheng replaced Lo Jung-huan in December 1956. Liu Po-cheng, Director of the General Training Department, was dismissed for "dogmatism in military affairs." Su Yu, one of the PLA's most brilliant staff officers, was removed in October 1958 for excessive inclination toward Soviet methods, and then came Peng Teh-hual who was succeeded by Lin Piao.

The latter has been torn between loyalty toward his mentor and supporter, Mao, and the more professional attitudes which he himself possessed toward army building. He has been obliged to go along with his chief on strictly pragmatic grounds because of the desperate shortages arising from industrial deficiencies.

Most students who have analyzed Lin's prospects after the demise of Mao have come to the conclusion that, while he is exceptionally gifted as an army commander, with a sure grasp of tactics and strategic planning, he is critically lacking in political flair of the kind that would enable him to survive the struggle of the Diadochi which might then be anticipated. That might throw up a "Red Bonaparte," or it could engender anarchy or perhaps invasion.

From the above, it can be seen that the immediate future is likely to be a period of rapid transition in the Chinese forces. It would be a mistake to assume that, although the regime has largely lost the popular support it commanded from 1937 until 1956, it does not represent a major threat to world security.

But the power base does not yet really exist, and people's war certainly cannot succeed if the people are alienated. There is an imbalance between what is still essentially a primitive force and some of its highly sophisticated equipment such as nuclear weapons and delivery systems. This will produce some surprises in strategic concepts unless these are carefully studied.

CIVIL-MILITARY FRICTION

The constant friction between the rulers and the ruled is plainly discernible within the power structure itself. It has always been difficult to demarcate the line of cleavage between areas of civil and military responsibility, and this is becoming daily more difficult in view of the persistent infiltration of the PLA into all walks of life.

However, at the center, the following factions can be identified: the Lin Piao faction of the People's Liberation Army; the cultural revolution group whose leaders are Chen Po-ta, Chiang Ching, and Yao Wen-yuan; a hard-line left group led by an extreme left or anarchist group; and the survivors of the Liu Shao-chi and Teng Hsiao-ping faction.

Chou En-lai, with his customary finesse and dexterity, has been able to remain on good terms with most factions and personalities, even when they themselves have been

diametrically opposed. He has, in fact, supplied an element of reason and stability during a situation which has often threatened the survival of order.

The PLA itself is also divided, and the fragments—which are still rather large—seem to conform to the following pattern:

The Lin Piao faction represents the "1st Front Red Army." Nieh Jung-jen and Yeh Chien-ying are adherents.

The Ho Lung faction represents the "2d Front Red Army."

The Hsu Hsiang-chien faction represents the "4th Front Red Army."

The Chen Yi faction. This is the "New 4th Army."

An independent faction exemplified by Chu Teh and Liu Pocheng.

The Purged faction. This last has been growing rapidly since the onset of the cultural revolution. Its first and most important representative was Peng Teh-huai. Examination shows that about 100 or more senior officers from the Peoples' Liberation Army Headquarters have been purged, and possibly about 300 from military regions and provincial appointments. It is not clear how many of these are still alive. Although they are not in a position to have much of a following, there is a considerable amount of military talent available which might, some day, bear arms against their former masters.

CONCEALED REVISIONISTS

The whole question of the purges is bound up with ideological matters, conflicts of loyalty, and the pathological suspicion of Mao. One aspect of the matter not often dealt with is the movement known as the "Three Check-Up" drive against concealed revisionists—that is, Soviet sympathizers or actual agents from among soldiers, intellectuals, or high-ranking cadres. A special committee to investigate suspected individuals has been set up.

What now are the prospects? Last year, there seemed to be a distinct probability that the deadly rivalry between Moscow and Peking would lead to war along their frontiers. But it seems that the death of Ho Chi-minh and his final posthumous exhortations brought Chou En-lai and Aleksei N. Kosygin together for a tense discussion which produced a breathing space at the cost of some concessions. These, the Chinese may be tempted to repudiate if and when they become stronger. There is little assurance that the respite will last.

One factor of disquiet in the situation is the knowledge, which must be plain to both Mao and Lin Piao, that their cause is, in any case, lost. The Red Sun which has been setting in the Forbidden City is paling now to twilight. Rather than go down in confusion and strife with their own kind, it may occur to these two that their performance might look better in the pages of history if they fought a last battle as patriots against a traditional foe.

WILL THE INSANE RULE THE WORLD?

(By Bruno Shaw)

(Note. The Kremlin rulers, for all the ruthlessness they have displayed against such weak nations as Poland, Finland, Hungary and Czechoslovakia, are not insane. They have shown no taste for playing nuclear roulette with the future of their nation and the world. The right course now is to engage them in arms control talks looking toward a halt in this mad race, not its extension.)

Contrary to what the Times says, the Kremlin rulers have shown a decided taste for playing nuclear roulette. They provided Red China with basic equipment and technicians for production of nuclear weapons; they placed nuclear warhead rockets on Cuba as a direct threat to the United States.

The record indicates, moreover, that the

Kremlin rulers are every bit as unstable as was Ivan the Terrible who 400 years ago massacred entire populations in areas of a hundred square miles at a time because of his nightmarish fantasies that somewhere among them were conspirators plotting against him.

Many nations of the world have, at one time or another, been ruled by leaders who were unquestionably paranoid, a form of insanity with several definite characteristics. First, the paranoid cannot abide criticism, and has so great a need to dominate that the notion of equality is intolerable. A second characteristic is a persecution complex—an all pervading suspicion that the world is against him. A third is an exaggeratedly high opinion of one's own importance or omniscience, with which a sense of humor is utterly incompatible. A fourth is false rumination over past events, which conjures up conspiracies by enemies for countless years. A fifth is its absolutely logical character, once its warped premises have been granted, which places all its megalomaniac references in systematic order to prove paranoid convictions. A sixth, and perhaps most important characteristic, is the device of projection—to charge others with conspiring to cause injury, thus giving the paranoid a perfect self-justification for attack.

Such paranoiacs, and there were many throughout history, from Attila, the terror of the world in the Fifth century, to Mao Tse-tung of our own time, whose thoughts are inspired revelation to 700 million Chinese, all had one thing in common: an insatiable drive to rule the entire world of their time.

Most school children have heard or read about the Roman emperor, Nero Claudius Caesar Augustus Germanicus, who lived in the first half of the first century, and who fiddled while Rome burned. To "fiddle while Rome burns" has since become a common phrase to describe procrastination in general and nothing more serious than that. But Nero, who was suspected of having set the city on fire himself, enjoyed watching the havoc and death he created and actually played the fiddle while others wept and died. Nero was a typical head of state of his time, a paranoiac who was constantly afraid of being murdered by those close to him a man who had no scruples about murdering his own mother, and who then, at age 31, on June 9, 68, committed suicide.

Nero's preoccupations with war and murder were child's play, however, compared with those of Caligula Gaius Caesar, two generations earlier. He was a monster of cruelty and vice. Statues of Roman gods were numerous throughout the city. Caligula had the heads of all of them chopped off and replaced by replicas of his own. He was to be the only god of the Romans, in marble as well as in life, a forerunner of what is now denounced by the Russians as "cult of personality" on the part of the Red Chinese leaders, and by the Red Chinese as "cult of personality" on the part of the Russians.

George III of England was on the way to losing the American colonies 12 years before Thomas Jefferson and his associates drafted the Declaration of Independence. In 1764 he was afflicted with a succession of illnesses: first melancholia, a state of extreme depression; then mania, a state of excessive mental activity and emotion; then complete breakdowns for period of many months, in which his subjects were told he was suffering from a cold. It was during one of these "colds" that the American colonies declared their independence from a king whose condition was considerably less than what was needed to cope rationally with such a situation.

Between those earlier times and World War I, known as the "war to end war", man's inhumanity to man was evidenced at frequent intervals in all four corners of the earth in local wars. The overthrow of imperial systems

of government in Europe spawned a host of power-hungry leaders, some of them quite as mad as the Romans of two millenniums before.

In due course we had World War II, brought about by men who were treated as rational human beings by the heads of other states, including our own. It was only after Hitler and Stalin were dead—Hitler in a suicide bunker in 1945 and Stalin a possible victim of palace intrigue in 1953—that the press of the world, again including our own, acknowledged that both were unbalanced.

These two men had one thing in common: each had publicly proclaimed his intentions to the world, Stalin in his book *Problems of Leninism* and Hitler in his *Mein Kampf*; but the world refused to believe them. In addition, at this time there was Premier Baron Biichi Tanaka of Japan, whose Tanaka Memorial to his emperor was a detailed blueprint of Japan's plan to conquer the world, beginning with an attack on the United States, but no one paid heed to that one.

It is also a sad commentary on foreign correspondents of American news media who had spent many years in Germany, Russia and Japan, that they never once called a spade a spade—never once described Stalin, Hitler, General Araki of Japan as the monsters they were. Not until they were dead. In an article in the *New York Times* of September 15, 1968, *Times* reporter Harrison Salisbury, who had spent ten years in Russia, some of them in Stalin's time, had this to say: "The Concept of the world as a prison comes naturally to a Russian—his world is a prison. So it was under the Czars. So it quickly became again in the flabby white hands of the paranoid Josef Stalin." And in the *New York Times Magazine* of August 10, 1969, *Times* reporter Henry Kamm, recently returned from the Soviet Union after two years there as the *Times'* Moscow bureau chief, used even stronger language. Describing how Nikita Khrushchev denounced his late boss, Josef Stalin, at the Soviet Communist Party Congress in Moscow in 1956, Kamm said that this marked "the first time that the Soviet Communist Party, the absolute and infallible guardian of the revealed truth by which 240 million Soviet citizens must pretend to live, confessed to the world that for three-quarters of the period of Soviet rule, that rule had been exercised by a megalomaniac madman." Now they tell us.

In the present decade, Communist China's rulers claim the right of apostolic succession to Lenin as true disciples of Marxism, and they are embarked on a crusade to bring Communism to all peoples of the world by means of violence, subversion, and terror. Mao Tse-tung has declared, and the Chinese Communist Party has affirmed, "China's revolution is part of the world revolution" and "the heroes of the colonies and semi-colonies have to stand either on the imperialist front and play a role in the world counter-revolution, or on the anti-imperialist front and play a role in the world revolution. They must choose one of the two. There is not a third road."

Mao Tse-tung, in his *Selected Works*, which is to the Communist Chinese what Hitler's *Mein Kampf* was to Nazi Germany, outlines the Red Chinese program for remolding man and his environment in two successive stages: first, remolding the minds of China's 700 million people by compulsion until they become docile instruments for the execution of his master plan; and second, employing this tremendous force in a crusade to remold the minds and lives of all mankind.

During the Hitler rule of Nazi Germany, many of America's leading industrialists and political conservatives praised him unrestrainedly. "You could do business with Hitler." No action was ever taken by any responsible segment of our community to urge

international action which could have stopped both Hitler and Stalin in their tracks.

Now we are confronted with the fact that Mao Tse-tung is unquestionably unbalanced, as were Stalin and Hitler. But, as with Stalin and Hitler, few in the non-Communist world have dared to breathe a word of it. On the contrary, we are being pressured by leaders in the academic world and in the Congress of the United States to repeat precisely the same error that was made with Russia and Nazi Germany—to destroy us, and to bring Red China into the United Nations so as to destroy that organization as well.

The challenge that confronts the non-Communist world today is this: When dealing with a paranoiac who is in possession of thermonuclear weapons and a missile system capable of delivering them across the seas, can the fact that we have a preponderance of such weapons act as a deterrent? The answer unquestionably is: In confrontation with such a leader, our preponderance of supply of these weapons of vast destruction would have no deterrent value whatever. And the corollary to that should be: Isn't it high time for the non-Communist world to awake from the euphoria it has talked itself into, and act in a manner that will keep it from becoming a contributor to its own destruction.

Lord Bertrand Russell, now age 97, is a mathematician and philosopher of great renown whose views now are dismissed by some Americans as "senile" because of his violent criticism of United States action in Vietnam.

It has been Bertrand Russell's fear, ever since the first explosion of an atom bomb, that scientists had created an instrument of such vast destruction as to lead to the complete extinction of the human race. And this, he believes, must be prevented at all costs. But on the way to arriving at this point of view, he has switched trains, as he puts it, quite often.

On March 8, 1958, in response to an inquiry about his stand on peace and war, Lord Russell gave his views on the kind of people he deems to be insane. He wrote, in a letter I have before me: "I have pursued one consistent purpose, namely, to prevent all-out nuclear war in which both sides possess nuclear weapons. At one time there was one method by which this could be achieved; at another, another. There was no more inconsistency than there is when a man gets out of a train after an accident because the train is not going to reach its intended destination. If it can be secured that only the U.S. and the U.S.S.R. have nuclear weapons, I favor negotiations between them for abolition of nuclear weapons by both sides. I do hold, however, that, if negotiations prove futile and no alternatives remain except Communist domination or extinction of the human race, the former alternative is the lesser of the two evils. As for your accusation that the policy I have advocated has changed from time to time: It has changed as circumstances have changed. To achieve a single purpose, sane men adapt their policies to the circumstances. Those who do not are insane."

What we will have to learn, if we are to avoid either of the calamities Bertrand Russell envisions for us, is to learn from history. What the Red Chinese call their Cultural Revolution is a form of behavior which parallels that of Nazi Germany. It is unmistakable in the colossal Red China pagentries in which hundreds of thousands participate, in massive seas of humanity bearing thousands of portraits of Mao Tse-tung, waving the Little Red Book of the "thoughts of Mao Tse-tung" and chanting verses from it. Screaming in unison at the now rare appearances of their Chinese Fuhrer, they display a frightening collective response to their leader's thirst for adulation.

Demand for appeasement of the threat of Red China is a repetition, in almost precisely the same terms, of the arguments that were advanced for the appeasement of Nazi Germany in the 1930's. "You cannot ignore 60 million German people; Nazi Germany will calm down if it is given a chance to become a member of the international community." And so Nazi Germany was invited to join the League of Nations. It did so. And it went on its beserk rampage with the help of its self-deluded victims, ourselves among them. Now we are being told, "You can't ignore 700 million Chinese. . . ." and so on, and so on.

Do we have to prove once again in our time what the German philosopher Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel, wrote a century and a half ago?: "Peoples and governments never have learned anything from history, or acted on principles deduced from it."

I hope not.

LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

HON. WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 10, 1971

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the month of February is a very important period in the lives of Americans of Lithuanian descent. In February 1251, Mindaugas the Great, unified all the principalities into one great kingdom.

Fifty-three years ago on February 16, 1918, the Republic of Lithuania was established. The Lithuanian Independence Day contains no note of joy, no jubilant tone of achievement and victory. Instead, the independence of Lithuania has been lost and survives only as a captive nation behind the Iron Curtain.

The Soviets took over Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia by force of arms in June 1940.

The short period of independence, during which the nation flourished, saw progress in all areas—land reform was instituted, industries reestablished, transportation facilities expanded, social legislation enacted and educational institutions enlarged. In short, Lithuania was established and functioned as a democracy such as the United States. The people were happy and content with their freedom.

This new independence was to last only 22 years until the life of this proud nation was snuffed out in 1940 and the area integrated into the Soviet Russian Empire.

Only the people in Lithuania know the heartaches and the suffering which they have endured since they have been unlawfully and illegally subjugated by the Communist regime in Moscow.

Let us hope that soon the Lithuanians will again witness the restoration of their great nation and enjoy once more the freedom and independence of a democracy.

The Lithuanian-American organizations deserve our support in commemorating these anniversaries during this month.

DISABILITY INSURANCE FOR THE BLIND

HON. JAMES A. BURKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 10, 1971

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, on January 22, 1971, I reintroduced the disability insurance for the blind bill, H.R. 1240, legislation to liberalize the conditions governing eligibility of blind persons to receive disability insurance benefits thereunder.

And, I believe, Mr. Speaker, this measure only needs a few words of reminder about it, for it is already so well known in this Chamber.

In the 91st Congress, I introduced H.R. 3782, the disability insurance for the blind bill, and during the following months, 159 of our colleagues in the House introduced measures identical to H.R. 3782.

Again I invite the cosponsors of this bill in the last Congress to join with me and introduce measures identical to my bill, H.R. 1240.

I also invite and urge those Members who did not cosponsor the disability insurance for the blind bill in the last Congress to do so in this one, for this is greatly needed legislation and, I am convinced, an indication of overwhelming House support will assure Ways and Means Committee acceptance of this measure in the present Congress.

When Senator HARTKE introduced a bill identical to H.R. 3782 in the U.S. Senate in the 91st Congress, he was joined by 68 cosponsoring Senators.

You will see from this, Mr. Speaker, that 229 Members of the 91st Congress unequivocally expressed their support of my bill to make Federal disability insurance more readily available to more blind persons.

And although the Ways and Means Committee did not adopt the provisions of H.R. 3782 when it considered social security matters in the 91st Congress, the Finance Committee of the Senate did act to incorporate these beneficial-for-the-blind provisions in the Senate-approved version of H.R. 17550.

Mr. Speaker, this was the fourth time the disability insurance for the blind bill has received the endorsement of the Senate.

But since the 91st Congress adjourned without finally acting upon a social security bill, we must start afresh and I have done this by putting the disability insurance for the blind bill back in the House "hopper."

Mr. Speaker, the disability insurance for the blind bill would liberalize disability insurance for blind people.

It would allow blind people to qualify for benefit payments after working six quarters anytime earned in social security-covered work rather than the present 20 of the last 40 quarters.

H.R. 1240 would also waive the present earnings test for blind people, and it would allow them to draw disability

payments so long as they remain blind and regardless of the amount of their earnings. Now, earnings as little as \$70 a month or as much as \$140 a month will disqualify a blind person from receiving disability benefit payments.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1240 is intended to equalize the economic disadvantages of blindness in a sighted world, by providing a regular source of funds that the blind may use to buy sight, because, as you must know, whatever the blind may do, however able and accomplished they may be, they must have sight available to them if they are to function at all.

Mr. Speaker, for a more definitive justification and explanation of H.R. 1240, I ask unanimous consent that, following these remarks, there be printed a fact sheet with reference to H.R. 1240.

The fact sheet follows:

IMPROVED DISABILITY INSURANCE FOR THE BLIND

A bill to amend Title II of the Social Security Act so as to liberalize the conditions governing eligibility of blind persons to receive disability insurance benefits thereunder.

HISTORY

Offered in 88th Congress by Senator Hubert Humphrey as floor amendment to H.R. 11865 (Social Security bill); adopted by voice vote without a dissent, lost when Social Security Conference ended in deadlock.

Offered in 89th Congress by Senator Vance Hartke, as S. 1787; 41 co-sponsors; adopted as floor amendment to H.R. 6675 by 78 to 11 roll call vote.

Offered in 90th Congress by Senator Vance Hartke, as S. 1681, 57 co-sponsors, including nine of the 17 member Committee on Finance; adopted by Committee on Finance as amendment to H.R. 1280; one provision approved definition of blindness (20/200, etc.) the standard for visual loss under the Disability Insurance Program.

Offered in the 91st Congress in the Senate by Senator Vance Hartke, as S. 2518, 68 co-sponsors including nine of the 17-member Committee on Finance; adopted by Committee on Finance as amendment to H.R. 17550; offered in the House by Congressman James A. Burke, as H.R. 3782 (identical to S. 2518), 160 co-sponsors including eleven of the 25 member Ways and Means Committee; offered in the Ways and Means Committee by Congressman Burke; Committee adopted liberalizing eligibility proposal of H.R. 3782; no further action since House-Senate Conference on Social Security matters was not held.

PROVISIONS

Allows qualification for disability benefits under the above definition if the blind person has worked six quarters in Social Security-covered work, rather than twenty of the last forty quarters as presently required to be eligible, as in all other disabilities; continuation of benefits irrespective of earnings so long as blindness lasts, rather than cutting off benefits if the blind person earns as little as \$140 a month as provided in existing law.

WHAT CHANGES WOULD DO

The Disability Insurance for the Blind bill would transform the Disability Insurance Program providing only subsistence income to long-time employed but presently unemployable blind persons into a system providing short-term employed blind persons with insurance income to off-set the economic consequences of blindness—diminished earning power, greatly diminished employment opportunities, greatly increased costs of living and working, blind, in a sight-oriented economy and society.

WHY CHANGES NEEDED

To many blind persons, able to work, although blind, but unable to secure work because they are blind—or unable to secure work of long and steady duration, because they are blind—to these people the requirement of employment for a year and a half in Social Security-covered work, instead of the five of the last ten year requirement in existing law, is much more realistic and reasonable under the special and adverse circumstances facing blind persons.

It is much more realistic, when considering the misinformed or uninformed attitudes, the adverse and prejudicial practices which confront blind people when they seek work, when they are skilled and able to operate successfully with blindness, when they are qualified by talent and training for work, yet, are not hired because they are believed to be incompetent and incapable.

Making disability insurance payments available when a blind person has worked six quarters in Social Security-covered work is much more reasonable than the five years' requirement, for it would make such payments more readily available to more persons when the disaster of blindness occurs, when the need for the security provided by regularly received disability insurance payments is greatest in a workingman's life.

This bill recognizes that a person who tries to function, sightless, in our sight-structured world, functions at a financial disadvantage.

For whatever a blind man would do, whatever employment or activity he would pursue, he has the need for sight to assist him.

So the blind person who would function self-dependently, the blind person who would earn a living, who would live self-responsibly, must not only pay the usual daily living costs which his sighted fellows pay, but he must also pay the extra, the burdening expenses of blindness—the expenses incurred in hiring sight.

By allowing a blind person to draw disability insurance payments so long as he continues blind and irrespective of his earnings, this bill would provide to such blind person, a regular source of funds to pay for sight, and it would thus help to reduce the economic disadvantages and inequalities of blindness in his life.

REORDERING OUR NATIONAL PRIORITIES

HON. VICTOR V. VEYSEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 10, 1971

Mr. VEYSEY. Mr. Speaker, in reading the President's budget message, one is again reminded of the tremendous impact the Nixon administration has had in reordering our national priorities.

It was a very great achievement for the administration that in last year's budget, more money was allocated for human resource programs than for defense programs. That was the reversal of an imbalance that existed for 20 years. I am heartened to note that while defense spending will increase in this year's budget, it will still be considerably less than what America spends for domestic concerns.

In this year's budget we see a further careful rethinking of national priorities in the President's proposals for multi-level spending programs. The administration has taken a sound, pragmatic

course. Where a need can be best met by national administration, such as welfare, the President has allocated that function to the Federal Government. But in many other cases, where problems can be better answered at the State and local levels, the President has asked that funds be returned directly to those levels of government.

This is a reasoned approach to government which should have the full support of the American public as well as the Congress.

MEMBERS SHOULD TAKE NOTE OF A BAD PRECEDENT

HON. BILL CHAPPELL, JR.

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 10, 1971

Mr. CHAPPELL. Mr. Speaker, the President recently took upon himself the decision to halt, in a state of midconstruction, a public works project lying mostly within my district.

This precedent should be a warning to every Member of this body since, if the action he took with regard to the Cross-Florida Barge Canal goes without notice by this House, no program in any congressional district is immune to this kind of action.

The President's decision was made without consultation with me or with any Member of any of the public bodies involved. The decision to halt this project has left my district and my State in serious difficulty and I will discuss these difficulties in any effort to point up what this kind of decision can lead to and to alert every Member of Congress to the trend to chop projects off without notice or forethought.

It has taken 175 years and more than 60 studies to reach the present State of Cross-Florida Canal project.

And where are we?

To put it bluntly, we are in a mess.

It was in March 1826, that the first study of a proposed canal was authorized by the Congress. In fits and starts, work and planning on a canal of sorts has been going on since that time, and in earnest on the present barge canal since February 1964.

That is, until January 19, 1971, when, by Presidential edict, the project was terminated.

This action by the President has given rise to problems which even the earliest proponents and opponents of a canal could not have foreseen: Legal battles over ownership of the land; potential floods which could devastate large portions of some mid-Florida counties; \$12 million in State and local tax money down the drain; more than \$50 million in Federal tax money wasted; the wilderness of the Oklawaha River was replaced by cabins, camps, and housing developments; an open wound stretching almost the entire girth of Florida for years; contracts between governmental agencies broken; facilities built by the taxpayers now going to waste; half completed bridges and camp sites; highways torn

up with repairs questionable in the foreseeable future.

These are just a few of the problems which now must be solved if the people of Florida are not to be witness to one of the most significant ecological and financial disasters of our time.

First, but perhaps not foremost of the problems is that of the legal status of the almost 60,000 acres of land acquired for canal construction.

Much of the land was taken by condemnation proceedings for the express purpose of building a barge canal. If the canal is not now to be completed, there is a serious legal question that the original owners may now have a right to reclaim their land, including any lake or other structure which now may be on that land.

Of the 60,000 acres, only about 14,000 are held by the Federal Government. The remainder is in the hands of the Canal Authority, a State-created agency charged with acquiring land for canal purposes. A legal question also arises over the right of the authority to now further convey any land to the Federal Government even for recreational purposes if the original purpose of the land acquisition—a canal—is not to be carried out.

Certainly one of the most immediate and prime considerations is that of flooding.

Massive works projects such as Four River Basins and Southwest Water Management are underway in other parts of the State and, although not directly related to the canal construction, are dependent on the canal or some other waterway to carry floodwaters away from heavily populated areas in Lake, Marion, and Orange Counties and to help protect the soon-to-be-opened Disney World complex.

As the canal project now stands, according to the Corps of Engineers, there are two choices available: They can either have a flood south of the Moss Bluff Dam south of Silver Springs on the Oklawaha River; or they can have a flood to the north of the Moss Bluff Dam.

Neither the river nor the surrounding lake system can possibly handle the floodwaters unless a great deal of work is done to deepen and widen the Oklawaha or unless a canal is constructed parallel to the river to carry water.

Of direct concern to everyone in Florida is the matter of the \$7 million in tax money already appropriated for land acquisition and the \$7.4 million in county tax moneys collected for this purpose. To date, nearly \$12.6 million has been spent, with part of the land turned over to the Federal Government and status of the rest in legal doubt.

With a legal cloud hanging over the ownership of the land, the specter of original owners' reclaiming their land along the lakes and the Oklawaha River is a very real possibility. If this happens, there is every reason to predict a boom in the construction of cabins, commercial establishments, housing developments, and increased pollution along the river which everyone seeks to protect.

How this debauching of the river right-of-way could be prevented is difficult to say at this point since the Federal Government does not own the land and the Canal Authority's right to it is under question because of the abandonment of the land for the purpose for which it was taken.

If, as has been predicted, the legal snarl continues for years, the scar which remains across our State would remain, and possibly grow worse with erosion, with no one's having clear authority to go in and do anything about it. Bridge pilings, barren of a completed span, probably will remain until legal title to the land is settled. Highway detours circumventing bridge and other construction would remain with continuing hazards to motorists.

In addition to the aforementioned structures, others will remain useless, at least from a canal usage point of view. The city of Sanford built a port facility, Putnam County's voters bonded themselves to build barge port facilities. Levy County voted to initiate port construction. What now is to become of these facilities, built solely on the word of the Federal Government that a canal would be constructed to serve them?

Not of direct interest to the taxpayers and ecologists is the question of the right of the President to repeal laws, such as the laws authorizing and appropriating money for the canal, which were passed by Congress and signed by President Nixon and his predecessors.

This is a question which may well find itself in the courts, but as of now, the question of congressional authority to pass a law with the expectation that the law be obeyed by everyone including the President of the United States is a serious matter which must be answered.

Regardless of how one feels about the construction of the canal, facts now are becoming glaringly apparent which President Nixon either did not consider or were not made available for him to consider when he was making his decision to stop the Barge Canal in its present state.

I, and many Members of Congress, have been attempting to get these facts before the President, thus far without success.

Prior to the Nixon announcement shutting down the work on the canal, several Florida Congressmen requested an audience with the President and the agencies involved to discuss the ramifications of a halt to work and to inspect data the President was using to reach a decision.

It was not until January 22, 3 days after the Presidential edict, that Florida's representatives were able to meet with anyone representing the President. That meeting was attended by members of the Council on Environmental Quality, the Corps of Engineers, and an assistant to the President.

The meeting came to nothing except that those representing the Federal Government conceded that the problems of wasted money, flood dangers, and continuing pollution of the Oklawaha were details which had to be considered. No engineering or other information was

made available to the Congressmen either at that meeting or since.

Speaking on behalf of the President, Clark McGregor stated that the President maintains an open mind on the canal.

Taking McGregor at his word, the Florida delegation next requested a meeting with the Council on Environmental Quality to discuss alternatives to the chaos which now exists.

It was at this second meeting that Russell Train, a member of the Council, said that the President's mind was made up—that the decision has been made.

Protesting that the initial decision had been made without consultation with the Florida congressional delegation, the Canal Authority, the Corps of Engineers, or appropriate State agencies, I and others asked that we be consulted on future discussions regarding the future of the area.

Also mentioned were alternatives to the present dangerous situation.

In an effort to save the remaining untouched portions of the Oklawaha River, it was suggested that an alternate route to the west of the river be considered.

Another alternative is for the Federal Government to move into the area and embark on a massive land acquisition program along the river's route.

This acquisition, if successful, could then be used as the basis for a controlled management area along the river to be joined with the nearly half-million acre Ocala National Forest.

Unless action is taken and taken soon, the aims of those who would save the Oklawaha will be in vain and we will see instead, devastating floods, commercial development along a wild river, and the skeletons of dams, locks, dikes, and bridges, which, for years to come, will be a reminder to Florida and the Nation that decisions, hastily made based on incomplete or ignored information, may well be decision that those for, and those against the canal, will live to regret.

DWANE L. WALLACE: KANSAN OF THE YEAR

HON. GARNER E. SHRIVER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 10, 1971

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, Dwane L. Wallace, one of the Nation's distinguished aviation leaders, recently was honored as "Kansan of the Year" by the Native Sons and Daughters of Kansas in Topeka, Kans. It was most deserved and long-overdue recognition for Mr. Wallace who is chairman of the board and past president of the Cessna Aircraft Co. of Wichita, Kans.

Mr. Wallace has been instrumental in making Kansas the world leader in private aircraft production and establishing his hometown of Wichita as the "Air Capital of the Nation." His aviation career was started by an airplane ride in 1921 with his uncle, Clyde V. Cessna, founder of Cessna Aircraft Co.

Today Cessna is one of the leaders in general aviation and in addition to its

internationally recognized private airplane production, the company has served the Nation as a responsible defense contractor.

Dwane Wallace has not limited his leadership and interest to aviation. He is a mover and leader in the community and the State, and has given his time willingly in behalf of our Nation.

Under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Hutchinson (Kans.) News concerning the honor accorded Dwane Wallace by his fellow Kansans:

[From the Hutchinson (Kans.) News, Feb. 4, 1971]

KANSAN OF THE YEAR

It came as a mild surprise that Dwane L. Wallace, board chairman of the Cessna Aircraft Co., was named "Kansan of the Year" by the Native Sons and Daughters at their annual get-together in Topeka last week.

Not that the title is not richly deserved. Far from it.

It's just that Dwane has become such a figure on the Kansas scene, the recipient of recognition at home and abroad, that one assumed he had at one time or another been named Kansan of the Year.

He has now, and that was one welcome note of the Kansas Day festivities.

Wallace is a nephew of Clyde V. Cessna, one of the Kansas pioneers in aviation. He studied engineering at Wichita U. He became Cessna's president in 1936, and began the long career of guiding the company to eminence in airplane and industrial manufacturing.

He also became a leader in civic pursuits, in industrial relation programs, in state booster efforts.

And he remains a Kansan. It was an apt recognition, if perhaps overdue, by the Native Sons and Daughters.

HEROIC YOUTH HELP SAVE HISTORIC DISTRICT IN BOSTON'S NORTH END

HON. LOUISE D. HICKS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 10, 1971

Mrs. HICKS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, in the north end section of Boston on Monday, February 1 and into February 2, a five-alarm fire raged in this historic district.

The serious magnitude of the events of these days which left hundreds of north end families homeless, was fully brought to bear with the designation of the section as a disaster area by the Small Business Administration.

Due to the heroic efforts by the youth of the north end in assisting the Boston Fire Department, there was no loss of life. This instinctive action by the young men of the district, clearly determined their deep concern for their neighbors.

Despite adverse weather conditions, these outstanding young men performed bravely as they helped move firelines and aided the police in keeping curiosity-seekers from hampering the efforts of the firemen in the performance of their duty.

The self-sacrificing efforts by the youth of the north end should serve as an inspiration to all the citizens of Boston.

"PUBLIC SERVICE STRIKES A BARBAROUS WAY OF SETTLING ECONOMIC CONFLICTS"

HON. SHERMAN P. LLOYD

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 10, 1971

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, a recent editorial in Newsweek written by Henry C. Wallich included a statement:

In the long run strikes—and surely public-service strikes—increasingly will come to be viewed as a barbarous way of settling economic conflicts.

This Congress has the increased responsibility of representing the public interest in achieving objectives which will help to bring an end to the disastrous consequences of nationwide strikes.

Mr. Wallich has suggested consideration of a no strike contract. Regardless of the objections to and controversial nature of any consideration of such an idea, it is significant to note the presentation of the subject for general discussion, and I submit it here for wider readership and consideration.

A NO-STRIKE CONTRACT

(By Henry C. Wallich)

"Job action," and strikes in essential public services are manifestations of an economically sick society. The disease is inflation. New York firemen and policemen lack social responsibility no more than anyone else does. But inflation makes everybody feel that he was robbed. Those who can are then tempted to go out and rob others the same way, at the gunpoint of denial of some vital service.

A real cure of this form of economic civil war can come only from ending inflation. To urge permissiveness with respect to inflation creates social tensions much as other forms of permissiveness do. The cure can be speeded, however, and maintenance of essential services better assured by finding a way to immunize the suppliers of these services against inflation. Simply to outlaw firemen's and police strikes is of questionable fairness and, what may be more immediately relevant, ineffective. The public does not regard the breach of a no-strike law as a criminal offense, and rightly so. In jail every striker becomes a hero. This is one of those cases where the carrot is more powerful than the stick.

THE OFFER

The particular carrot that I have to offer is a contract that would guarantee the employee full protection against inflation, plus increases in real income equal to nationwide productivity gains. For instance, with inflation at 5 per cent and productivity gains at 3 per cent, the annual increase would come to 8 per cent. There would be a no-strike pledge, with financial penalties on the union for violation. Differences of interpretation, unforeseeable events, and matters like work rules and conditions would be subject to negotiation, with compulsory arbitration.

If one were to propose this no-strike deal to one of New York's Finest, would he have reason to jump at it? If he had taken economics at night school he would see that he was being offered exactly what an average American can expect to get from his economy. His income would rise with the growth, per capita, of the economy, no more, no less. Nobody could call that a bad deal, particularly since it removes the risk of doing worse. But an aggressive man might think that he, or his union, could do better.

To justify surrender of the right to strike—which New York's Finest supposedly don't have—an additional sweetener may be needed. Upon signing the agreement, the employees might get a once-and-for-all increase. They would be raised relative to the average American income. Subsequent increases would maintain that differential. A sufficiently large sweetener would bring everybody on board.

I do not see this contract as a solution for all eternity. It would freeze the income status of the group involved, relative to the rest of labor force. Eventually that could make it difficult to attract enough and the right kind of men into the job. But the contract provides a means of getting by in a time of inflation. It would take one group of employees, and a very crucial one, out of the battle for dollar survival. It would de-escalate the rhetoric, and reduce the pitch of conflict.

TO DEFUSE STRIKES

But the proposal has more to offer than that. In the long run, strikes—and surely public-service strikes—increasingly will come to be viewed as a barbarous way of settling economic conflicts. A battle like that between GM and the UAW some day will be viewed like the trial by combat of the Middle Ages. It is becoming increasingly clear that the ability of company or union to beat the other to the ground and so to impose a low or high settlement has very little to do with the economics of an appropriate settlement. The wage-and-price guideposts of Presidents Kennedy and Johnson, whatever their defects, have made clear to all that wage settlements should not be based on a company's ability to pay. Such profit-based settlements lead to wide wage differentials among industries. These then lead to further demands on grounds of equity, and so spiraling on ad infinitum.

Differences in profitability among industries should lead to appropriate price cuts and increases. The "ability to pay" of high-profit companies should be used to the benefit of all. Strikes and big wage hikes merely divert this margin away from the stockholders to another small group. The guidepost philosophy, which seems to be experiencing a revival, undercuts the logic of strikes. The "no-strike" contract I am proposing, which is an application of the guidepost principle, works in the same direction.

NIXON ADMINISTRATION IS A DIFFERENT ADMINISTRATION TODAY THAN IT WAS ONLY 1 MONTH AGO

HON. SAMUEL L. DEVINE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 10, 1971

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, toward the end of last year there were a great many assessments of the accomplishments of the Nixon administration at the halfway mark. I cannot help thinking that these 2-year evaluations came about a month too early because in the wake of the President's state of the Union and budget messages, the Nixon administration must be viewed in an entirely different light.

When President Nixon took office he was faced with two critical problems: ending a war and ending an inflation caused largely by Democrat handling of that war. These were monumental problems and the President devoted his full

attention to them. He has now succeeded in bringing about an end to both these crises which were draining America's resources and her spirit.

Now the President has turned the attention of this country to its domestic problems. The six great goals which the President outlines in his state of the Union message and expanded in detail in his budget message, would treat a very broad spectrum of our country's domestic ills. If accepted by the Congress, they would provide a highly desirable change in our domestic policy, much the same as the President has turned around our foreign policy.

In short, the Nixon administration must be viewed as a very different administration today than it was only a month ago.

THE CHICKEN LICKEN SYNDROME

HON. GEORGE A. GOODLING

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 10, 1971

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, somehow, somebody got hold of the dismal theme of "what is wrong with us today" and whipped it up into something approximating national hysteria.

The time has come for us to give serious consideration to escaping from this suffocating fog of gloom, and in this respect a talk delivered in July of last year by Mr. Thomas R. Shepard, Jr., publisher of *Look* magazine, provides a giant assist. It does this by pulling the "what is wrong" veil from the face of true facts and, in the process, reveals quite convincingly that there is a lot that is right with things all about us today.

Because Mr. Shepard's talk is uplifting and encouraging, I insert it in the *RECORD* and commend it to the attention of my colleagues:

THE CHICKEN LICKEN SYNDROME

Ladies and gentlemen: One day, as Chicken Licken was walking through the woods, an acorn fell on her head.

"Dear me," she thought, "the sky is falling. I must go and tell the king."

So Chicken Licken hurried off to tell the king that the sky was falling. On her way she met Henny Penny.

"Where are you going, Chicken Licken?" asked Henny Penny.

"The sky is falling and I am going to tell the king," said Chicken Licken. "You come too."

So Henny Penny and Chicken Licken hurried on together. Soon they met Cocky Locky.

"Where are you going, Chicken Licken and Henny Penny?" asked Cocky Locky.

"The sky is falling and we are going to tell the king," said Henny Penny. "You come too."

So Henny Penny and Chicken Licken and Cocky Locky hurried on together. Soon they met Drakey Lakey . . .

Well, I don't want to keep you on the edge of your seats, so I'll condense the rest of the story. It seems that Chicken Licken and her hysterical friends, including a couple of late-comers named Goosey Loosey and Turkey Lurkey, kept running through the forest shouting that the sky was falling until they encountered a cool, level-headed chap by the name of Foxy Loxy who, taking advantage of the general panic, ate them all up.

I cite this harrowing tale of barnyard ecology because I believe it is relevant to the socio-economic outlook for the Nineteen Seventies, which is the subject of my talk here today.

I happen to be very optimistic about this new decade—and the decades to come—but I keep bumping into people who do not share my enthusiasm. They seem gloomy and disheartened, and I think I know why.

In recent years, several acorns have fallen on the citizens of the United States—in the form of inflation and the war in Vietnam and racial and campus unrest—and suddenly all of the bird-brained Chicken Lickens from coast to coast have come waddling out of their henhouses to cackle about impending disaster. This could have its amusing aspect but, unfortunately, some of us are beginning to listen to these crapehangers and to have doubts about ourselves and this great nation of ours.

Well, I say it's time to stop listening and to start setting the record straight. Today, I would like to launch—in the argot of the day—a "Hell no, the sky is *not* falling" movement. And I would like to do it by spotlighting the various types of Chicken Lickens who, in fainthearted innocence or by despicable design, are spreading the poisons of doubt and doom and despair. And I want to tell you *why* these alarmists are as misinformed as they are misleading.

Perhaps if we get to know them better, we can laugh them out of existence—or at least off the airwaves and out of the pages of our newspapers and magazines.

First of all, there is the Ecological Chicken Licken. He is very much like his nursery-story prototype, since he, too, sees catastrophe in the sky. Only to him, the sky is not falling; it's just so full of noxious fumes that pretty soon none of us will have enough oxygen to breathe and we'll all turn blue and expire. And along with that terrible gunk in the air, he keeps moaning, there is also the frightful glop in the water and, if by some miracle, we survive the shortage of oxygen, we shall most certainly succumb to galloping dehydration. That is, if the DDT's don't get us first.

Well, there is a word for this kind of talk, but I don't use words like that, so I'll simply resort to the facts. Take the oxygen scare first. If you listen to the Ecological Chicken Licken, you get the impression that gradually, over the past century or so, the air around us has become less and less inhalable until today we stand on the brink of oxygen starvation.

One trouble with this particular brand of Chicken-Lickenism is that it isn't true. The National Science Foundation recently collected seventy-eight samples of air at different sites around the world and compared them with analysis reports for air samples taken sixty years ago. And what do you know . . . there is precisely the same amount of oxygen in the air today as there was in 1910—twenty point nine four six per cent by volume.

Furthermore—and I quote now from *The New York Times*—"the scientists announced that man's burning of coal, oil and gas would not have any appreciable effect on the world oxygen supply *even if all of the known reserves of these fuels were to be consumed.*" End of quote.

But what about those nasty pollutants in the air—things like carbon monoxide and sulfur dioxide? Well, there is no denying that in some communities the incidence of these elements has increased over the past few years. Pollutant ratios always fluctuate. But it is equally true that in many other communities, including some of our biggest cities, the amount of pollutants in the air is actually on the decrease.

The most notoriously air-polluted city of all—Pittsburgh—has very much *cleaner* air today than it once had. And New York City,

despite all of the negative publicity, also has substantially *less* air pollution. In the past five years, the average amount of sulfur dioxide in the New York atmosphere has dropped from over two-tenths of a part per million to less than one-tenth, while carbon monoxide concentration has fallen from four parts per million to about three-and-a-half. Both indexes are well below the levels that constitute a health hazard.

And just as we're not going to run out of breathable air, we're not running out of drinkable water either. Ironically, the credit for this must go to the inventors and manufacturers so despised by the Ecological Chicken Lickens.

Years ago, science and industry, working together, conquered that ancient scourge of water drinkers: typhoid fever. Today, science and industry—through desalinization processes and sewage treatment—are making sure that we'll always have enough pure water to drink.

Even the fish will survive—despite the dire predictions of the Chicken Lickens. The fear-mongers kept telling us that hot water discharged into lakes and rivers by factories was killing fish. So scientists from the University of Georgia investigated. They studied the effects of one billion gallons of one-hundred-and-fifteen-degree water pumped daily into a lake in South Carolina. What did all of that hot water do to the fish? According to the scientists, it made them *healthier*. The largemouth bass in the lake are bigger and mature earlier and live longer and lay more eggs than their counterparts in nearby lakes that don't have the benefit of hot water.

These findings, incidentally, have been confirmed by scientists at Johns Hopkins University, who announced that—quote—"The population, size and condition of fish in zones affected by hot water appear to be equal to or better than those in unaffected areas." End of quote.

So apparently even the fish will make it. But don't expect the doom-peddlers to calm down. As soon as one of their fears is proved groundless, they always come up with another—even more terrifying.

I recall vividly one chilling forecast of the Ecological Chicken Lickens back in the Nineteen Thirties and Forties. The earth was getting colder, they said. It was getting so cold that glaciers were coming back and would soon cover much of the Northern Hemisphere.

Well, that shook me up. I mean, who wants a glacier on top of his house?

But then, in the Nineteen Fifties, there was an abrupt about-face by the Chicken Lickens. The earth wasn't getting colder after all, they said. It was getting *warmer*. In fact, it was getting so much warmer that the polar ice caps were about to melt, which would cause the oceans to rise and flood the seacoasts and pretty soon we would have to do our surfing in places like Topeka and Albuquerque.

But just when I had resigned myself to a parboiled and water-soaked future, the Chicken Lickens did another flipflop this past year and said they had been right in the first place. The earth is really getting colder. What's doing it is all this air pollution, they explained. It's setting up a shield that keeps the sun's rays from getting through to us. So once again, folks, here come those glaciers.

And if the glaciers don't get you, we're told in all seriousness, old DDT certainly will. I confess to being puzzled by the present uproar about DDT. The most devout critics admit that this insecticide, by helping farmers raise bumper crops, has—since its first commercial use in 1939—saved the lives of as many as one billion human beings who might otherwise have starved to death. And by wiping out malaria in many parts of the world, it has saved other hundreds of millions. Meanwhile, it has not—to my knowl-

edge-killed a single person, except in isolated instances of accidental misuse. It has killed some fish, yes. Some birds, possibly. But no people. Still, the Ecological Chicken Lickens, who say they care more about people than about fish or birds, persist in condemning DDT as one of the great evils of modern civilization.

One difficulty with Chicken-Lickenism is the inability of its practitioners to agree on what to get most alarmed about. While one branch of the club sees mankind perishing under the onslaught of everything from polluted air to rampaging glaciers, another branch is horrified by the prospect of his flourishing to the point where there won't be any room for him. To this subgroup—the Population Explosion Chicken Lickens—people are so healthy that they are about to reproduce themselves into oblivion.

They will, needless to say, do no such thing. As a matter of fact, the United States currently is in the second decade of a substantial, year-by-year reduction in both birthrate and actual births. In the last reported year—1968—only three-and-a-half million babies were born in this country—the lowest number since World War Two. The birthrate is now seventeen per thousand population—down thirty-one per cent in the past fifteen years. And other countries, including the most densely populated, report similar trends.

And we're not short of elbow room either. Right now, there are eleven and a half acres of land in the United States for every man, woman and child. Some of the land may be uninhabitable by current standards, but never underestimate the scientists. If and when the land is needed, it will be there. And it will be inhabitable.

Now, I am not trying to convey the impression that, ecologically, America is above reproach. We have lots of dirty air and plenty of dirty water and something should be done about it. And, of course, something is being done about it. This year, U.S. industry will spend close to three billion dollars to clean things up. Additional billions are being spent to develop the kind of machinery and chemicals and fuels that will keep things clean. As a result, polluted rivers like the Hudson are in the process of being purified, and there is even hope for such hard-core problems as Lake Erie.

Meanwhile, the Chicken Lickens notwithstanding, our air is breathable, our water is drinkable, the Atlantic Ocean hasn't reached Topeka and conditions are getting better, not worse. Mankind is not about to disappear under the sea or beneath a glacier or in a puff of factory smoke.

But our environment is only one of the acorns that have stirred up the prophets of doom. Our rebellious youth is another. Now the Youth Revolution Chicken Licken is a strange bird indeed. His habitat ranges from the faculty lounges of large universities to the speaker's platforms at left-wing political rallies. His cry—you must have heard it many times—goes something like this . . . and I quote:

"Oh dear me, our generation has messed up everything. We've created warfare and we've created poverty and we've created intolerance and all of us old fogies over thirty are violence-prone, money-grubbing hypocrites and we've alienated our children because they're a lot smarter than we are and a lot nicer and pretty soon we're going to have a terrible revolution because the kids won't put up with the likes of us much longer and they're going to overthrow the Establishment and change everything from top to bottom."

The answer to the cry of the Youth Revolution Chicken Licken should be a dash of salt on the tail feathers, but we'll settle here for a few facts.

First of all, there is no evidence at all that today's kids are any smarter or any more

idealistic than the kids of past generations. To the contrary, tests in a number of cities have revealed a slight decrease in I.Q. for public school pupils since World War II.

And there is a certain Kafka-like surrealism, not to mention hypocrisy, about the teenager who accuses his elders of being violent while he himself is tossing a rock at a policeman or planting a bomb in an R.O.T.C. building . . . who denounces the repression of freedom by adults while denying adults the right to speak at their own meetings . . . who attacks the conventionalism of the Establishment while walking around in hairdo and attire that are precisely the same as those worn by every other teenager in sight. And if today's kids aren't money-hungry, isn't it because we have given them so much of our money that they haven't had to hunger for it?

But I think the single biggest fallacy about the Youth Revolution Chicken Licken is that there isn't going to be any youth revolution. None at all. You see, those rock-throwing, bomb-planting, Establishment-hating teenagers I was just talking about represent only a tiny fraction of the kids in our country. The great majority of our youngsters think pretty much along the same lines we do.

How do I know? Because four months ago, LOOK commissioned Dr. George Gallup's American Institute of Public Opinion to conduct a nationwide study into the Mood of America as we begin this new decade, and Dr. Gallup found that, on virtually every major issue facing our nation, the views of teenagers parallel those of their elders.

Take the Vietnam war, for example. The teenagers proved to be even more hawkish than the adults. While slightly fewer than twenty per cent of all adults wanted us to remain in Vietnam until victory is achieved, slightly more than twenty percent of the teenagers expressed this militant opinion. While twenty percent of all adults favored immediate withdrawal, only fifteen percent of the teenagers did. By far, the biggest group of teenagers—over half of them—supported President Nixon's plan for gradual withdrawal without a set timetable.

When asked whether America is still the land of opportunity, eighty-eight percent of all adults answered yes. So did eighty-seven percent of our supposedly disillusioned teenagers. The teenagers actually outscored the adults—eighty-three percent to seventy-two—in expressing optimism about the coming year.

And the teenagers sided grimly with their elders in opposing the legalization of marijuana, in condemning young men who dodge the draft and—perhaps most significantly of all—in denouncing youth potests. Indeed, the impression you get when you study the results of this LOOK-Gallup poll is that the young people of America are, in many ways, even more conservative than the adults.

I think this may be true of youngsters everywhere, and, as an indication, I would cite the recent elections in Great Britain. This was the first time eighteen-year-olds were permitted to vote there, and for that reason, among others, most observers predicted a sweeping victory for the liberal-oriented Labour Party. Well, as you know, the Conservatives scored a tremendous upset victory, and indications are that the eighteen-year-old vote may have been instrumental.

So I am afraid those Youth Revolution Chicken Lickens are chirping up the wrong tree. When America's kids come of age and take over the management of this country of ours, they may very well out-Establishment the Establishment.

But there are a few melancholy Cassandras among us who keep predicting an early grave for the American Establishment—and for the free-enterprise system on which it is

based. These are the Economic Disaster Chicken Lickens and right now they're out in full feather clucking and squawking about rising unemployment, falling stock prices and continuing inflation.

Well, I can't deny that there are soft spots in our economy. There are always soft spots in every economy and there always will be. But the spots in ours aren't nearly so soft or so numerous as the Chicken Lickens would have us believe.

Take unemployment. Recently, the number of jobless in the United States rose to five per cent of the total labor force, and the alarmists began wailing. But what they failed to observe was that five per cent unemployment is a low figure for this or any other country. Even in the boom years of the 1950s, U.S. unemployment topped eight per cent on several occasions. It was close to seven per cent at the start of the sixties and it averaged well over five and a half per cent through the first half of the decade.

And the Chicken Lickens also failed to note that the number of employed persons in our country has just reached an all-time high of seventy-seven million. That's an increase of over a million in the past two years—of over twelve million in the past ten years.

Then there's the stock market decline. The old Wall Street hands aren't too upset about it, because they understand that stock market declines are part of the business. Most of the shock seems to be restricted to the newcomers who got into the market during the past ten or fifteen years and were under the impression that stock prices only go up.

Actually, at the current level of about seven hundred—the Dow Jones industrial average is up roughly five hundred over what it was in the summer of 1945 . . . four hundred and fifty over mid-summer 1950 . . . and two hundred and fifty over the figure for 1955. It's even three hundred points higher than what it was at the very peak of the big boom of the late nineteen twenties.

So long-term investors haven't been hurt. And they never will be—nor will anyone else who has the kind of faith you and I have in this country of ours and in its propensity for growth over the long haul.

Which brings me to the caterwauling about inflation. Now nobody likes rising prices. And there's no getting away from the fact that prices have been going up. But so have incomes. As a result, except for special cases, most Americans are better off today by far than they were a generation, or even a decade ago.

The plain truth is that, despite inflation, today's American working man enjoys the highest standard of living this or any other country has ever known. And it's getting higher all the time.

Some facts. In stable terms of 1957-1959 dollars, the spendable, after-tax income of the U.S. factory worker has gone up steadily by about a dollar per week per year since 1940. That year, the average weekly take-home pay for workers with no dependents was fifty dollars and twelve cents. In 1950, it was fifty-nine dollars and ninety-eight cents. In 1960, seventy dollars and thirty-nine cents. And today, over eighty dollars. Again, I want to emphasize that these figures—from official government sources—are in terms of what a dollar bought in the 1957-1959 period. Actual weekly take-home pay for factory workers today averages well over a hundred dollars.

What's more, much of what passes for inflation is illusory. True, most products cost more than they used to, but most products are better than they used to be. And any rise in price attributable to a rise in quality cannot be regarded as inflationary.

Also let us not forget that, while the cost of living has zoomed, so has the style of living for the average family. For one thing, today's Americans eat a great deal better

than their grandparents did. More meat. More out-of-season foods. And many, many more convenience foods—foods that have cut the average housewife's time in the kitchen from over five hours a day to about an hour and a half.

Other goods and services have also appreciated in value delivered as well as in price charged. Take your own industry. The lawnmowers you gentlemen sell do cost more than the ones your predecessors sold, but no one can deny they're better mowers. You can't even compare the ease and performance of today's key-starting, grass-catching, self-propelled power mowers with the cast iron back-breakers of a generation ago. And the same is true of virtually everything to be found in a modern hardware-housewares store—from roof gutters to basement sealers.

Fortunately, most Americans have confidence in our economic system and in the way of life it has produced. In that study Gallup did for LOOK, sixty-four per cent of all adults said they expected it to be easier or just as easy to make ends meet next year. Sixty-eight per cent reported that their family standard of living was improving annually.

And the American public doesn't buy that nonsense about businessmen taking advantage of consumers or about consumers needing more and more government protection. When Gallup asked which was a bigger threat to America—Big Business, Big Labor or Big Government—fewer than twenty per cent of all adults said Big Business. Over forty-one per cent said Big Government. Thirty-three per cent said Big Labor.

So much for the Economic Disaster Chicken Lickens.

Which brings us to another part of the flock—the Racial Upheaval Chicken Lickens. These are the raucous birds who flit around the country denouncing America as a racist nation and predicting a fearful uprising in which non-whites will be arrayed against whites in a fight to the finish.

This is so ridiculous a premise that I hesitate to dignify it by detailed comment. Obviously, we are not a racist country. Oh, we have individual racists, to be sure, just as all countries do. But on the basis of official policy we are perhaps the least racist nation on earth. We are one of the few with specific laws protecting all minority groups from every sort of discrimination—even in places of business. And we are probably the only nation with special programs designed to help minority groups in the areas of education, housing and employment.

Compare this, if you will, with the policies of supposedly enlightened countries like India, where a rigid caste system has operated for centuries with governmental sanction.

And America's non-white citizens—I'm talking about the overwhelming majority, not the handful of hate-mongering paranoiacs who get all the publicity—love and respect and appreciate this country fully as much as its white citizens do. This attitude reflects, among other things, the fact that the standard of living of non-whites in the United States is rising even faster than that of the white population . . . a circumstance of which the non-white community is acutely aware.

I refer again to that LOOK-Gallup Study. It shows that while seventy-two per cent of all white adults are optimistic about the coming year, seventy-five per cent of the non-whites are optimistic. While fifty-four per cent of the whites expect a salary raise next year, the figure for non-whites is fifty-seven per cent. And while sixty-three per cent of the whites think it will be easier or just as easy to make ends meet in the coming year, seventy-two per cent of non-whites have that rosy expectation.

With an outlook like that, the purveyors of hate will fail miserably in their attempt to

foment a clash between races in the United States. And the Racial Upheaval Chicken Lickens will have to find something else to cackle about.

So will the Atomic Annihilation Chicken Licken. This bird comes in two varieties. There's the kind who expects a giant H-bomb bang to obliterate mankind in one huge mushroom cloud. And there's the type who sees destruction coming in the form of slow radioactive poisoning.

Actually, there is nothing new about this species of Chicken Licken. In one form or another, he has been around since the first slingshot came on the scene and the nervous nellys of the day decided mankind was doomed. After all, with slingshots you could wipe out whole populations from a distance.

Then came gunpowder . . . and more hysteria. Later, the Swedish inventor Alfred Nobel saw doomsday in dynamite, while H. G. Wells envisioned it in poison gases and bacteriological warfare. Still others saw catastrophe in the stars and, clad in long white gowns, they travelled hither and yon with signs announcing the end of the world.

But mankind has somehow hung on, confounding all of the Chicken Lickens through thousands of years. And I strongly suspect mankind will be around for thousands of years to come, still making liars out of the pitiful gaggle of nitwits, charlatans and psychopaths who prophesy his demise.

I should note in passing that one subgroup of atom-age alarmists—the Strontium Ninety Chicken Lickens—has been phased out of existence. Scientists recently reported that the incidence of Strontium Ninety in milk is lower than at any time since 1961.

So there goes another bugaboo that used to scare the daylight out of people but is rarely even remembered today.

Needless to say, there are many additional kinds of Chicken Lickens afflicting our society. A whole poultry market full of them. I won't burden you with the complete roster, but I would like to touch briefly on two other sub-species: the Moral Decay Chicken Licken and the What Ever Happened to Our Cherished Freedoms Chicken Licken.

The Moral Decay Chicken Licken keeps flapping around in a state of agitation about all of the sexual promiscuity and public nudity and filthy language and drug addiction he keeps seeing and hearing. My advice to him is to quit looking and to quit listening. The morality of today's Americans—and I include the longest-haired teenagers—is so pure by past standards as to make even the casual student of history wonder what all the fuss is about. To appreciate just how painfully innocent our young people are, all one has to do is spend an afternoon reading about the things that went on in ancient India, ancient Persia, ancient China, and medieval Europe, not to mention good old Sodom and Gomorrah. These modern X-rated movies are greasy kid stuff by comparison.

And to the What Ever Happened to Our Cherished Freedoms Chicken Lickens, I would like to say only this. If you think we have lost our freedom to speak out in America, I suggest you go to some other country—any other country—and say about that country and that society some of the things you have been saying about our country and our society and see how long you stay out of jail. Or away from a firing squad. The prisons of Europe and Asia and Africa and South America are filled with the kind of people who walk our streets today at complete liberty to sabotage our institutions and foment civil unrest. So, please, belabor me not about repression in the United States. We are the freest, fairest, most merciful country on earth and you, Mr. Chicken Licken, are living proof of it.

One thing most Chicken Lickens have in common is the tendency to speak ill of the present, to despair of the future and to look

back longingly to the good old days when the world was such a peaceful, pleasant and all-around wonderful place to be alive in.

Out of curiosity, I did some checking to find out how good those old days really were. Take the good old days ten years ago. I got out the microfilms of The New York Times for the week of July 18, 1960, and here are some of the front-page headlines I found in that single seven-day period:

"Riot disrupts Newport Jazz Festival; Marines and Guardsmen Sent In" . . . "Congolese Police Kill Ten in Clash" . . . "Youths Squeezed by City Job Crisis" . . . "U.S. Files Protest on Cuban Seizure of Oil Refineries" . . . "Four Italians Slain in Red-Led Riot" . . . "Belgian Women and Children Flee as Troops Rebel in Congo Capital" . . . "Khrushchev Makes Threat on Berlin" . . . "Long Island Railroad Shut Down as Union Rejects Governor's Plan."

Those were the good old days of 1960. It then occurred to me that I hadn't gone back far enough. So I re-examined the wonderful times we all had twenty years ago—in 1950. That's the happy year sixty thousand North Koreans invaded South Korea and captured the capital city in less than a month. The delightful year Puerto Rican fanatics tried to kill President Truman. The truly magnificent year the U.S. Government had to seize all of the railroads to prevent a strike.

Or maybe I should have gone back thirty years—to 1940. Those were the glorious, halcyon days when German saturation bombing destroyed half of London . . . when Japan invaded French Indo-China . . . when the British Army was almost annihilated at Dunkirk.

Perhaps fifty years ago was the magic moment. Nineteen twenty. That's the year an anarchist's bomb exploded on Wall Street, killing thirty and injuring hundreds. The year the world was just beginning to recover from a flu epidemic that killed twenty million people. Twenty million people. An absolutely unbelievable number by today's health standards.

Or let's go back a hundred years—to when France and Germany were at each other's throats in the Franco-Prussian war . . . when Italy was wracked by revolution . . . when Black Friday hit the New York stock market . . . when the carpetbaggers were pillaging the American South . . . when rebels sacked Paris, killing sixty-seven hostages and burning scores of public buildings.

Or two hundred years ago . . . the time of the Boston Massacre.

Or three hundred years ago . . . when the bubonic plague swept Europe, taking over seventy thousand lives in London alone.

Incidentally, I would recommend Defoe's "A Journal of the Plague Year" for anyone who harbors the slightest doubt that life today is infinitely better than it was in the so-called good old days. And if you're too squeamish for Defoe, there's Pierre Goubert's "Louis the Fourteenth and Twenty Million Frenchmen." It tells about France in the good old Sixteen Sixties, when life expectancy was twenty-five and famine and disease and pillage and rape were the order of the day.

No, ladies and gentlemen, the sky is not falling. If anything, it is brighter and bluer and more full of promise than it has ever been before. Oh, of course, there are occasional clouds. There are diseases that have not been conquered and conflicts between nations that have not been resolved and poverty in some quarters that has yet to be alleviated.

But none of these problems is as overwhelming as it once was and each is being worked on by dedicated men and women who have at their disposal tools that our ancestors never even dreamed of.

Of course, we can't expect perfection overnight—even though there are some among us who demand instant Utopia. And we must be

willing to make compromises. We simply cannot, for example, have all of the electric power we need to run our businesses and improve our homes without cutting down a few trees to make room for additional power plants. And we can't grow enough food to feed the world without using chemicals to kill the insects that otherwise would destroy that food.

Yet these are minor inconveniences at most. The sky is not falling. And as I look around at this sky that remains securely in place, I find it shining at its most brilliant over the nation that is our home. A nation so prosperous that even its poor people drive cars and go on cruises and still have money left over to send food and clothing to less fortunate lands. A nation so powerful that it can and does go to the aid of countries overrun by aggressive neighbors. A nation so just that it punishes its own soldiers when they commit crimes against humanity. A nation so secure and so charitable that it tolerates the shameful antics of that pathetic band of anarchists who keep clamoring for its downfall.

And even our Chicken Lickens are not beyond redemption. There is hope for them, too. I am reminded of a statement made by a famous American who at the time was deep in a trough of despondence and who was surrounded by others just as despondent as he.

"We have no men who are fit for the times," he said gloomily. "We are deficient in genius, in education, in travel, in fortune, in everything. I feel unutterable anxiety."

Those words were spoken over one hundred and eighty years ago. The speaker was a Boston lawyer named John Adams, soon to become the second President of the United States. And that country he was so downhearted about is our country. I think it turned out just fine, and this is only the beginning.

CONGRESS, PEOPLE WANT DETAILS OF PRESIDENT'S IMAGINATIVE BLUEPRINT

HON. ROBERT T. STAFFORD

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 10, 1971

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, the bold and imaginative proposals advanced by President Nixon in his state of the Union address have been enthusiastically received by an overwhelming portion of the Nation's press. While most commentators are properly reserving detailed comment until they see the specifics of the President's legislation, most also agree that the President has put forward a revolutionary and highly meaningful set of reforms.

An excellent editorial on this subject entitled "Congress, People Want Details of President's Imaginative Blueprint," was printed recently by the Nashville Banner. I include it in the RECORD:

DETAILS OF PRESIDENT'S IMAGINATIVE BLUEPRINT

In spirit, as in contents, President Nixon's "State of the Union" message last night lived up to its advance billing of "new approaches and new initiatives." It was bold and imaginative—well based, as a pattern of reform and philosophy, on administrative experience and objectives refined in the two initial years behind him, and a challenge for greater national progress in the years ahead.

Candor demands the realistic assessment to which details of the program will be subjected, still bearing in mind the desirability of the bulk of these proposals; a scrutiny which this newspaper hopes will center on the means to the ends stated, rather than for formulation of an obstacle course.

That is to say that in substantial measure the objectives accord with the national interest, and genuine progress for revitalization of government—as the President reiterated it—of, by, and for the people. There can be no quarrel, certainly, with that.

His description of the present welfare program as a "monstrous consuming outrage" was apt—and shared by constituents who have watched with shock and disgust as annually, almost daily for a generation, it has become more so. These have demanded real reforms. National sentiment applauds the terminology he employed concerning emphasis on a work incentive—the suggestion of help only for the helpless; but there is hesitancy and some consternation in further reference to a "guaranteed annual income" as the basis of such a program. And the President would contemplate that in vain unless the specifics spelled out are more realistic and palatable than the tentative references suggest.

America does want opened the doors to further and greater opportunity—to fulfill in boundless measure the national dreams and purposes of the greatest governmental system, and greatest land on earth.

To those open doors he pointed—with the ultimate objective the restoration of government to the hands of the people. That is not a new proposal. It has been his as frequently stated by him both in the presidential campaign and since.

He believes, as emphasized in salient paragraphs of specific reference last night, that such can be achieved—reversing the trend of resources and authority from local and state levels to Washington—by enlargement and implementation of the revenue-sharing plan. But more than that, with a boldness characteristic of the man, he has advocated not just reforms, but reorganization of the Federal Government to reduce its excess weight and cumbersome bureaucratic irresponsibility. And while he leaves that challenge to Congress to alter the legislative structure, he begins a movement for drastic overhaul and departmental reduction in the Executive branch.

In the area of profound human interest, the welfare reforms he seeks would include improved health care—the ideal objective a system of applied resources to that end which would make America not only the wealthiest, but the healthiest, land on earth.

To that worthy end, too, he proposes a major increase in federal aid to medical schools "to greatly increase the number of doctors and other health personnel"—obviously inclusive of greater research facilities in that realm. Such federal grants as originally provided were reduced and almost eliminated by action of Congress itself. With accent on the research needed, President Nixon has stipulated an extra \$100 million to help find a cancer cure.

That can be done. It is an emancipation which every right-thinking American will adopt as the worthiest of objectives on the part of a people whose scientific skill is second to none.

He wants the Federal Government to do its part respecting environmental excellence—the right of the people with their own help to live in a world of clean air and water. He wants more parks and open areas for the people to enjoy—preserving a great national heritage.

He believes in the capacity of the nation, a free enterprise system, to work its way out of the inflationary problem which he inherited, and whose pace he has arrested. Con-

cerning that he has pointed to signs of progress. Nevertheless, he sees a duty for responsible spending on the federal government's part, and has called for an expansionary budget.

That is something both he, and responsible congressional leaders, would have to watch carefully—with facilities of restraint to avert the excesses that in the past have ensued by the liberal motivation of spend and spend, tax and tax, elect and elect. He knows the dangers of that.

Obviously with the scope of such a message and program addressed to what he has called a "New American Revolution—a Peaceful Revolution," there are details concerning whose instant practicality, or desirability, questions arise. They are questions with which to deal forthrightly, with a view to the total and long-range national welfare. And on that basis, with non-partisan treatment, they can be resolved.

The President can look with pride on progress made in the two years just closed, on the program of deescalating a war—and strengthening the nation with regard to both domestic and foreign policy.

No such sweeping program at the federal level has been enunciated by any President since Franklin D. Roosevelt's memorable acceptance speech at Philadelphia in 1936.

In terms of vision, and sensitivity to the enduring interests of the people of the United States—enhancing the American dream without sacrificing its purpose—it was Richard M. Nixon at his best.

CRIME SHOULD NOT BE CONDONED

HON. BILL ARCHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 10, 1971

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, in the February issue of *Fortune* magazine there is a perceptive review by Sidney Hook of the recently published book: "Crime in America," authored by former Attorney General Ramsey Clark.

In his review, Professor Hook explores Mr. Clark's central thesis that responsibility for crime lies not with criminals but with society. As Mr. Hook shows, things are not quite that simple.

I include Mr. Hook's review in the RECORD.

[From *Fortune* Magazine, February 1971]

A SENTIMENTAL VIEW OF CRIME

(By Sidney Hook)

There can hardly be many adult Americans, no matter how remote from the highways of life, who are not by now aware that crime is a major national problem. Accordingly, it was to be expected that a book on crime by a former Attorney General of the U.S. would attract a lot of attention, and such has indeed been the case with Ramsey Clark's *Crime in America* (Simon & Schuster). It is an extraordinary book—in content, in style, and in the uncritical plaudits it has so far received. Were a reader to pick it up unaware of the author's identity, he would regard it as the effusions of a naive and sentimental social worker rather than the sober reflections of a man who for a time was the nation's principal law-enforcement officer.

The basic theme of the book is that responsibility for most crime lies not with the criminals but with society, and more specifically that poverty is the main cause of crime. The basic solution of the crime problem is therefore economic. We must re-

form society. We must "contain our acquisitive instinct" and relegate "selfishness" to the past. Our failure to do all this is attributed to deficiencies of our will. But the American character in which the American will is rooted has been as much determined by its social and physical environment as the character of criminals by their environment. The criminal, it nevertheless appears, is not morally responsible for his actions, while society—an abstraction that stands for the rest of us—is responsible.

The old and overly simple thesis that most crime is caused by economic deprivation is difficult to prove. First of all, it is based on statistical correlations that cannot by themselves establish causal connections. Second, as economic conditions have improved, crime rates have increased instead of decreasing. Third, at any economic level, the behavior of most individuals is not criminal. There must, therefore, be some other factors at work.

The prevention and control of crime, although guided of course by what we think we know, do not have to wait upon full elucidation of the multiple causes of crime, any more than the control of population has to wait upon full elucidation of, and agreement upon, all the causes that make for overpopulation. Those who, in either matter, keep insisting that we devote all attention to the "real" or "true" or "underlying" causes perform a double disservice. They not only oversimplify complex and subtle questions of causation, but also impede and undermine imperfect but nonetheless worthwhile efforts to reduce the amount of actual harm being done.

Ramsey Clark ranges over the entire field of crime including the methods of detection and the procedures of arrest, parole, and corrections. At every point he displays a heartwarming and commendable interest in the human rights of criminals—but alas, little concern for the human rights of their victims. The fundamental weakness of his analysis is his failure to realize that there are conflicts of human rights, and that the requirements of wise decision making impose an order of priority. In the long run, were crime totally abolished in Clark's utopia, the human rights of all would be safeguarded; but in the succession of short runs that constitute the continuing present, we must often choose between the rights of the potential criminal and the rights of his potential victims. In a period when the number of violent crimes is rising rapidly, when in almost every large city citizens fear to leave their homes at night, it is psychologically unrealistic as well as morally unjustifiable to expect the potential victims of criminal behavior to give priority to the human rights of criminals if these conflict with their own rights.

Clark's failure to face up to the necessity for hard choices in the prevention and control of crime results in a shocking absence of common sense. "There is no conflict between liberty and safety," he declares. "We will have both, or neither." This is sheer balderdash. In many situations, liberty and safety are inversely related. If plane passengers were free to carry anything they please in their baggage and enjoy freedom from search, the safety of passengers in this age of hijacking would be correspondingly reduced. The safety of a traffic system depends upon restriction of motorists' freedom to drive in any lane or at any speed they please. Clark himself, with characteristic inconsistency, urges that, in the interest of safety and crime prevention, we severely abridge the freedom to acquire handguns and other lethal weapons.

The uncritical use of large abstractions leads Clark to positions that are little short of bizarre. He reiterates again and again that the end of law is justice. But surely this is not the only end of law, or always the most important. Most philosophers of

law consider other ends to be at least as important: security (or reliability) and the ordered regulation of human affairs, so that human beings, knowing what to expect, can arrange their lives and business accordingly.

If justice were the sole end of law, then many of the procedural safeguards that shield the criminal from prosecution—and in defense of which Clark is rightly vehement—would have to be abandoned. For example, if conclusive evidence of a defendant's guilt has been acquired without a proper search warrant, justice in the case would certainly require that the evidence be admitted. And the privilege against self-incrimination, it has often been pointed out, has nothing to do with the ends of justice, for it is more often a shelter for the guilty than a shield for the innocent. One may of course say, as Blackstone did, "It is better that ten guilty persons escape than one innocent suffer." But no one can say this in the name of justice.

Clark's prejudices and one-sidedness are also manifest in his case against creation of a national police force in this country. (The F.B.I. is primarily an investigative agency.) The idea deserves fairer treatment than he gives it. He contends that concentration of police power would pose a threat to liberty. He believes in the dominance of local law enforcement, although in some areas of our country it is local law enforcement that has violated the basic rights of citizens, especially minorities. Nor is citizen participation in local law enforcement the unmixed blessing Clark apparently thinks it is. The lynch mobs and vigilante parties of yesteryear were made up of local citizens insisting on participation in law enforcement. And it certainly cannot be argued that in recent years local law enforcement has adequately protected the citizenry against criminal outrage.

It seems at least possible that a federal police force could be coordinated with local police in such a way as to avoid the danger of concentration of power and at the same time afford all citizens greater protection of the laws. But Clark disregards the possibility. He does not even ask, much less examine, the central question of whether, granting all the difficulties, dangers, and potential corruption in both local and federal police authorities, it would be easier to cope with them if we had a central police agency.

Clark makes some sound points, to be sure. He is certainly right in contending that we should put more effort and resources into rehabilitation of imprisoned criminals. And he is certainly right that speedier trials would be more effective than harsher punishments in reducing the incidence of crime. The book's merits, however, are outbalanced by faulty thinking and ritualistic rhetoric. Clark speaks eloquently of justice, of human dignity, and of reverence for life, but his words have a hollow ring because they are combined with judgments, exhortations, and sometimes insinuations that are incompatible with elementary fairness. It is possible, for example, to criticize the arguments for preventive detention of repeated offenders or for limitations upon abuse of the Fifth Amendment, without smearing those who hold such views as demagogues. (In a contrasting spirit, Clark refers to the Black Panthers and the Weathermen as "poor and unpopular groups and individuals" who might suffer from preventive-detention laws.)

THE IMAGINARY SHUDDER

On the whole, *Crime in America* holds the police up to obloquy. One gets the impression, indeed, that the country has more to fear from its police (who, of course, are not undeserving of criticism) than from its criminals. "A major portion of the American public, for a variety of reasons," Clark tells

us, "feels a little shudder when a squad car goes by."

On the basis of my own experience—as one born and raised in a big-city slum, a lifelong city dweller, and a visitor to many of the nation's large metropolitan centers—I doubt that Ramsey Clark knows what a "major portion of the American public" feels. There have been times in the past, to be sure, when activist radicals were harried by municipal ordinances. But today the police squad car is usually welcomed as a sign of safety. The most common complaint about the police I have recently heard from people who live in cities (as opposed to people who write books about city problems) is that there are not enough policemen around.

Typical of Clark's book as a whole is the final sentence (final, that is, if we disregard a hectic, italicized Epilogue). "Our greatest need," it runs, "is reverence for life—mere life, all life—life as an end in itself." Like many other dubious assertions in *Crime in America*, this seems vaguely appealing on a first, hurried reading. But on scrutiny, it is a dangerously muddled sentiment. Devotion to life as an end in itself is incompatible with, among many other things, the passionate devotion to justice that Clark also urges upon us. Whoever glorifies "mere life, all life" is evading the necessity for making the distinctions that are required for a life worthy of man.

ADDRESS OF SECRETARY KENNEDY BEFORE GEORGIA ASSOCIATION OF BROADCASTERS

HON. ROBERT G. STEPHENS, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 10, 1971

Mr. STEPHENS. Mr. Speaker, on January 27, 1971, the Honorable David M. Kennedy, Secretary of the Treasury, made an address in my home of Athens, Ga., before the Georgia Association of Broadcasters. At the invitation of Dr. Worth McDougald, head of the Department of Radio-TV-Film of the Henry W. Grady School of Journalism in Athens, I attended this session of the broadcasters and heard the address of the Secretary. The remarks he made were important and timely and I insert them in the RECORD for a wider circulation in America.

This address was given as one of the last public appearances of Mr. Kennedy before his pending retirement as Secretary of the Treasury and the assumption of his new responsibility with the administration. I am glad his abilities will continue to be used in serving the United States in an official capacity.

The remarks follow:

ADDRESS BY DAVID M. KENNEDY

It is a pleasure to be with you today. Recent decades have seen an industrial transformation of your region. And now a new and progressive spirit is broadening areas of opportunity for all of your citizens. Any visitor senses and respects the vast strides your region has been making. There are lessons here for all of us to learn. Today, however, I will be concerned primarily with national economic events.

This is the time of year in Washington when major decisions are being made on economic and financial policy. President Nixon has already pointed the way with his

stirring State of the Union Message. But the President's Economic and Budget Messages are still to come. There is, therefore, an interlude during which the remarks of any Administration official on the economic and financial situation must be pitched in a minor key.

There is also the complication that it is sometimes difficult to remember exactly which of the budgetary and financial numbers are suitable for mention in public company, and which are still marked for future release. Indeed, this is a time of year when one can speak more freely the less one knows of the actual facts. My problem today is increased since your business—at which I know you are very good—is getting news and broadcasting it. You will understand, therefore, why my remarks must be fairly general and without any news breaks of the sort that sometimes generate a lively interest.

There are perhaps some compensations. Preoccupation with numbers or technical details may tend at times to divert our attention from larger issues that will be of enduring significance. Today, I would like to review with you one of those larger economic issues—inflation and the progress we have made in dealing with it. I will take a look back over my two years in the Treasury—not in terms of the full range of those activities for that would be a major undertaking, but simply in terms of the inflation problem.

When this Administration took office two years ago the Nation was faced with extremely serious inflationary pressures. An upsurge in Federal defense spending after mid-1965 was piled on top of sharply rising Federal spending for nondefense purposes. The economy was already moving toward full employment until its own momentum and this extra stimulus was too much. Total demand quickly became excessive and inflation for a time took on its classic form: too much money chasing too few goods.

The error in policy during the mid-1960's was the failure to pay for the sharply expanded defense effort through a curtailment of Federal spending increases for nondefense purposes, or an increase in taxes. This failure to cut expenditures or raise taxes placed an excessive burden on monetary policy. Tight money inevitably became the order of the day. Belatedly at mid-1968, a tax increase was finally passed in the form of the 10 percent surcharge. By then, however, a very strong inflationary momentum had built up, and a move toward monetary ease in the second half of 1968 had subsequently to be reversed.

In early 1969 there were two basic policy alternatives: continue an inflation-generating policy despite its short-term distortions and long-run risks; or, apply sufficient economic restraint to cool down the economy and check the trend toward chronic inflation. The latter, and more responsible, alternative was chosen. The chances were that the application of economic restraint would cause considerable temporary pain and hardship, but the alternative of caving in to inflation was still less attractive—indeed, it did not deserve, or receive, serious consideration.

We chose, therefore, to deal directly with the problem and imposed restraints on Federal spending, the basic cause of inflation. Between fiscal 1965 and fiscal 1968, total Federal outlays had risen by about \$60 billion. To be sure, national defense outlays rose by about \$31 billion of that total. But Federal nondefense outlays rose nearly as much, by more than \$29 billion. In three short years, total Federal outlays rose by 50 percent and nondefense outlays by more than 40 percent. Small wonder that the econ-

omy turned onto a sharply inflationary course.

In the next two fiscal years, national defense outlays were flattened out and we applied tight restraint on Federal nondefense spending. Total Federal outlays were held to a rise of about 5 percent a year, in contrast to about 15 percent a year in the 1965-1968 period. This move to fiscal restraint was supplemented during much of 1969 by monetary restraint. The money supply had grown at more than 7½ percent in 1968. The rate of monetary growth was cut back to 3 percent in 1969 with very little growth occurring after midyear.

The application of restraint was successful in removing excess demand—the basic and original cause of the inflationary problem. By late 1969 and early 1970, total spending—both private and public—was back within the potential productive capacity of the economy for the first time since 1965.

As we know all too well, this did not signal a quick end to inflation. The successful application of restraint did, however, remove the basic cause of inflation—excess demand—and created an environment within which remaining inflationary pressures could gradually diminish.

Current inflationary difficulties, usefully described as "cost-push", are a lagged response to the earlier excess demand. One of the basic distortions of the inflationary process occurs in the wage-price area. Prices will very often outrun wage increases in the very early stages of an inflation. But this soon leads to higher wage demands thus pushing up costs. Profit margins narrow unless a business is able to pass on wage increases in the form of price increases. To the extent that price increases are passed on, further wage increases are likely to be demanded, and so on. The situation is aggravated by the fact that total productivity—output per manhour—tends to fall off temporarily when demand is restrained and output grows more slowly. Wages and prices may continue their upward and self-defeating spiral for a considerable period of time—even after demand has been cut back.

There are, however, clear signs of improvement in the inflationary situation despite the continuing pressures from the cost side. Consumer prices rose at about a 6 percent annual rate in the second half of 1969 and the first half of 1970. The increase since mid-1970 has been closer to 4½ percent. Wholesale prices rose about a 2 percent annual rate in the second half of 1970 and were virtually flat by the end of the year. In the second half of 1969 they were growing at more than a 4 percent rate. More sensitive—if less comprehensive—price measures show even greater improvement. For example, late this month an index of industrial raw materials prices was more than 10 percent below the level of a year earlier. In general, those prices that react quickly to changes in demand, or reflect special supply conditions, have been reacting about on schedule.

But there are also some areas in which prices and costs continue to rise at a disturbing rate. Recognition of the complexity and difficulty of the problem has been clearly reflected in the Administration's anti-inflationary policies in the wage-price area. Wage-price controls were ruled out from the first. So-called "incomes policies" in which government determines, or tries to determine, the various income shares going to different groups in the economy have not worked successfully in foreign countries. Efforts in this country during part of the 1960's with the less formal guideposts approach were hardly crowned with success.

The present Administration has proceeded cautiously in the wage-price area, recogniz-

ing that there are no panaceas. The stubborn nature of the inflation problem has made a pragmatic approach the only feasible one. Last summer President Nixon established the "inflation alerts" and a Productivity Commission. More recently there has been some intensification of the government's efforts in the wage-price field. Further specific steps may be required within the framework outlined by the President. In the last analysis, government does have an inescapable responsibility for the control of inflation. The only question is how that responsibility can best be met without harmfully impinging upon the private decision-making process.

Inflation will surely remain a problem for some time to come. But the crucially important steps to bring it under control have already been taken. Therefore, fiscal and monetary policy have moved into a new phase. There is a need now for a re-expansion of the economy to reduce unemployment and raise output. It is sometimes argued that to re-expand the economy before the last vestiges of inflation are removed may risk a return to earlier rates of price increase. It is important to recognize the risks of inflation but not to exaggerate them.

The current inflation—coexisting with an appreciable amount of unemployment—is a cost-push inflation and primarily takes the form of a distorted relationship between money wages and productivity. During the period 1960-1965, compensation per manhour (money wages plus fringe benefits) rose at an average of a little over 4 percent a year. Productivity rose only a little less than 4 percent a year and unit labor costs were very nearly constant as were the wholesale prices of industrial commodities. In sharp contrast in 1969, the rise in compensation exceeded 7 percent, productivity rose only fractionally, and unit labor costs rose 6½ percent. But during 1970, a better productivity trend began to emerge after the first quarter with productivity gains at more than a 4 percent annual rate. Fourth quarter figures, when available, may be distorted by the General Motors strike.

Past experience suggests that as the economy expands productivity gains well above the normal may be achieved for a considerable period of time. Also, money compensation can—and should—rise less rapidly as the rate of price advance declines. Thus the existing gap between money wages and productivity can be narrowed from both sides.

Paradoxically, a fairly brisk expansion might do more to relieve upward cost pressures than a halting and incomplete one. Too slow a pace of expansion would mean sluggish improvement in productivity and perhaps very little relief from "cost-push" pressures. Once excess demand has been removed for an appreciable period of time, there is little point in keeping the economy in a sluggish state. The key to restoration of balance in costs and prices in the existing situation is a strong productive expansion, but one that stays within the extreme outer limits of capacity and does not return us to a condition of excess demand. This is the path along which economic policy will be seeking to direct the economy over the next year or two.

The main policy tools are fiscal and monetary policy. Responsibility for determining the appropriate course of monetary policy is properly that of the Federal Reserve. I will confine my attention, therefore, to the role that fiscal policy will be called upon to play. As I have already indicated, fiscal policy moved in a restraining direction in 1969, primarily through very close restraint on Federal nondefense expenditures. That restraint was a short-run imperative if excess demand inflation were to be checked. But now with

the economy moving into the phase of steady expansion, there is a need for a budgetary rule which will avoid excessive spending yet help to stabilize the economy.

It is no secret that the principle of annual balance in the Federal budget is a defective guide in terms of the stability of the economy. For example, when the economy slows down and tax revenues fall off the Federal budget runs a deficit. Efforts to restore budget balance quickly by raising taxes and cutting expenditure, would simply drive the economy down further and be self-defeating.

Yet we cannot safely abandon all connection between Federal spending and taxes, leaving each year's budget decisions to be made on an *ad hoc* basis depending solely upon whether the economy seems to need a stimulant or a depressant. In the last analysis, the best test of the worthwhileness of any particular amount of Federal spending is a democratically determined willingness on the part of the public to pay at least that much in taxes.

In an effort to retain this crucial control over the growth of Federal spending without compromising the ability of the budget to help stabilize the economy, President Nixon has advanced a full employment budget rule. The rule is that save in exceptional circumstances Federal budget outlays should not exceed the amount of revenue the economy would produce when operating at full employment.

In the current situation with the economy temporarily well below full employment, an actual budget deficit is acceptable as a part of the program to promote economic stability. But there should be some objective guide to the maximum expenditures that might be contemplated without departing from the principle of long-run budgetary stability. The revenues that would be generated at full employment provide such a guide.

It is worth emphasizing that this rule sets an upper limit on Federal spending, but does not specify an amount by which Federal expenditures should necessarily increase year in and year out. If Federal spending can be held below this limit while meeting urgent national needs, then tax reductions or retirement of the Federal debt would be in order.

Suitably employed the full employment budget concept may become a valuable and widely accepted tool of budget planning. Certainly one hopes that this will prove to be the case. In any event, however, this concept will in no way supplant or substitute for our regular and accepted ways of arriving at the budget totals. It will simply provide an approximate guide in arriving at an overall Federal expenditure total consistent with the needs of the economic situation.

In concentrating today upon the inflation problem and the emerging expansion, I have singled out but one aspect of our domestic problems. Still, a strong productive domestic economy with relatively stable prices will be the foundation upon which much of our future progress in many directions will inevitably come to rest.

The strength and persistence of recent inflationary pressures should serve as a reminder to all of us how important it is to avoid excessive Federal spending and a destabilizing Federal budget. There are limits to how fast we can force the pace of economic expansion and limits to how much the Federal sector can do.

The policies of the last two years have set the stage for expansion of the economy. The task now will be to insure that the expansion proceeds at a brisk but orderly pace, without return to the heavy inflationary pressures of recent years.

LEAD POISONING

HON. PARREN J. MITCHELL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 10, 1971

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues a most significant development for the children of innercity America which was reported on Sunday in the New York Times.

I have been deeply concerned by the tragic high incidence of lead poisoning which continues in my city and in the large urban areas of this Nation. In Baltimore we have been attempting to screen young children who might be subject to lead poisoning from old paint in ghetto buildings, but we have been handicapped by the lack of a simple test suitable for mass screening.

Now the announcement has come of a simple and effective way to screen large numbers of children for evidence of lead poisoning before the affliction progresses to irreparable damage to the brain. This technique, according to the New York Times has been developed by Dr. Lester Hankin and Kenneth R. Hanson, biochemists at the Connecticut Agricultural Experiment Station, and Dr. Joseph M. Kornfield and William W. Ullman of the laboratory division of the Connecticut State Department of Health.

Mr. Speaker, this is a momentous advance for child health in our country and I wish not only to commend those who have developed this test but to urge my colleagues to capitalize on this development by fully funding the lead poisoning programs approved by the Congress.

The significance of this ailment is set forth in detail in the February issue of Scientific American magazine. I insert this article in the RECORD along with the newspaper story on the development of this new test:

[From the New York Times, Feb. 7, 1971]

TEST SIMPLIFIED FOR LEAD POISON

NEW HAVEN.—A simple and effective way to screen large numbers of children for evidence of lead poisoning has been devised by four scientists in Connecticut.

The method was devised by Dr. Lester Hankin and Kenneth R. Hanson, biochemists at the Connecticut Agricultural Experiment Station, and Dr. Joseph M. Kornfield and William W. Ullman of the laboratory division of the Connecticut State Department of Health. Their research is described in the publication *Clinical Pediatrics*.

Lead poisoning is a serious public health problem, especially in the inner city. Poisoning from eating chips of lead paint can lead to neurological disorders and, in extreme cases, to mental retardation and even death.

Therefore, early detection is essential to effective treatment, and it is estimated that only a 10th of the children in "high-risk" areas have been tested.

Heretofore, two laboratory tests have been used to detect lead poisoning. One is based on the direct determination of lead in blood. This test is limited by the availability of medical personnel and the emotional problems of drawing blood samples from the children. In addition, there is a limit on the number of samples that can be tested daily.

The second method estimates the delta aminolevulinic acid content of urine. However, the collection of samples and their transport is clumsy. Also, the laboratory portion of the test is relatively lengthy. Consequently, testing the large numbers of children who warrant examination has not been practical.

The new test developed at the station uses a dipstick for sampling urine similar to that used for detecting sugar in urine. A specially treated iron exchange paper attached to a plastic holder is submerged in a sample of urine, then drained, dried in air, wrapped in aluminum foil and mailed to the laboratory.

At the laboratory the paper is tested for its acid content. The acid is a compound needed in the synthesis of blood. Normally, little or no acid is found in urine. Lead blocks the action of an enzyme that converts the acid to another compound in the blood-making chain. When lead blocks this enzyme, the acid piles up and is excreted in abnormal amounts in the urine.

Volunteers of the American Friends Service Committee distributed and used the new dipsticks in Hartford last summer with excellent results. The dipsticks, they found, were far easier to use and transport to the laboratory than the bottles of urine formerly collected.

Some mothers can take care of the sampling and mailing themselves. Laboratory personnel can test many more samples daily than by the older method.

[From Scientific American, February 1971]

LEAD POISONING

(By J. Julian Chisolm, Jr.)

Lead has been mined and worked by men for millenniums. Its ductility, high resistance to erosion and other properties make it one of the most useful of metals. The inappropriate use of lead has, however, resulted in outbreaks of lead poisoning in humans from time to time since antiquity. The disease, which is sometimes called "plumbism" (from the Latin word for lead) or "saturnism" (from the alchemical term), was first described by the Greek poet-physician Nicander more than 2,000 years ago. Today our concerns about human health and the dissemination of lead into the environment are twofold: (1) there is a need to know whether or not the current level of lead absorption in the general population presents some subtle risk to health; (2) there is an even more urgent need to control this hazard in the several subgroups within the general population that run the risk of clinical plumbism and its known consequences. In the young children of urban slums lead poisoning is a major source of brain damage, mental deficiency and serious behavior problems. Yet it remains an insidious disease; it is difficult to diagnose, it is often unrecognized and until recently it was largely ignored by physicians and public health officials. Now public attention is finally being focused on childhood lead poisoning, although the difficult task of eradicating it has just begun.

Symptomatic lead poisoning is the result of very high levels of lead in the tissues. Is it possible that a content of lead in the body that is insufficient to cause obvious symptoms can nevertheless give rise to slowly evolving and long-lasting adverse effects? The question is at present unanswered but is most pertinent. There is much evidence that lead wastes have been accumulating during the past century, particularly in congested urban areas. Increased exposure to lead has been shown in populations exposed to lead as an air pollutant. Postmortem examinations show a higher lead content in the organs of individuals in highly industrialized societies than in the organs of most individuals in primitive populations. Al-

though no population group is apparently yet being subjected to levels of exposure associated with the symptoms of lead poisoning, it is clear that a continued rise in the pollution of the human environment with lead could eventually produce levels of exposure that could have adverse effects on human health. Efforts to control the dissemination of lead into the environment are therefore indicated.

The more immediate and urgent problem is to control the exposure to lead of well-defined groups that are known to be directly at risk: young children who live in dilapidated housing where they can nibble chips of leaded paint, whiskey drinkers who consume quantities of lead-contaminated moonshine, people who eat or drink from improperly lead-glazed earthenware, workers in certain small-scale industries where exposure to lead is not controlled. Of these the most distressing group is the large group of children between about one and three to five years of age who live in deteriorating buildings and have the habit of eating nonfood substances including peeling paint, plaster and putty containing lead. (This behavior is termed pica, after the Latin word for magpie.) The epidemiological data are still scanty: large-scale screening programs now in progress in Chicago and New York City indicate that between 5 and 10 percent of the children tested show evidence of asymptomatic increased lead absorption and that between 1 and 2 percent have unsuspected plumbism. Small-scale surveys in the worst housing areas of a few other cities reveal even higher percentages.

There is little doubt that childhood lead poisoning is a real problem in many of the older urban areas of the U.S. and perhaps in rural communities as well. Current knowledge about lead poisoning and its long-term effects in children is adequate to form the basis of a rational attack on this particular problem. The ubiquity of lead-pigment paints in older substandard housing and the prevalence of pica in young children indicate, however, that any effective program will require the concerted and sustained effort of each community. Furthermore, the continued use of lead-pigment paints on housing surfaces that are accessible to young children and will at some future date fall into disrepair can only perpetuate the problem.

Traces of lead are almost ubiquitous in nature and minute amounts are found in normal diets. According to the extensive studies of Robert A. Kehoe and his associates during the past 35 years at the Kettering Laboratories of the University of Cincinnati, the usual daily dietary intake of lead in adults averages about .3 milligram. Of this, about 90 percent passes through the intestinal tract and is not absorbed. Kehoe's data indicate that the small amount absorbed is also excreted, so that under "normal" conditions there is no net retention of lead in the body. In addition the usual respiratory intake is estimated at between five and 50 micrograms of lead per day. These findings must be reconciled with postmortem analyses, which indicate that the concentration of lead in bone increases with age, although its concentration in the soft tissues is relatively stable throughout life. The physiological significance of increasing storage in bone is not entirely clear, but it has caused considerable concern. It is quite clear that as the level of intake of lead increases, the rate of absorption may exceed the rate at which lead can be excreted or stored in bone. And when the rates of excretion and storage are exceeded, the levels of lead in the soft tissues rise. Studies in adults indicate that as the sustained daily intake of lead rises above one milligram of lead per day, higher levels of lead in the blood result and metabolic, functional and clinical responses follow. The

reversible effects abate when the rate and amount of lead absorbed are reduced again to the usual dietary range.

As far as is known, lead is not a trace element essential to nutrition, but this particular question has not been adequately examined. Some of the adverse effects of lead on metabolism have nonetheless been studied in considerable detail. These effects are related to the concentration of lead in the soft tissues. At the level of cellular metabolism, the best-known adverse effect of lead is its inhibition of the activity of enzymes that are dependent on the presence of free sulfhydryl (SH) groups for their activity. Lead interacts with sulfhydryl groups in such a way that they are not available to certain enzymes that require them. In the living organism, under most conditions, this inhibition is apparently partial. Inhibitory effects of lead on other aspects of cellular metabolism have been demonstrated in the test tube. Such studies are preliminary. Most of the effects reported are produced with concentrations of lead considerably higher than are likely to be encountered in the tissues of man, so that speculation about such effects is unwarranted at this point.

The clearest manifestation of the inhibitory effect of lead on the activity of sulfhydryl-dependent enzymes is the disturbance it causes in the biosynthesis of heme. Heme is the iron-containing constituent that combines with protein to form hemoglobin, the oxygen-carrying pigment of the red blood cells. Heme is also an essential constituent of the other respiratory pigments, the cytochromes, which play key roles in energy metabolism. The normal pathway of heme synthesis begins with activated succinate (produced by the Krebs cycle, a major stage in the conversion of food energy to biological energy) and proceeds through a series of steps. Two of these steps are inhibited by the presence of lead; two others may also be inhibited, but at higher lead concentrations.

Lead is implicated specifically in the metabolism of delta-aminolevulinic acid (ALA) and in the final formation of heme from iron and protoporphyrin. Both of these steps are mediated by enzymes that are dependent on free sulfhydryl groups for their activity and are therefore sensitive to lead. The two steps at which lead may possibly be implicated are the formation of ALA and the conversions of coproporphyrinogen to protoporphyrin. Although the exact mechanism is not known, coproporphyrin (an oxidized product of coproporphyrinogen) accumulates in the urine and the red cells in lead poisoning. Whatever the mechanisms, the increased excretion of ALA and coproporphyrin is almost always observed before the onset of symptoms of lead poisoning, and the presence of either is therefore important in diagnosis.

The enzyme that catalyzes ALA metabolism is ALA dehydrase. A number of investigators, including Sven Hernberg and his colleagues at the University of Helsinki and Abraham Goldberg's group at the University of Glasgow, have studied the extent to which varying levels of lead in the blood inhibit ALA-dehydrase activity in red blood cell preparations in the laboratory. They have shown a direct relation between the concentration of lead in blood and the activity of the enzyme. Moreover, they find that there seems to be no amount of lead so small that it does not to some extent decrease ALA-dehydrase activity; in other words, there appears to be no threshold for this effect. If that is so, however, one would expect to see a progressive increase in the urinary excretion of the enzyme's substrate, ALA, beginning at very low blood-lead levels. This does not seem to be the case. Stig Selander and Kim Cramer in Sweden, correlating blood-lead and urine-ALA values, found that the first measurable increase in urine ALA is observed only after blood lead rises above approximately 30 micrograms of lead per 100 milliliters of whole

blood. The apparent inconsistency between the effect of lead on the activity of an enzyme in the test tube and the accumulation of the enzyme's substrate in the body might be explained by the presence of an enzyme reserve. This hypothesis is consistent with the functional reserve exhibited in many biological systems.

Almost all the information we have on the effect of lead on the synthesis of heme comes from observations of red blood cells. Yet all cells synthesize their own heme-containing enzymes, notably the cytochromes, and ALA dehydrase is also widely distributed in tissues. The observations in red blood cells may therefore serve as a model of lead's probable effects on heme synthesis in other organ systems. Even so, the degree of inhibition in a given tissue may vary and will depend on the concentration of lead within the cell, on its access to the heme synthetic pathway and on other factors. For example, J. A. Millar and his colleagues in Goldberg's group found that ALA-dehydrase activity is inhibited in the brain tissue of heavily lead-poisoned laboratory rats at about the same rate as it is in the blood. When these workers used amounts of lead that produced an average blood-lead level of 30 micrograms per 100 milliliters of blood, the level of ALA-dehydrase activity in the brain did not differ significantly from the levels found in control rats that had not been given any added lead at all. It is now established experimentally that lead does interfere with heme synthesis in tissue preparations from the kidney, the brain and the liver as well as in red cells but the concentrations of lead that may begin to cause significant inhibition in these organs are not yet known.

Only in the blood is it as yet possible to see a direct cause-and-effect relation between the metabolic disturbance and the functional disturbance in animals or people. In the blood the functional effect is anemia. The decrease in heme synthesis leads at first to a decrease in the life-span of red cells and later to a decrease in the number of red cells and in the amount of hemoglobin per cell. In compensation for the shortage, the blood-forming tissue steps up its production of red cells; immature red cells, reticulocytes and basophilic stippled cells (named for their stippled appearance after absorbing a basic dye) appear in the circulation. The presence of stippled cells is the most characteristic finding in the blood of a patient with lead poisoning. The stippling represents remnants of the cytoplasmic constituents of red cell precursors, including mitochondria. Normal mature red cells do not contain mitochondria. The anemia of lead poisoning is a reversible condition: the metabolism of heme returns to normal, and the anemia improves with removal of the patient from exposure to excessive amounts of lead.

The toxic effect of lead on the kidneys is under intensive investigation but here the story is less clear. In acute lead poisoning there are visible changes in the kidney and kidney function is impaired. Again the mitochondria are implicated: their structure is visibly changed. Much of the excess lead is concentrated in the form of dense inclusions in the nuclei of certain cells, including those lining the proximal renal tubules. Robert A. Goyer of the University of North Carolina School of Medicine isolated and analyzed these inclusions and found that they consist of a complex of protein and lead. He has suggested that the inclusions are a protective device: they tend to keep the lead in the nucleus, away from the vulnerable mitochondria. Involvement of the mitochondria is also suggested by the fact that lead-poisoned kidney cells consume more oxygen than normal cells in laboratory cultures, which indicates that their energy metabolism is affected.

Kidney dysfunction, apparently due to this impairment in energy metabolism, is ex-

pressed in what is called the Fanconi syndrome: there is an increased loss of amino acids, glucose and phosphate in the urine because the damaged tubular cells fail to reabsorb these substances as completely as normal tubular cells do. The excessive excretion of phosphates is the important factor because it leads to hypophosphatemia, a low level of phosphate in the blood. There is some evidence that, when phosphate is mobilized from bone for the purpose of maintaining an adequate level in body fluids, lead that is stored with relative safety in the bones may be mobilized along with the phosphate and enter the soft tissues where it can do harm. The effect of acute lead poisoning on the kidney can be serious but, like the effect on blood cells, it is reversible with the end of abnormal exposure. Furthermore, the Fanconi syndrome is seen only at very high levels of lead in blood (greater than 150 micrograms of lead per 100 milliliters of blood) and only in patients with severe acute plumbism.

In the central nervous system the toxic effect of lead is least understood. Little is known at the metabolic level; most of the information comes from clinical observation of patients and from postmortem studies. Two different mechanisms appear to be involved in lead encephalopathy, or brain damage: edema and direct injury to nerve cells. The walls of the blood vessels are somehow affected so that the capillaries become too permeable; they leak, causing edema (swelling of the brain tissue). Since the brain is enclosed in a rigid container, the skull, severe swelling destroys brain tissue. Moreover, it appears that certain brain cells may be directly injured, or their function inhibited, by lead.

The effects I have been discussing are all those of acute lead poisoning, the result of a large accumulation of lead in a relatively short time. There are chronic effects too, either of the aftereffects of acute plumbism or the result of a slow buildup of a burden of lead over a period of years. The best-known effect is chronic nephritis, a disease characterized by a scarring and shrinking of kidney tissue. This complication of lead poisoning came to light in Australia in 1929, when L. J. J. Nye became aware of a pattern of chronic nephritis and early death in the state of Queensland. Investigation revealed that Queensland children drank quantities of rainwater that was collected by runoff from house roofs sheathed with shingles covered with lead-pigmented paint. In 1954 D. A. Henderson found that of 352 adults in Queensland who had had childhood lead poisoning 15 to 40 years earlier, 165 had died, 94 of chronic nephritis. Chronic lead nephropathy, which is sometimes accompanied by gout, is also seen in persistent, heavy moonshine drinkers and in some people who have had severe industrial exposure. In all these cases, however, the abnormal intake of lead persists for more than a decade or so before the onset of nephropathy. Most of the patients have a history of reported episodes of acute plumbism, which suggests that they have levels of lead in the tissues far above those found in the general population. Furthermore, there is the suspicion that factors in addition to lead may be involved.

The other known result of chronic overexposure to lead is peripheral nerve disease, affecting primarily the motor nerves of the extremities. Here the tissue damage appears to be to the myelin sheath of the nerve fiber. Specifically, according to animal studies, the mitochondria of the Schwann cells, which synthesize the sheath, seem to be affected. Various investigators, including Pamela Fullerton of Middlesex Hospital in London, have found that conduction of the nerve impulse may be impaired in the peripheral nerves of industrial workers who have had a long exposure to lead but who have no symptoms of acute lead poisoning.

These findings and others raise serious questions. It is clear that a single attack of acute encephalopathy can cause profound mental retardation and other forms of neurological injury that is permanent. Similarly, in young children repeated bouts of symptomatic plumbism can result in permanent brain damage ranging from subtle learning deficits to profound mental incompetence and epilepsy. Can a level of absorption that is insufficient to cause obvious acute symptoms nevertheless cause "silent" brain damage? This question remains unanswered, in part because of the difficulty in recognizing mild symptoms of lead poisoning in children and in part because the experimental studies that might provide some answers have not yet been undertaken.

Classical plumbism—the acute disease—is seen today primarily in children with the pica habit. Before discussing these cases in some detail I shall briefly take up two other current environmental sources of lead: earthenware improperly glazed with lead and lead-contaminated alcoholic beverages.

Michael Klein and his colleagues at McGill University recently reported two cases of childhood lead poisoning, one of which was fatal, that they traced to an earthenware jug in which the children's mother kept a continuously replenished supply of apple juice. The slightly acidic juice was leaching lead out of the glaze, the thin layer of glassy material fused to the ceramic surfaces of the jug. The investigators thereupon tested 117 commercial earthenware food and beverage containers and 147 samples made with 49 different commonly used glazes in the McGill ceramics laboratory. Excessive amounts of lead—more than the U.S. maximum permissible amount for glazes of seven parts per million—were leached out of half the vessels. (The maximum permissible amount should probably be reevaluated, since past methods of testing have not taken account of such variables as the quantity of the food or beverage consumed, its acidity, the length of time it is stored and whether or not it is cooked in the pottery.) As the McGill report points out, the danger of poisoning from lead-glazed pottery has been rediscovered periodically since antiquity. The Greeks knew about the danger but the Romans did not; they made the mistake of storing wine in earthenware. James Lind, who in 1753 recommended lemon or lime juice as a preventive for scurvy, also warned that the juices should not be stored in earthenware jugs. Now that index of suspicion has fallen too low: one physician poisoned himself recently by drinking a cola beverage (and 3.2 milligrams of lead) every evening for two years from a mug his son had made for him. Do these cases represent isolated occurrences? How many other people are similarly exposed? Clearly the first step is the testing of earthenware and a reevaluation of its fabrication and use for food and drink.

In the manufacture of moonshine whiskey, lead solder is used in the tubing of distillation units. Moreover, discarded automobile radiators that contain lead often serve as condensers. Lead is therefore found in most samples of confiscated moonshine. Lead encephalopathy, nephritis with gout and other lead-related conditions have been reported in moonshine consumers, largely in the southeastern part of the U.S. The problem of diagnosis is complicated by the fact that the symptoms of acute alcoholism and acute lead poisoning are similar in many ways. (Again there is a historical record. The McGill report noted that the Massachusetts Bay Colony forbade rum distillation in leaded stills in 1723 in an effort to prevent "dry grapes," an intestinal condition. In 1767 Sir George Baker blamed "the endemic colic of Devonshire" on the use of lead-lined troughs in the making of apple cider.)

Childhood lead poisoning in the U.S. is seen almost exclusively in children of pre-

school age who live in deteriorated housing built before 1940 (when titanium dioxide began to replace lead in the pigment of most interior paints). The causative factors are commonly a triad: a dilapidated old house, a toddler with pica and parents with inadequate resources (emotional, intellectual, informational and/or economic) to cope with the family's needs. The three factors interact to increase the likelihood that the child will eat chips of leaded paint. A chip of paint about the size of an adult's thumbnail can contain between 50 and 100 milligrams of lead, and so a child eating a few small chips a day easily ingests 100 or more times the tolerable adult intake of the metal! In one study conducted some years ago at the Baltimore City Hospitals and the Johns Hopkins Hospital, Harold E. Harrison and I found that the average daily fecal excretion of lead by children with severe plumbism was 44 milligrams. In a group of normal unexposed children we found a daily fecal lead excretion of less than .2 milligram of lead. In other words, pica for leaded paint results in genuinely massive exposures. And when the abnormal intake ceases, it may be several months or years before blood-lead levels return to normal.

The repeated ingestion of leaded-paint chips for about three months or longer can lead to clinical symptoms and eventually to the absorption of a potentially lethal body burden of lead. During the first four to six weeks of abnormal ingestion there are no symptoms. After a few weeks minor symptoms such as decreased appetite, irritability, clumsiness, unwillingness to play, fatigue, headache, abdominal pain and vomiting begin to appear. These, of course, are all quite nonspecific symptoms, easily ignored as behavior problems or blamed on various childhood diseases. In a few weeks the lassitude may progress to intermittent drowsiness and stupor; the vomiting may become persistent and forceful; brief convulsions may occur. If the exposure to lead continues, the course of the disease can culminate abruptly in coma, intractable convulsions and sometimes death.

This picture of fulminating encephalopathy is commonest in children between 15 and 30 months of age; older children tend to suffer recurrent but less severe acute episodes and are usually brought to the hospital with a history of sporadic convulsions, behavior problems, hyperactivity or mental retardation. The symptoms tend to wax and wane, usually becoming more severe in summer. (Some 85 percent of all lead-poisoning cases are reported from May through October. This remarkably clear seasonal pattern is still not understood. It may be due at least in part to the fact that the ultraviolet component of sunlight increases the absorption of lead from the intestine.)

The symptoms of even acute encephalopathy are nonspecific, resembling those of brain abscesses and tumors and of viral and bacterial infections of the brain. Diagnosis depends, first of all, on a high level of suspicion. To make a positive diagnosis it is necessary to show high lead absorption as well as the adverse effects of lead. This requires the measurement of lead in blood and other specialized tests. Mild symptoms may be found in the presence of values of between 60 and 80 micrograms of lead per 100 milliliters of blood. As the blood-lead level rises above 80 micrograms the risk of severe symptoms increases sharply. Even in the absence of symptoms, in children blood-lead levels exceeding 80 micrograms call for immediate treatment and separation of the child from the source of lead.

Treatment is with potent compounds known as chelating agents (from the Greek *chēlē*, meaning claw): molecules that tend to bind a metal atom firmly, sequestering it and thus rendering it highly soluble [see "Chelation," by Harold F. Walton; SCIEN-

TFIC AMERICAN, June, 1953]. Chelating agents remove lead atoms from tissues for excretion through the kidney and through the liver. With chelating agents very high tissue levels of lead can be rapidly reduced to levels approaching normal, and the adverse metabolic effects can be promptly suppressed. Initially two agents are administered by injection: EDTA and BAL. (EDTA, or edathamil, is ethylenediaminetetraacetic acid; BAL is "British Anti-Lewisite," developed during World War II as an antidote for lewisite, an arsenic-containing poison gas.) After the lead level has been reduced another agent, d-penicillamine, may be administered orally as a followup therapy.

Before chelating agents were available about two-thirds of all children with lead encephalopathy died. Now the mortality rate is less than 5 percent. Unfortunately the improvement in therapy has not substantially reduced the incidence of brain damage in the survivors. Meyer A. Perlestein and R. Attala of the Northwestern University Medical School found that of 59 children who developed encephalopathy, 82 percent were left with permanent injury: mental retardation, convulsive disorders, cerebral palsy or blindness. This high incidence of permanent damage suggests that some of these children must have had recurrent episodes of plumbism; we have found that if a child who has been treated for acute encephalopathy is returned to the same hazardous environment, the risk of permanent brain damage rises to virtually 100 percent. In Baltimore, with the help of the Health Department and through the efforts of dedicated medical social workers, we are able to make it an absolute rule that no victim of lead poisoning is ever returned to a dangerous environment. The child goes from the hospital to a convalescent home and does not rejoin his family until all hazardous lead sources have been removed or the family has been helped to find lead-free housing. Cases of permanent brain damage nevertheless persist. It appears that even among children who suffer only one episode, are properly treated and are thereafter kept away from lead, at least 25 percent of the survivors of lead encephalopathy sustain lasting damage.

Clearly, then, treatment is not enough; the disease must be prevented. Children with increased lead absorption must be identified before they become poisoned. Going a step further, the sources of excessive lead exposure must be eliminated.

Baltimore has taken a "case-finding" approach to these tasks. Free diagnostic services were established by the city Health Department in the 1930's. Physicians took advantage of the services, and increasing numbers of cases were discovered. Since 1951 the removal of leaded paint has been required in any dwelling where a child is found with a blood-lead value of more than 60 micrograms. The number of cases reported each year rose for some time as diagnostic methods and awareness improved, but recently it has leveled off. In order to reach children before they are poisoned, however, more is required than case-finding; what is needed is a screening program that examines entire populations of children in high-risk areas of cities. Chicago undertook that task in the 1960's. Last year New York City inaugurated a new and intensive screening program in which children are being tested for blood lead in hospitals and at a large number of neighborhood health centers; an educational campaign has been launched to bring lead poisoning and the testing facilities to public notice. As in Baltimore, a blood-lead finding of more than 60 micrograms results in an examination of the child's home. If any samples of paint and plaster contain more than 1 percent of lead, the landlord is ordered to correct the condition by covering the walls with wallboard to a height of at least four feet and by remov-

ing all leaded paint from wood surfaces; if the landlord does not comply, the city undertakes the work and bills him. Before the new program was begun New York was screening about 175 blood tests a week; by the end of the year it was doing about 2,000 tests a week. Whereas 727 cases of lead poisoning were reported in the city in 1969, last year more than 2,600 were reported. As Evan Charney of the University of Rochester School of Medicine and Dentistry has put it, "the number of cases depends on how hard you look."

Screening is complicated by technical difficulties in testing both children and dwellings. The standard dithizone method of determining blood lead requires between five and 10 cubic centimeters of blood taken from a vein—a difficult procedure in very small children—and the analysis is time-consuming. What is needed is a dependable test that can be carried out on a drop or two of blood from a finger prick. A variety of approaches are now being tried in several laboratories in order to reach this goal; as yet no microtest utilizing a drop or two of blood has been proved practical on the basis of large-scale use in the field. Several appear to be promising in the laboratory, so that field testing in the near future can be anticipated. As for the checking of dwellings, the standard method is laborious primarily because it requires the collection of a large number of samples. Several different portable instruments are under development, including an X-ray fluorescence apparatus that gives a lead-content reading when it is pointed at a surface, but these devices have not yet been proved reliable in the field.

Since World War II the incidence of lead poisoning (usually in the form of lead palsy) among industrial workers, which was once a serious problem, has been reduced by various control measures. The danger is now limited primarily to small plants that are not well regulated and to home industries.

There is increasing concern over environmental lead pollution. Claire C. Patterson of the California Institute of Technology has shown that the levels of lead in polar ice have risen sharply since the beginning of the Industrial Revolution. Henry A. Schroeder of the Dartmouth Medical School has shown that the burden of lead in the human body rises with age, and that this rise is due almost entirely to the concentration of lead in bone. Although man's exposure to lead in highly industrialized nations may come from a variety of sources, the evidence points to leaded gasoline as the principal source of airborne lead today. These observations have occasioned much speculation. It is nonetheless clear that a further rise in the dissemination of lead wastes into the environment can cause adverse effects on human health; indeed, concerted efforts to lower the current levels of exposure must be made, particularly in congested urban areas.

At the moment there is no evidence that any groups have mean blood levels that approach the dangerous range. Some, however, do have levels at which a minimal increase in urinary ALA, but nothing more, is to be expected. This includes people whose occupation brings them into close and almost daily contact with automotive exhaust. These observations emphasize the need to halt any further rise in the total level of exposure. A margin of safety needs to be defined and maintained. This will require research aimed at elucidating the effects of long-term exposure to levels of lead insufficient to cause symptoms or clear-cut functional injury. With regard to respiratory exposure, it is still not clear what fraction of the inhaled particles reaches the lungs and how much of that fraction is actually absorbed from the lung. Still another important question is the storage of lead in bone. Can any significant fraction of lead in bone be easily and quickly mobilized? If so, under what circumstances

is it mobilized? There are more questions than answers to the problems posed by levels of lead only slightly higher than those currently found in urban man. Much research is required.

With regard to childhood lead poisoning, however, we know enough to act. It is impermissible for a humane society to fail to do what is necessary to eliminate a wholly preventive disease.

MINORITIES SHOWING GAINS ON SHRINKING U.S. PAYROLL

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 10, 1971

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, a recent column by Philip Shandler in the Washington Star points out that while the Federal work force has been decreasing, the position of blacks and other minorities who are employed by the Civil Service has been steadily improving. The improvement is not only in the numbers employed but also in a steady upgrading to higher level jobs.

Some time ago, President Nixon said that he would not indulge in civil rights rhetoric. Rather, he felt that his administration should be judged on its deeds. The President evidently means to earn high marks in this area because it is obvious that this administration is quietly, but effectively, pursuing a program of opening up Federal job opportunities to members of minority groups.

I include Mr. Shandler's article, entitled "Minorities Showing Gains on Shrinking U.S. Payroll" in the RECORD: THE FEDERAL SPOTLIGHT: MINORITIES SHOWING GAINS ON SHRINKING U.S. PAYROLL

(By Philip Shandler)

The position of minorities in the federal work force has been improving.

While Uncle Sam's payroll has been shrinking generally, the number of blacks, Spanish-Americans and other minorities on it has been increasing.

It's not just a percentage-comparison improvement, either. In some cases, there's been a raw-number increase.

And the rise is most marked where it's needed most: in upper-level jobs.

The situation is a remarkable reversal of the adage that historically has reflected the status of minorities in a recession: "Last hired, first fired."

The situation is reflected in the latest figures released by the Civil Service Commission on minority employment.

The data was compiled last May. A later survey was taken in November, but those figures haven't been released yet.

The minority censuses were directed in an executive order issued by President Nixon in August 1969. The first was made in November 1969.

In the six months between November 1969 and May 1970, the more recent survey shows, total net federal employment declined by almost 8,700 jobs. At the same time, there was a net increase of minorities on the federal payroll of almost 1,400.

Percentage-wise, that's a rise of only .3 percent, from 500,508 minority workers to 501,871.

And only 14 of those new minority careerists are in the so-called super-grade positions, GS-16 to GS-18.

But the rate of rise clearly is improving:

Only 10 minorities were named to supergrade jobs in the two years preceding November 1969, according to the CSC.

And there has been a striking shift of minorities from blue-collar (Wage Board) to white-collar (General Schedule) positions.

In the blue collar area minority jobs did drop, by 2.5 percent. But that's compared with a decline of 3.1 percent among white workers. In numbers of jobs, the decline was 3,825 for minorities and 12,633 for whites.

At the same time, minority white collar jobs rose by 4,445 while nonminorities dropped by 1,241. That's an improvement of 2.4 percent for minorities, a decline of .1 percent for whites.

As things stand, minorities now comprise 19.4 percent of the federal work force of almost 2.6 million.

Blacks total 15 percent (389,355), Spanish-speaking 2.9 percent (73,968), Indian .7 percent (17,446), and Orientals .8 percent (21,102).

The minorities remain concentrated at the lower levels, however. While 111 minorities now hold super-grade jobs, there are thousands at lower levels. The largest number of blacks, for example, are at GS-4—31,804. That's 18.6 percent, compared with 1.5 percent at GS-17.

Indeed, the number of minorities is in almost inverse proportion to the level of the job. The slight exception is among Orientals, whose numbers rise from .4 percent at GS-1 to 1 percent at GS-9 through GS-11, before declining again.

Of the 111 minorities in top-level jobs, 75 are listed as Negro, 17 Spanish-surnamed, 13 Oriental and six American Indian.

In percentages, that's about 1.4 percent Negro, .3 percent Spanish-speaking, .3 percent Oriental and under .2 percent Indian (there apparently are no Indian GS-18s).

When one considers that blacks comprise about 12 percent of the total population and the Spanish-speaking about .3 percent, most are still a long way from the top of the Civil Service.

MESSAGE ENCOURAGES THE PRESERVATION AND RESTORATION OF HISTORIC BUILDINGS

HON. OGDEN R. REID

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 10, 1971

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, I was pleased to note the inclusion in President Nixon's environment message of proposals to encourage the preservation and restoration of historic buildings and other manifestations of our architectural heritage.

At the end of the 91st Congress, I introduced legislation with the same intention after an 18th century building near my home was demolished because funds could not be found to save it. The financial arrangements in my bill to encourage such historic preservation are somewhat different than those outlined in the President's proposals but I feel that the best provisions will be enacted if we have the benefit of examining several different approaches.

Accordingly, I am reintroducing today my bill to amend the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 to provide grants and loans for persons who have buildings or structures registered in the National Register in order to preserve such historic properties.

While the historic preservation program now established under existing law is an indication of and a start on a national commitment to preserve significant elements of our past, it simply is not broad enough in scope or application to accomplish that goal. In the 4 years that the National Historic Preservation Act has been on the books, appropriations totaling \$32 million have been authorized. Yet only \$1.3 million of that sum has ever actually been appropriated.

Compared to other Western nations, this sum is pitifully small. England, for example, spends more than 6 million pounds annually on the preservation of historic buildings under the purview of the Historic Buildings and Ancient Monuments Act. In addition, private donations support the work of the national trust which maintains old historic homes and gardens and even villages as a private organization, relying on voluntary contributions and the receipt of property as a gift in lieu of estate taxes. France, too, spends several million in pursuit of similar historic preservation.

The recent destruction of an 18th century farmhouse in my district is an instructive example of the inadequacy of existing statutes.

A large corporation acquired property in Westchester County to build its world headquarters. On a corner of that land stood a farmhouse built in the late 18th century. While not a unique structure, the building incorporated several features peculiar to the Colonial period and nonexistent in contemporary architecture. The Westchester County Historical Society and a number of other local groups made persistent efforts to secure the funds necessary for the building's upkeep and to find a new location for it, since the corporation indicated it would be willing to move the structure. I tried to assist these interested citizens by attempting to secure Federal or State historical preservation funds.

And then one morning, while all these public-spirited efforts were in progress, a bulldozer appeared and demolished the farmhouse.

I shared the disappointment of local citizens at this unnecessary destruction and made plain my belief that it is a Federal responsibility to provide an appropriate mechanism for preserving such evidence of our national past.

The legislation I have introduced is one way of making it more difficult for the bulldozer to prevail over the preservation of our American heritage. This would be accomplished by providing Federal grants and loans for the restoration and preservation of historic structures to make them suitable for private occupancy or commercial use—to make them living historic sites rather than museums.

Specifically, my bill would:

First. Make funds available to counties to survey old buildings and structures and to have included in the National Register those which are "significant in American history, architecture, archeology, and culture, or whose lasting beauty of design and landscaping—including trees—have significantly enhanced the quality of American life." This will substantially expand the Na-

tional Register which now contains some 1,100 properties as a result of Federal and statewide surveys. But more importantly, it recognizes some of the more intangible qualities of our American past; it recognizes, for example, that it is the large maple on the front lawn of an 18th century house which gives the house its charm and its character and that the maple ought to be preserved along with the house. In short, my bill emphasizes the esthetic quality of our American heritage, the way a building looks and feels as well as the presence in it for one night of George Washington or Abraham Lincoln.

Second. Provide that if the owner of such property agreed to have his property recorded in the National Register a restrictive covenant would be included in the deed which would prohibit alterations in or destruction of the property without the written approval of the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation.

Third. Make the owners of National Register property eligible for matching grants and low-interest loans to restore the structure in order to preserve, directly or indirectly, the salient historical features and make it suitable for private occupancy or commercial use.

Fourth. Permit the Secretary of the Interior to seek a court order restraining any attempt to alter or destroy a National Register property in the event that such alteration or destruction has not been approved by the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation.

A survey made by the National Register recently indicated that the States could match \$2 million annually for 5 years for survey and planning, and that they could match the following figures for projects: fiscal year 1972, \$28 million; fiscal year 1973, \$34 million; fiscal year 1974, \$41 million; and fiscal year 1975, \$46 million. My bill makes authorizations based on these estimates.

Mr. Speaker, the greatness of a Nation is to a large extent measured by the use of its past to give stability to its present and to forge its future. There is some quality of strength, some feeling of continuity that is derived from contemporary use of homes and buildings that were the shelters and mainstays of our forebearers. Surely a large corporation, a community, a nation gains very little from destroying these links with our past; there is much more to be had from their restoration and constant use.

STILL THE FIRST OPTION

HON. JOHN G. SCHMITZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 10, 1971

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Henry Kissinger, Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs, said:

If there is the danger of a general war in this administration, I do not believe, and we do not believe, that it will come from Southeast Asia. It is very hard to see what we could do in Southeast Asia that would produce a direct confrontation with the Soviet Union.

House Joint Resolution 71—formerly House Joint Resolution 1378—calls for a declaration of war against the Government of North Vietnam unless, within 30 days following passage of the resolution, they begin a large-scale withdrawal of their armies from the territory of their neighbors and release all American prisoners of war.

I have reintroduced this resolution because the overriding factor which determines the outcome of the war has not changed. The key to Communist victory has always been to protract the conflict, while the key to Allied success has always been to end it quickly and decisively. The first option of victory is still easily possible with the material we have on hand in Southeast Asia, and is more necessary than ever before.

Under the current guidelines limiting significant U.S. and allied military activity to allied territory, the Government of North Vietnam has no reason whatsoever either to stop the war or to release the American prisoners whom they hold. There are now prospective presidential candidates whose major campaign prom-

ise seems to be that they will surrender in Southeast Asia as soon as possible after taking the oath to protect the Nation from enemies, foreign and domestic.

For Hanoi, this opens up the real possibility of transforming the current U.S. policy of orderly retreat into a galloping rout—through the simple expedient of maintaining military pressure until the next election in the United States. The Soviet Union has promised the material necessary to prolong the war indefinitely. To the men of the North Vietnamese Politburo, some of whom have been waging a war for the conquest of Indochina for over 30 years, 2 more years must seem a very short time indeed to wait for complete victory.

The spirit of many Americans has flagged in the face of our self-imposed indecisive approach to the battle in Southeast Asia. This can be understood, but it cannot be applauded. We are not going to solve our problems at home by scuttling our allies abroad, just as we are not going to solve the problems in Asia by refusing to defeat the enemy.

The Congress of the United States has the power to declare war and direct the administration to utilize all necessary force to curtail North Vietnamese aggression. The administration, taking Dr. Kissinger at his word, does not feel that this would lead to a general war with the Soviet Union. Unless Dr. Gallup has now become a member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, or fear of student unrest has become a determinant in military decisions—in which case we are not going to actively resist communism anywhere—there is no reason not to win.

It is time to stop simply talking about possible peace and move to eliminate the North Vietnamese capability to go on making war. As three noted authorities on communism—Stefan Possony, Robert Strausz-Hupe, and William Kintner—bluntly put it:

If the Communists prove to have more courage, a stronger will, a more steadfast spirit, a clearer intellectual insight into conflict in the nuclear age, they obviously are the better men and deserve to win—and probably will.

SENATE—Thursday, February 11, 1971

(Legislative day of Tuesday, January 26, 1971)

The Senate met at 11:45 a.m., on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. ELLENDER).

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, by whose providence this Nation was brought forth and in whose will it has been preserved, keep us ever mindful of Thy goodness and mercy which has been over us from the beginning until now. As with grateful hearts we honor the heroes of old, spare us from merely admiring the past when we would be doers of great deeds in the present. Help us to lift high the banner of freedom in our time not only in eloquent phrase but in practical programs. Let the mantle of Washington and of Lincoln fall upon their sons in this age.

In faith and hope that sends a shining ray far down the future's broadening way, send us to our tasks here, our travels and our talks beyond, with hearts aglow with the inspiration of Thy spirit.

In the Master's name. Amen.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Geisler, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

As in executive session, the President pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting the nomination of Donald W. Whitehead, of Massachusetts, to be Federal Cochairman of the Appalachian Regional Commission, which was referred to the Committee on Public Works.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, February 10, 1971, be approved.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all committees be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

POSTAL SERVICE PASSPORT APPLICATION FEES

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 6, S. 531.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the bill (S. 531) to authorize the U.S. Postal Service to receive the fee of \$2 for execution of an application for a passport was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 531

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the proviso clause in section 1 of the Act of June 4, 1920, as amended (22 U.S.C. 214), is hereby further amended by striking out the period after "\$2" and inserting in lieu thereof "or to transfer to the Postal Service the execution fee of \$2 for each application accepted by that Service."

SEC. 2. The amendment made by this Act shall become effective on the date of enactment and shall continue in effect until June 30, 1973.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate go into executive session, to consider certain nominations on the Executive Calendar.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider executive business.

NATIONAL CREDIT UNION BOARD

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations to the National Credit Union Board.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of these nominations.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate return to the consideration of legislative business.

There being no objection, the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.