

America; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. GROSS:

H.R. 10678. A bill for the relief of Marie Tjernagel and others; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MITCHELL:

H.R. 10679. A bill to provide that a gold

medal be presented to the widow of the late Louis Armstrong; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MONAGAN:

H.R. 10680. A bill to provide that a gold medal be presented to the widow of the late Louis Armstrong; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

131. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the Town Board of Cheektowaga, N.Y., relative to Federal-State revenue sharing, which was referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

LEGAL SERVICES TO THE POOR

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 13, 1971

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, on August 7, 1971, the National Bar Association held a convention in Atlanta, Ga. This organization of black attorneys passed two most significant resolutions pursuant to their goal of assuring full and adequate participation of poor and black people in the life of America. The thrust of these measures states their opposition to Judicare as it has been implemented in the United States, and their belief in the necessity of involving more minority attorneys in OEO legal services. In addition, they deplore any action which tends to make a legal services program for the benefit of the poor a political issue. With all of these notions I concur; and therefore, I submit the text of their resolutions for the RECORD:

RESOLUTION 27: JUDICARE

The promise of America is not yet a reality for the poor and the minorities of this Nation. This Republic cannot endure half enslaved by poverty, racism, lack of power and dignity, and half-free. The National Bar Association recognizes that certain fundamental changes must occur in our institutions and in our practices, and is committed to bringing about such changes within the framework of the law. The Legal Services Program of the Office of Economic Opportunity has been such a force for change in this Nation.

Whereas, the National Bar Association is an organization of Black attorneys which seeks to assure the full and adequate participation of poor and Black people in the life of America; and

Whereas, the Legal Services Program is an instrument on the cutting edge of the law establishing the rights of the have-nots of society who have traditionally been denied these rights; and

Whereas, the Legal Services Program has been effective in establishing such rights because it has provided a national concentrated attack on the denial of effective advocacy for the Black and poor through the establishment of neighborhood law offices and the establishment of sound back-up research programs; and

Whereas, the Legal Services Program has placed Black attorneys in communities where Black lawyers in numbers which have never before been achieved; has allowed the efforts of legal services attorneys to extend beyond the traditional boundaries of legal representation to include the regular organizing of community groups, economic development projects, legislative activities, and community education; has developed attorneys with broad expertise in highly specialized areas of poverty law practice; and most important,

has allowed full-time attention by attorneys to the needs of Black and poor people; and

Whereas, certain State Governments, newly created associations and powerful corporate interests are attempting to undermine and destroy this vital program through the guise of substitution in its place a vague, undefined, untested, experimental idea called judicare; and

Whereas, the four judicare experiments that have been conducted in the past six years have failed to provide effective delivery of services to the poor; and

Whereas, these programs have been conceived and developed without the involvement of the organized Black Bar and have proven totally useless and irrelevant to the Black community; and

Whereas, the most significant experiment with legal services delivery systems is about to be launched under the auspices of the State of California and the Office of Economic Opportunity; and

Whereas, this California experiment has grand implications for the highly effective neighborhood office legal services delivery system operating throughout this country.

Therefore be it resolved that, NBA strongly endorses the current concept of providing legal services to the poor of this Nation; and as the Black and brown population form a disproportionate share of the poor, we urge that more minority attorneys, minority attorney organizations and client community organizations be given greater representation in staff positions, directorships and policy making and implementing positions at all levels of OEO Legal Services.

Be it further resolved that the National Bar Association does hereby urge the director of the Office of Economic Opportunity, the Director of Legal services of such office and all responsible persons not to fund the California Legal Assistance Foundation or any other grantee or delegate Agency unless and until such agency be truly representative of Black People, the Organized Local Black Bar, the Poor, and present OEO legal services attorneys and the Organized Bar generally.

Be it further resolved that based upon the available information and attempted experimental and proposed plans with Judicare to date, we find this to be an unacceptable method of providing quality legal services to the poor—and therefore we are opposed to the Judicare as it has been implemented in the United States.

Be it further resolved that a committee be created to study the question of Judicare and its implications for the Black Bar and Black Community and to report the results of this study to the Executive Committee within a time to be established by that Committee.

Be it further resolved that the Secretary of the National Bar Association be authorized and directed to communicate to the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity and the Governor of the State of California our strong desire that the National Bar Association and the Black Bar of the State of California become immediately involved in the planning phase of the experiment for Legal Services Delivery Systems about to be launched in that state.

Be it further resolved that the National Bar Association deplores and condemns any practice of making the legal services program a political issue.

RESOLUTION NO. 28: JUDICARE

The promise of America is not yet a reality for the poor and the minorities of this Nation. This Republic cannot endure half enslaved by poverty, racism, lack of power and dignity, and half free. The National Bar Association recognizes that certain fundamental changes must occur in our institutions and in our practices, and is committed to bringing about such changes within the framework of the law. The Legal Services Program of the Office of Economic Opportunity has been such a force for change in this Nation.

Whereas, the National Bar Association is an organization of Black attorneys which seeks to assure the full and adequate participation of the poor and Black people the life of America; and

Whereas, the Legal Services Program is an instrument on the cutting edge of the law establishing the rights of the have-nots of society who have traditionally been denied these rights; and

Whereas, the Legal Services Program has been effective in establishing such rights because it has provided a national concentrated attack on the denial of effective advocacy for the Black and poor through the establishment of neighborhood law offices, the establishment of sound back-up research programs; and

Whereas, our surveys indicate that during the period of time in which Judicare programs have been tried and developed in certain areas, Judicare lawyers have never filed a class action, have never appealed a case, have never filed an action in Federal Court, have never initiated any trial level actions (except domestic relations), have never been involved in jury trials, have almost never been involved in any type of trial, have almost never initiated any actions other than domestic relations; and

Whereas, aggressive representation in these areas is necessary to bring about meaningful change for the poor and Black; and

Whereas, the Judicare Programs threaten both the continuance of the Legal Services Programs and the effective delivery of legal services to the poor; and

Whereas, the Judicare Programs have been advocated and developed without the involvement of the organized Black Bar.

Therefore be it resolved that NBA strongly endorses the current concept of providing legal services to the poor of this Nation; and as the Black and brown population form a disproportionate share of the poor, we urge that more minority attorneys, minority attorney organizations and client community organizations be given greater representation in staff positions, directorships and policy making and implementing positions at all levels of OEO Legal Services.

Be it further resolved that because as Black attorneys we are deeply concerned about the provision of legal services to the poor, we insist upon full participation at all

stages of the development of any legal services delivery system.

Be it further resolved that based upon the available information and attempted experimental and proposed plans with Judicare to date, we find this to be an unacceptable method of providing quality legal services to the poor—and therefore we are opposed to Judicare.

OLD STURBRIDGE VILLAGE CELEBRATES ITS 25TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 13, 1971

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, Old Sturbridge Village, a replica of an early American village, has just celebrated the 25th anniversary of its public opening. Spreading over the gently rolling countryside outside the town of Sturbridge, Mass., the village is almost eerily evocative of colonial New England's mood and setting. Its authenticity, minutely exact, has been unchallenged throughout its history.

A museum, the village's forerunner and still its chief attraction, exhibits early New England artifacts—furniture, tools, utensils, clocks, glassware. Early 18th century houses, painstakingly restored to the bleakly austere elegance of colonial architecture, stand by the village's streets and walkways. A general store displays the few wares early New Englanders did not make for themselves. A blacksmith shop, an early factory, a gun museum, and a herb garden are among the scores of other attractions that could be listed here.

The village began humbly. Albert B. Wells, a Southbridge industrialist, discovered the lore of antiquing one rainy weekend in 1926. His interest, once casual, soon became a passion. His collection slowly outgrew his house, additions to his house, even his barns. Wells' son, George, proposed the museum eventually built in 1936. Around it, Old Sturbridge Village grew up under the stewardship of the Wells family and their friends. Mrs. Ruth D. Wells, the village's director from 1946 to 1950, and still active in its administration, opened it to the public in 1946.

The village now draws hundreds of visitors each year, and is the site of a master of arts program in American history offered by the University of Connecticut.

I was honored to take part in the ceremonies last weekend, Mr. Speaker, just as I was honored to serve on the village's 25th anniversary committee.

I feel sure my colleagues join me in congratulating the officers, trustees, and administration of Old Sturbridge Village.

I put in the RECORD an editorial and an article from the Evening News, a newspaper published in nearby Southbridge, and the anniversary celebration's program and schedule of events:

ON CELEBRATING THE VILLAGE'S ANNIVERSARY

(By Loren Ghiglione)

Each of us finds, I suppose, his own reasons for satisfaction in the celebration today of Old Sturbridge Village's 25th anniversary.

I am someone captured by the romance of newspapering. I'm not talking about just the excitement of writing but the romance that surrounds the many different parts of putting together a newspaper—designing the ads, editorializing, setting the type, reporting the news, printing the paper.

It's difficult today for people to see all these different parts as a whole. And few newspapermen today are masters of the entire operation.

Henry Beetle Hough, editor of The Vineyard Gazette, explained the problem, "The generations that knew and practiced the setting of type by hand, that knew the type case and all the rest, are gone; and these were the generations that knew the craft, business and profession of newspaper work as a whole, from first to last, in all its details, and had reason to know it, because one man in his time did all the things required in the making of a newspaper. The division of duties was a shadow line crossed and recrossed as occasion demanded."

A modern newspaper, on the other hand, is like many things modern. It's fragmented and dominated by electronic gadgetry—computers, cathode ray tubes, and typesetting machines. Gone are the sounds of the composing room. Gone is the smell of the ad department paste pots. Gone, to some extent, is the raucous, chaotic life of the newsroom. And, most important, gone is the opportunity for one man to know the feel of newspapering as a whole.

I've tried, as I'm sure a number of newspapermen have tried, to preserve some of the richness and romance of the newspaper's past so that others will understand our love for the business. However, old papers, autographs and photographs cannot, by themselves, convey the feeling we want to convey.

But Old Sturbridge Village has the Isalah Thomas Printing Office. The romance of newspapering is all there. One can feel it in the presses, type banks, and in the demonstrating printing that is done.

And so the romance and history are captured and conveyed to a society that today has few opportunities to know the craft, art, business and profession of newspapering as a whole.

Perhaps it's a special act of grace that the Village should call upon a newspaperman, Erwin Canham, Editor in Chief of The Christian Science Monitor, as its principal speaker today. I like to think Canham's speech is a way we newspapermen get to say thanks to the Village for helping keep alive the meaning and romance of our profession.

MUSEUM OF PAST LOOKS TOWARD ITS FUTURE

In the 1965 annual report of the president, Henry Sewall Woodbridge, Mr. Woodbridge quotes the New England poet, "New England is the Authorized Version of America." If this is so, then surely Old Sturbridge Village is the authorized version of New England.

Woodbridge begins the summation of the first 20 years of the Village thus "During a rainy weekend, in 1926, Albert B. Wells, a Southbridge, Massachusetts, industrialist went antiquing with a friend in Vermont, and then and there developed an intense personal interest in the furniture, tools, and utensils of early-day rural New England. He began collecting with the same enthusiasm and the drive that marked all of his other activities and within a few years his collection had outgrown his home, as well as various additions and barns."

The idea for an outdoor museum came from Albert Well's son, George, and the museum was created in 1936. The Wight-Ballard farm in Sturbridge was purchased as the museum site.

Joel Cheney Wells, Albert's brother, added his collection of New England clocks and paperweights and glass to the exhibit. Mrs. Albert B. Wells purchased the Dreyfus lighting collection in Switzerland.

In 1937, Arthur Shurcliff, a landscape architect, was hired to make the site plan for the museum and the Cheney Sawmill and the Gebhardt Barn was erected.

In 1938, Quinebaug Village was incorporated to operate a model New England village on the site and the Wight Gristmill was reconstructed on its original site and equipped.

In the next few years a number of houses were purchased and brought to the village. They included the Stephen Fitch House (1735-1820), from Willimantic, Conn.; Miner Grant's General Store (pre-1800) from Stafford, Conn., and a boot shop from the Alice M. Wight farm.

The Solomon Richardson farmhouse (ca. 1735) was moved from Podunk in East Brookfield in 1940 and the gristmill began operating.

The following year the Harrington Gun Museum was built as an adaptation of an early New England farmhouse.

Also in 1940, a reproduction of the first factory used by the American Optical Company, with which the Wells family was connected for many years, was constructed to house an exhibit of glassware and spectacles.

A reproduction of a blacksmith shop at Gilmanton Ironworks, New Hampshire, was constructed in 1942. The Farmer's Nooning and a blacksmith house now known as the Tin and Broom Shop, had worked begun on them in the same year.

All work on the village halted during the remaining war period.

In 1946, Mrs. George B. Wells became Acting Director. The Cabinet Shop and Miller's House were completed that same year and a reproduction of the Denison District School in Southbridge (now the Clock Museum) was built and construction of the Tavern began.

The Quinebaug Village became Old Sturbridge Village in 1946, also.

The focal point of the Village, the Baptist Meetinghouse (1832) was moved to the village from nearby Friskdale in 1947.

In the following year, the village became more representative with the election of a Board of Trustees for the first time of persons other than members of the Wells family or executives of the American Optical Company.

In July, 1948, "the Friends of Old Sturbridge Village", a membership organization, was established.

The Liberty Cap Motel was begun in 1950 on the Alice M. Wight farm on Route 20, near the Village.

The Pliny Freeman Farmhouse was moved from its site on Route 15, Sturbridge, into the Village in 1951, and a farm exhibit, one of the most popular and affecting exhibits of the museum, was developed.

Also that year, a program for school groups was begun on a limited basis and a "Teacher's Day" was held to acquaint teachers with the program.

Work was begun on the extensive and authentic herb garden and an early tobacco barn was moved from Hadley, for the drying and processing of herbs.

In 1953, Albert B. Wells died. His brother, Joel Cheney Wells, survived until 1960.

In January, 1955, the Old Sturbridge Village Booklet Series was begun with the publication of the New England Village Scenes: 1800. In August of 1955, the worst flood in the

history of the Village caused damage in excess of \$250,000. An appeal for reconstruction funds brought gifts totalling \$108,441.89.

In 1956, the Museum Shop was opened, later to be expanded. The first Annual Muster Day was celebrated on the Village Green in that year, but has since been discontinued. The Salem Towne House, the building which stands at the opposite end of the green to the meetinghouse, was added to the Village.

In the following year, the Village welcomed its one-millionth visitor. The Horn of Plenty gift shop was opened.

In 1959, the New England Galaxy was first published. George B. Wells resigned as president and was succeeded by Henry S. Woodbridge.

In February, 1961, the first issue of the Rural Visitor, a quarterly newsletter for the Friends of the Village, appeared.

"The New England Harmony: A Collection of Early American Choral Music," was produced by the Sturbridge Singers and released by Folkways Records.

In April, sequences for the motion picture "Hawaii" were filmed in the Village.

The Woodland Walk was dedicated as a memorial to Joel Cheney Wells in April.

With Village attendance figures increasing year by year, the expansion of Village facilities suddenly had become a matter of the first priority and additional land was urgently needed. Alexander J. Wall, president of the Village, reported in 1966, "Fortunately . . . the very land best suited for our purposes had become available and options had been taken on two tracts adjoining the present Village, a summer youth camp of approximately 1,000 acres—known as Camp Robinson Crusoe—and a gravel pit of small acreage but strategically located."

The camp was purchased in 1967 and the Trustees voted the newly acquired land be designated the Philip M. Morgan Tract in honor and in memory of the former chairman of the board.

A new fire resistant wing of the administration building provided an additional 3,400 square feet for the research library and 1,450 square feet for additional offices.

In 1966-67 Village attendance reached the half-million mark.

In 1969, an important program added during the year was the inauguration of the Village's new graduate program.

Aided by a \$20,800 grant from the National Endowment for the Humanities, the Village, in cooperation with the History Department of the University of Connecticut, presented the first year of a M.A. Program in American History and Historical Museum Work. Eight students worked and studied in the program.

At the Pliny Freeman farm in the same year, a Cooper's shop was added and approximately 16 acres of wood and brush land were cleared, broken up fertilized and seeded for farm crops. Over 6,000 feet of four-rail, most of it handmade at the farm, was built around the new farm fields. New orchards near the farm and the Salem Towne House were also prepared.

Just as the last Village year came to a close, arrangements were completed for the first major step in plans for the proposed manufacturing village, the acquisition of an original cotton mill building.

The Phoenix Mill in Phoenixville, Conn., was purchased to provide the key exhibit building for the new manufacturing village.

The tenth year of the Village music program brought a new facility which will provide a recording studio, a rehearsal room for the martial band, the Sturbridge Singers, and the Anacreontic Society.

As in the past, Village visitors were offered a dramatic presentation during the summer months. The play was directed by Elaine Bullis-Orms, who for many years directed The Merry Go Round Theater in Sturbridge.

SCHEDULE OF EVENTS.—FRIENDS' DAY AND 25TH ANNIVERSARY CELEBRATION, SEPTEMBER 11, 1971

9:30 a.m.—Village opens.
9:30-11:30 a.m.—Early Village scenes. Slide film presentation in the Gebhardt Barn. Continuous.

Special demonstrations—Wood carving, Cabinet Shop; Distaff making, Farm; Flower drying and arranging, Herb Garden; Quilting, Towne House; Clay grinding, Pottery.

11:30-12:00 noon—The Ancient Mariners, Guilford, Conn. Fife & Drum Corps, and the Sturbridge Martial Band performances on the Village Green.

2:00-2:45 p.m.—The Ancient Mariners and the Sturbridge Martial Band on the Village Green.

3:00-4:15 p.m.—Annual meeting and 25th anniversary celebration. Erwin Canham, editor, Christian Science Monitor, principal speaker, and Richard F. Treadway, master of ceremonies.

4:30 p.m.—President's reception and tea, Langdon House area. Education Center-Auditorium exhibits.

5:30 p.m.—Village closes.

TWENTY-FIFTH ANNIVERSARY PROGRAM AND FRIENDS' DAY ANNUAL MEETING, OLD STURBRIDGE VILLAGE, STURBRIDGE, MASS., September 11, 1971.

TWENTY-FIFTH ANNIVERSARY COMMITTEE

Richard F. Treadway, *Chairman*.
Dr. Homer D. Babbidge, Jr.
James Biddle.
Hon. Edward P. Boland.
Hon. Edward W. Brooke.
Hon. Paul J. Corriveau.
Dr. Abbott Lowell Cummings.
Mrs. F. Harold Daniels.
Albert J. DiGregorio.
Hon. Maurice A. Donahue.
Hon. Donald R. Dwight.
Dr. Lawrence E. Fox.
Mrs. Milton P. Higgins.
Harold D. Hodgkinson.
Hon. Edward M. Kennedy.
Ralph Lowell.
Marcus A. McCorsion.
Mrs. Philip M. Morgan.
Hon. Christopher H. Phillips.
Hon. Phillip A. Quinn.
Mrs. Albert W. Rice.
Dr. S. Dillon Ripley.
J. Hampden Robb.
Hon. Leverett Saltonstall.
Hon. Francis W. Sargent.
Rudolph J. Schaefer.
Richard C. Steele.
Robert W. Stoddard.
Hon. John A. Volpe.
Alexander J. Wall.
Hon. Sinclair Weeks.
Mrs. George B. Wells.
Dr. Walter Muir Whitehall.

OFFICERS AND TRUSTEES
Chairman of the Board, J. Hampden Robb.
Vice-Chairman of the Board, Edward L. Clifford.

Secretary, Linwood M. Erskine, Jr.
Treasurer, Albert J. DiGregorio.
Edward L. Bigelow.
Bruce Allen Brazo.
William H. Bulkeley.
Robert U. Clemence.
Edward L. Clifford.
Albert J. DiGregorio.
Dean A. Fales, Jr.
William C. Fenniman.
Walter F. Fullam.
Mrs. Bernard D. Grossman.
Dr. Lloyd Elmer Hawes.
Kenneth P. Higgins.
Harold Hugo.
Dr. Howard B. Jefferson.
Maurice Lazarus.
Mrs. Betram K. Little.
Mrs. Francis B. Lothrop.

Mrs. David B. Magee.
Edward W. Marshall.
Alton K. Marsters.
C. Virgil Martin.
Peter S. Morgan.
Dr. Franklin Patterson.
H. Ladd Plumley.
C. Mason Powell.
Louis M. Ream, Jr.
Miss Gay Reddig.
J. Hampden Robb.
Richard K. Showman.
Theodore L. Storer.
James A. Taylor.
Richard F. Treadway.
Edward R. Tufts.
Mrs. George B. Wells.
John M. Wells.

HONORARY TRUSTEES

John W. Agnew.
Dwight K. Bartlett, Jr.
Mrs. Frank M. Brennan.
Bartlett H. Hayes, Jr.
Thomas A. Pappas.
James J. Shea.
Frank O. Spinney.
Robert J. Starr.
Sheridan J. Thorup.
Dr. Talman W. Van Arsdale, Jr.
Henry Sewall Woodbridge.
Alexander J. Wall, *President*.

J. E. Auchmoody, *Vice-President for Business Administration*.
Barnes Riznik, *Vice-President for Museum Administration*.

PROGRAM

"Sturbridge", William Billings, 1779—Sturbridge Martial Band.
Welcome—Richard F. Treadway, *Master of Ceremonies*.
Annual Meeting of the Friends—J. Hampden Robb, *Chairman of Board of Trustees*, Presiding.
Report of the Nominating Committee.
Election of Friends' Trustee.
Report of the President—Alexander J. Wall.
Anniversary Comments and Introductions of Guests of Honor—Mr. Treadway.
Address—Erwin D. Canham, *Editor-in-Chief, The Christian Science Monitor*.
"Sturbridge", Samuel Holyoke, 1791—Sturbridge Martial Band.

SOME THOUGHTS ON THE MODERN VOLUNTEER ARMY

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 13, 1971

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, at the recent annual meeting of the Armor Association, Gen. Bruce C. Clarke, U.S. Army, retired, gave an enlightening speech about the modern volunteer army concept.

Because of his outstanding record of service and his vast experience in the military, I want to make his remarks available to my colleagues.

He was introduced by Brig. Gen. Hal C. Pattison, and I am also including his introductory remarks. Both appeared in the July-August issue of *Armor* magazine from which I obtained the material:

INTRODUCTION BY BRIG. GEN. HAL C. PATTISON

Our next speaker is a man who truly needs no introduction to an audience of *Armor* people. He is a former President of our

Association and was a longtime member of the Executive Council before that.

Few people have been as unstinting of their time and talents, particularly in retirement, as has General Bruce C. Clarke. I doubt that any single individual has appeared before as many Army audiences as he has during the past nine years. Recently, the Chief of Staff sent him on a fact-finding mission in support of the Modern Volunteer Army concept. General Clarke has volunteered to brief us on some of the salient points of his findings.

SOME THOUGHTS ON THE MODERN VOLUNTEER ARMY

(By Gen. Bruce C. Clarke, U.S. Army, retired)

General Pattison, General Desobry, distinguished guests, members of the Armor Association.

During the last 10 weeks, I have traveled to over a dozen Army posts looking at what is being done to increase the attractiveness of the service. I'd like to point out to you that in doing this I worked for General Forsythe, who is here today. He is a great believer in mission-type orders. When he sent me on this trip, he said "Get recruits." A two-word mission-type order, that's all the instructions I've had. And that's what I've been trying to do.

Now the purpose of the recruiting program in the Modern Volunteer Army is to get as many high quality enlisted men into the Army as we can. You note that the Army does not speak about an all-volunteer Army because "all" is pretty positive. When I commanded USAREUR, we had 84.6 percent volunteers. That's probably the optimum. The other 15 percent fit in well. That mix made a very fine army.

We must keep what we are doing in perspective. I enlisted in the Army 53 years ago. I have lived through five armistice periods. We are in an armistice period right now. Every one of them has been the same really—bring home the troops, no more wars. Soldiers say, "Well I've done my part and I'm getting out," and that sort of thing. Personnel turbulence, turbulence in appropriations, turbulence in everything. Now this sort of thing is going to go on for three or four years. It is not going to end tomorrow.

This reminds me of a story of the West Virginia countryman who went into town as he was having problems—physical problems. He told the doctor all about his aches and pains and about his spells. When he got through, the doctor said, "Have you ever had this before?" and he said, "Yes, I've had these spells about twice before." "Well," the doctor said "don't worry, you've got it again."

So we've got it again. But we've lived through it before. Out of the turmoil has always come a better Army. Out of this will come a better Army—I am convinced of it. I would not tell you so if I were not sure. I'm not interested in a choice assignment. I don't want to go to the War College. And I don't want a command. So I can tell it to you like it is—I think.

Now a part of the program that General Westmoreland approved was unit recruiting. I had discussed with General Forsythe the proposition of trying unit recruiting—say for the 1st Infantry Division in Kansas. General Westmoreland thought it was worthwhile to expand the experiment to seven units. I agreed. I recently visited all seven units and spent at least a day with them. In a two months period the Army has refined the instructions and techniques and so forth to the point where we are now really beginning to produce. This has not been easy. But it has been done and the units have good instructions; they have good procedures; and

they are all going at recruiting with good enthusiasm.

I don't know how many were here on the 15th of July 1940 when we stood on the street out here and activated the 1st Armored Division. Just before that the members of the 7th Cavalry Brigade (Mechanized) were turned loose in the states of Kentucky and West Virginia and brought back a division. That's where the 1st Armored Division came from. We brought back a division in civilian clothes by unit recruiting. So, it can be done.

And now a few further remarks on mission-type orders. Everywhere I talk to senior commanders, they all say the same thing. "Tell me what you want to accomplish. Tell me the factors that are needed for coordination. Tell me how you are going to help me. That's all I want to know."

Every one of them says the same thing. That's a mission-type order. But when you get down to the staff, gentlemen, they don't want that. They are going to have to interpret it. I was in General Forsythe's office the other day when somebody, a staff officer, called and said, "I have an instruction which said so and so, but he didn't spell it out exactly. What do you want to do?"

General Forsythe said, "Get recruits!" and hung up. We need staff officers that want mission-type orders and by God we don't have them. Now, why don't we have them? Because they are afraid to make mistakes.

Recently I talked to an ROTC outfit, and when I got through, the first question from the floor was, "General, what did that commander of the Coast Guard ship do wrong when he turned this man back to the Russians?" I answered, "He asked." If he had not asked, he would be still on active duty. Now, he's been retired. If the fellow above you knows less than you do, don't ask.

I can tell you that people in the Pentagon will welcome that. I never served in the Pentagon, but now I'm learning about those that do, and they aren't as bad as I used to think they were.

Today, we must get back to the peacetime garrison type of handling our men and our training. We have a new ballgame, the situation is different than it was in Vietnam. You have not been commanders in Vietnam. I have not. But I have kept track of what is going on. I have three sons in the service. Two majors in the Army and one in the Marine Corps. And they have no hesitation about telling me what's wrong with the service.

The leadership we need is not new. We have not dug up any new slabs in the desert with hieroglyphics on them that can be interpreted. The principles are not new. When you came in here you were handed a little card entitled "What Our Soldiers Have a Right To Expect from their Leaders." This was part of a lecture I gave to the First Class at West Point in 1945. I claim there is nothing on the card that anybody who wants to lead soldiers can find fault with. Nobody ever has.

In the letters that General Westmoreland gets on the misuse of American soldiers, the basis for complaint almost every time is a violation of one of these simple principles. Now, why is this? I bring this up to you because these principles are the basis of the VOLAR Program. They were not written for that purpose, but I studied the VOLAR Program and I can find nothing in it that differs materially from what is on the card. Furthermore, I can find nothing on the card that is permissive. We have all seen things in the paper about beer, no reveille, long hair, and that sort of business. This doesn't worry me at all. I was at Benning and spent a day with the 197th Infantry Brigade, 6000 troops, and I asked about the beer business. "Oh," they said, "less than half of our soldiers want beer. That is just something to write about in the paper."

Let's not get up in the air over beer and whether a soldier's hair is three inches long or three-and-a-half.

Not long ago, we took the green tabs off the shoulders of the sergeants major for some reason which I have not figured out yet. All we did was to make the sergeants major mad. My point of view is that if the sergeant major wants to wear a feather in his hat, that's all right with me. There's only one in the battalion and it takes two to establish precedent. The point is, let's concern ourselves with the proper things. As far as having a reveille formation goes, General Desobry, your commandant stopped the reveille formation in the 1st Armored Division a year before it was ever published. And the 1st Armored Division didn't go to pieces. I don't think that this made any particular difference—in efficiency, or discipline. So let's not get ourselves exercised about that either.

You know, when I was a recruit I took training under a drill sergeant named Scott. He was a cavalryman. He was a good soldier, with about 20 years of service. Every time we had a 10 minute break, we fell out under the only tree on the parade ground and he wouldn't let us rest. He lectured to us about the Army. One thing he said which I have never forgotten was, "Young Gentlemen, never forget, the Army isn't what it used to be; in fact it never has been." That was 53 years ago and it is just as true today. It never has been. And it isn't going to be. And therein lies its strength.

Now, what is the challenge that you and I—no just you—face, I don't face it anymore, but you officers and NCOs on active duty do. You have a challenge unique among the services. That is you are charged with producing superior units with the ordinary run of manpower. No other service will attempt that. Now remember that. That, to me, makes the Army attractive. "Produce superior units with the ordinary run of manpower." And we do it. The people who do it are good leaders and good commanders.

And that leads us to the question of morale which is a thing that a lot of people do not understand. Civilians usually do not understand morale. Many soldiers do not understand it either. Morale results from only three simple things.

The first is having a responsible job to do. From this comes job satisfaction. The greatest gripe that I get from soldiers is "I'm doing make work. I don't have a job." I get the same thing from lieutenants. "I'm doing a buck sergeant's work. The company commander is doing everything. He does not trust me because he is trying to build up good statistics. He does not want me to make a mistake."

Everyone in the Army must have an important job from which he can get job satisfaction.

The second thing is that everyone must have been trained well enough that he feels he is properly trained to do his job properly.

And the third thing is that somebody appreciates what he has done.

Now that is all there is to morale. Job satisfaction, a good job, trained to do it well, and somebody appreciates it. With that, you've got a complete course in leadership.

As some of you know, in connection with the Kermit Roosevelt Lectures, we exchange very senior speakers each year with the British. In 1969 British Lieutenant General Sir John Mogg had this to say: "In my command, the task of man management is given a higher priority than the skill at arms or professional ability." That, gentlemen, is what we must get back to.

At this point it seems appropriate to say that leadership must be, and truly can only be, exercised in the climate of good commandership. Not long ago I spoke to an audi-

ence of company officers at one of our service schools. I came down strong on what our soldiers have a right to expect from their leaders. At the end one captain rose to say, "General, I understand your points and I agree. But what has the company commander a right to expect from his battalion commander?" And shortly thereafter, students at Leavenworth asked what the battalion commander had a right to expect from the commanders above him. I had to admit that these questions were in a field that we had avoided. So, on the plane, I sat and sketched out a list of things I thought company and battalion commanders had a right to expect from higher commanders and their staffs. It is not a final product. I sent this to about 30 persons for comment.

One of the comments was, "This is hurriedly written and it has many errors of syntax." You know I was in the last section in English at West Point and I don't know what the hell syntax is. Apparently this hasn't stunted my career and I haven't looked it up. I asked somebody the other day what it meant and he said, that's the fee which you pay for opening up a house of ill repute. That's as good a definition as I need.

It seems to me that commanders if above battalion, brigade, division, and so on and their staffs would follow these precepts, it would make life worthwhile for the people below them. The commanders, I find in going around, are not universally at fault. However, the staff is often at fault. The staff fellow has got to show that he is industrious. In being so he often harasses the troops.

Red tape has been cited as one source of friction the Army must eliminate. One means to do this is to stop having staff sections subordinate to other staff sections. Section heads should report to the chief of staff or executive officer directly. When I instituted that system in USAREUR, the chief of staff was a classmate of mine. He said to me, "Bruce, that's too many for me to coordinate." "Well," I said, "Bill, I'm sorry about that because I wanted you to stay on as chief of staff. Do you have a suggestion as to who I should get in who can coordinate?" "Well," he said, "maybe I'd like to try." Nothing more was said about that and everything went fine.

Now, size of headquarters also has a lot to do with red tape. When I took over command of Seventh Army, I inherited a major general as chief of staff, a brigadier general as deputy chief of staff for operations, and a colonel as deputy chief of staff for administration. The papers went * * * young brigadier. I said I wanted him to come up and replace those three. "Would you like to try it?" I asked. "I sure would, sir," he replied. So I brought him up and he took over the job of those three and did it in half the time. His name was Harold K. Johnson. As you know, he later became a fine chief of staff of the Army.

Not long ago, I asked 40 students at the Army War College to fill out a questionnaire on leadership and commandship. This was done before my talk to their class in order that they would feel free to be completely objective. These students are smart people, being well within the top 15 percent of officers in the Army.

One question was, "If you were appointed Chief of Staff of the Army tomorrow, what are the first five things you would do to improve the Army?" Their strong first choice was to eliminate or cut down on the size of headquarters.

And now a related area—there is a difference between leadership and commandship. There is a difference, a broad difference. I have seen commanders who never could get over being leaders and they are awfully hard to work for. We have got to do a better job in teaching the technique of leadership and commandship. We teach very well the principles. I bet that everybody here could sit down and write a very good paper, a page-

and-a-half, on the principles of being a good company commander. But the technique of how to do it is another matter. We must teach technique of command. People used to study law from a book of principles. Now all law schools teach by case method. If you are going to study the law on burglary, you have about 15 or 20 burglary cases that have been decided by the courts. After you study them through and analyze them and so forth, you get a pretty good idea of what the law is on burglary.

I would like to suggest that the Armor School prepare a case study of the technique of the command of an armored company. Students could write up two or three experiences illustrating the special problems which confronted them as company commanders, what was done about these and what the results were. Such a book would be fascinating and it would be the best instruction one could get. I think our school would lead the entire Army school system with that sort of thing. I think everybody would follow.

I would like to end with a story that probably is a little silly, but it makes me laugh and maybe it has some application.

There was a countryman in Vermont who went into a general store and found only the proprietor there. Tom, the boy who had worked there, was not present, so the man asked, "What's become of Tom?" The storekeeper replied, "Tom ain't here no more." Well, the customer went on with his shopping and finally he said, "Have you thought about who is going to fill Tom's vacancy?" The storekeeper said, "Tom didn't leave any vacancy."

I suggest to you that whenever you go to a new assignment, you leave a hell of a big vacancy.

VITAL CONTRIBUTION TO AGRICULTURE BY JOHN DEERE

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 13, 1971

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, Agriculture furnishes one of the mainstays in the economy of the State of Iowa and the Nation. When coupled with the entire agribusiness community, it clearly is the predominant industry in Iowa. Agriculture has reached a high plateau of efficiency through the many scientific developments achieved over the years. Few were more important than the development of a plow suitable for tilling the rich prairie soil of Iowa and the rest of the Midwest. An article in the August 16 issue of the *Christian Science Monitor* more fully describes the role of John Deere in the development of the plow. The article follows:

WHEN JOHN DEERE ENGINEERED EFFICIENCY INTO TILLING THE LAND
(By Frank L. Remington)

It was to be a memorable event in the history of agriculture, that bright morning in 1837.

On the Rock River at Grand Detour, Ill., several small boats rowed by local farmers pulled to shore near Lewis Crandall's farm across the stream from the town. A powerfully built, 33-year-old blacksmith with curly hair and blue eyes hopped ashore.

From the boat he lifted a heavy plow of white oak and gleaming steel to his broad shoulders. Followed by scoffers and enthusiasts, he strode toward the field where Lewis Crandall waited with a horse in the hot mid-morning sun.

"I'll hitch 'er up, John," Mr. Crandall said. In a few moments he adjusted the harness to the plow.

"You drive, Lew," the blacksmith said, "I'll take the plow."

The bystanders watched the proceedings silently—perhaps a bit apprehensively. All of them had anticipated this field trial for months.

Desperately they needed a plow capable of tilling the rich but stubborn prairie soil that had already forced many discouraged settlers to abandon their farms. Without an efficient implement to till the land, many had returned to the more easily plowed soil in the East.

As the American frontier moved westward to the fertile prairies, the standard plow of the day proved deficient. The tough sod of the plains could be turned and broken easily enough; but in the years following the initial breaking, the plow failed to shed the soil properly. The rich dirt clung to the plow's moldboard to the despair of every farmer.

It was left to John Deere to design a better plow to fulfill the potential abundance of vast expanses of prairie land.

Born in Vermont in 1804, the plow's inventor apprenticed himself to the local blacksmith at a still tender age. His first-year wages came to \$30.

In the glow of the forge the talented youngster mastered his trade to perfection. From making horseshoes and fitting them, he turned to the ironwork on carriages and wagons and to harness links and buckles. Later, he excelled in manufacturing shovels, hoes, and pitchforks that delighted Vermont farmers. The blacksmith took great pride in quality work.

In the 1830's America was on the march westward. Tales of the golden opportunities in the new West stirred men's imaginations. John Deere decided to join the trek.

Leaving his wife and family to join him later, he set out with his bundle of tools and a small amount of cash. Traveling by canal boat, lake boat, and stage, he arrived at Grand Detour, Ill., in 1836.

Upon his arrival, he was asked to repair a broken mill shaft. With characteristic initiative, he set up a forge, using rocks from the river mortared with clay. Within two days, he had repaired the shaft. From then on he was busy shoeing horses and oxen and repairing broken clevises and trace chains.

The community soon learned that it had acquired a skilled workman who knew how to use tools. John Deere served them well. He could do little, however, for the discouraged farmers who daily brought their broken, bent, and shattered plows to his shop. Every day he heard the same complaint: "No plow will scour in this heavy, sticky soil after the first breaking."

John Deere lay awake nights pondering this seemingly insuperable problem. Recognizing the agricultural possibilities of the vast prairie, he set about building an earth-turning device that would clean itself as it cut and turned the furrow slice.

Months on end he attempted to resolve the problem. Neighbors often heard him hammering at his forge into the small hours of the night—and again as early as 4 in the morning. But gobs of prairie mud still clung to his remodeled plows; none of them would polish itself.

One day while visiting a sawmill, the blacksmith spotted a large circular saw blade of excellent Sheffield steel. It had been discarded but to John Deere it was much more than a piece of junk. He noticed the highly polished surface.

Even the sticky prairie soil couldn't cling to that shiny stuff, he thought. When he left the sawmill, the steel saw blade was under his arm.

On a log, he carved the shape he desired for the moldboard and share of his plow.

With a hand chisel he cut the teeth from the steel saw blade—then heated it on the forge and shaped it a bit at a time with a mallet over the log pattern.

Afterward he hardened the steel to adapt it better for work. The wood parts he fashioned from sapling—the handles from roots.

Many trials were made on nearby farms. After each trial the blacksmith carried the plow back to his shop, took it apart and changed the curve of the moldboard to improve its performance.

Day after day, early in the morning and late at night he toiled. And finally on that bright morning in 1837, John Deere proudly announced: "She's finished."

He had selected Lewis Crandall's land for the crucial test, for reputedly it contained the stickiest soil on the plains. "Giddap!" Mr. Crandall slapped the reins on the horse's back. John Deere gripped the handles; the plowshare bit deep into the black soil.

As the horse pulled forward, the plow followed steadily and easily without tug or jerk. The soil cut and curled from the moldboard in a neat, even strip, leaving a smooth furrow.

At the end of a long, straight row everyone examined the plow. "She's clean as a whistle!" exclaimed one of the onlookers. "She polishes herself as she moves." Later, after plowing the entire field, the moldboard still was clean.

A spontaneous shout issued from the crowd. They had beheld a miracle; a plow that scoured itself. Now the prairies could be farmed efficiently and produce abundant crops. The group at Crandall's farm had witnessed a significant turning point in the history of the plains.

Since that eventful day more than a century and a quarter ago, the plow created by the erstwhile Vermont blacksmith has seen service in every country on the face of the earth. No farming implement is more essential.

And John Deere was the man behind the modern plow that saved farmers hours of discouraging toil and opened the door to greater abundance for all.

MOVING THE BIG CROPS

HON. GARNER E. SHRIVER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 13, 1971

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, the impact on the Nation's economy of the West Coast longshoremen's strike is well known to all of us. The following editorial from the Hutchinson, Kans., News graphically illustrates the serious threat posed to Kansas' grain trade and to U.S. export business by the closure of American ports. Now there is the imminent threat of a tie-up of Gulf and Atlantic ports.

Great Plains Wheat, Inc., also has brought to my attention their concern over the loss of wheat export business and the damaging effect to the U.S. balance of international payments.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the editorial from the Hutchinson News and a copy of a letter to President Richard M. Nixon from Carl A. Dumler, president of Great Plains Wheat, Inc., on this situation:

MOVING THE BIG CROPS

West Coast longshoremen, who have been engaged in a costly, destructive strike, have thumbed their collective nose at the Presi-

dent. Longshoremen still plan to shut off Gulf ports Oct. 1, despite Washington pleas.

What this means to the Kansas grain trade is another crisis.

The News has frequently noted the cash loss to grain producers as a result of this threat to exports.

Now that the figures are coming in on this year's production, the physical problem of handling all the grain is awesome to contemplate. Neither railroads nor brokers have even been faced with such a stickler.

Kansas alone will pump out 686 1/4 million bushels, a 20 percent increase over last year. The latest USDA bushel figures, compared with the 1970 totals for Kansas:

1970:	
Wheat	299,013,000
Corn	79,670,000
Soybeans	15,075,000
Milo	145,960,000
Barley	7,141,000
Oats	10,250,000
Total	557,109,000
1971:	
Wheat	312,605,000
Corn	104,880,000
Soybeans	23,244,000
Milo	227,248,000
Barley	7,320,000
Oats	10,948,000
Total	686,245,000

The boxcar problem this summer was eased by light crops in Oklahoma and Texas. But most of the crop remains in the country. It soon will face the big yields in corn, grain sorghums, and soybeans—not only from Kansas but from Nebraska, Iowa, Missouri.

One bright spot is that we have much idle storage. That should do it, provided boxcars and trucks are where they are needed when needed—and provided the docks are open.

If not, look out for a mountainous grain-handling problem in early fall.

GREAT PLAINS WHEAT, INC.,

Washington, D.C., August 20, 1971.

HON. RICHARD M. NIXON,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: As Chairman of the Board of Directors of Great Plains Wheat, and on behalf of the approximately 400,000 wheat producers which it represents, I was pleased to note the measures you proposed to end the Pacific Coast dock strike. We are dismayed, however, to note that the unions have opposed the Federal order and are continuing the strike. We are even more greatly alarmed at the prospect of a Gulf ports and East Coast strike which will become a certainty if the unions are permitted to pursue their defiant course.

The strike has now run for more than seven weeks, and it has already cost the United States many millions of dollars in exports, which the United States, showing the first trade deficit since 1893, can ill afford to lose. The short-run loss is in itself distressing, but the long-term losses are staggering. Our overseas customers must seek dependable suppliers and have stated in meetings with agricultural groups they must have suppliers on whom they can depend the entire year—not merely eight or ten months of the year. They can become accustomed to using wheat from other sources, resulting in permanent losses to United States export trade.

With a bumper wheat crop this year, large quantities of which have even had to be stored on the ground and in the streets of midwestern cities, the United States wheat producer is more than ever dependent on exports. Considering the precarious balance of trade and payments, the United States economy suffers a distinct blow from the

loss of every bushel of wheat which does not go into export because of the strike. The negative multiplier effect on agri-business as a result of a weaker agricultural plant cannot but further debilitate a sagging economy.

We appreciate your efforts to help bolster the economy and urge you strongly to take the necessary measures to enforce the return to work order issued to the unions.

Sincerely,

CARL A. DUMLER,
President.

BLUE RIBBON PROBE OF CALIFORNIA WATER PROJECT URGED

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 13, 1971

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, recently, in an editorial, Mr. Don B. Curran, general manager of KGO-TV in San Francisco, Calif., called upon the California State Legislature to form a blue ribbon commission to make a thorough study of the California water project. The background arguments he uses are those that many of us in California have felt for a number of years now, and I find his suggestion an excellent opportunity for a full airing of these and other arguments against the current water plan. The editorial follows:

(KGO-TV Editorial)

WATER PROJECT PROBLEMS

A decade ago, Californians united to approve a massive three billion dollar water project. The purpose was to carry excess water from Northern California to heavily populated areas in the Los Angeles Basin. But in the ensuing ten years, much has changed in the State. The air and water pollution in Southern California is driving population away. The unemployment picture in the Los Angeles region is causing workers to pack up and move elsewhere. And the environmental threat to the Bay Area and Northern California is constantly growing because of this water project. In the next editorial, we will suggest what steps can be taken to correct this situation.

WATER PROJECT PROBLEMS

The State Legislature should immediately create a blue-ribbon investigation committee to determine if drastic changes should be made in the California Water Project, General Manager Don B. Curran declares in a Channel 7 editorial.

BLUE RIBBON PROBE

In the past ten years, the once grand California Water Project appears to be leaking at the seams. The need for which it was created is passing. And what is left is a definite threat to the environment of the Bay Area and Northern California. State Senator John Nejedly, of Contra Costa, suggests that a complete re-evaluation of the three billion dollar water project is in order. We agree. With thousands leaving Southern California because of pollution and unemployment, the need for great amounts of Northern California water has passed. We believe the State Legislature should immediately create a blue-ribbon water commission to investigate the whole California Water Project. If the commission finds the project needs overhauling, then drastic changes must be made at once. We cannot afford the luxury of watching our environment go down the drain. Thank you.

FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION HAS PROVIDED OUTSTANDING SERVICE DURING TIMES OF MAJOR DISASTERS THROUGH FEDERAL ASSISTANCE IN FORM OF EMERGENCY LOANS—DURING PAST FISCAL YEAR FHA PARTICIPATED IN LARGEST MONEY-VOLUME EMERGENCY PROGRAM

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 14, 1971

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, the Farmers Home Administration has done commendable work in carrying out the intent of the Congress by providing outstanding assistance to State and local governments during times of major disasters through its emergency loan program.

I wish, particularly, to commend Administrator James V. Smith, a former Member of Congress from Oklahoma, for his diligence and devotion to this program which aided hundreds of thousands of American citizens.

The loss of life, human suffering, loss of income, property loss and damage, which result from major disasters such as hurricanes, tornadoes, highwaters, earthquakes, drought, and other catastrophes, has affected every State at some time.

During fiscal year 1971, the Farmers Home Administration advanced \$127,635,906, the largest money-volume emergency program in its history, to aid in relieving human misery caused by disasters throughout our Nation.

Administrator Smith, together with Jack Frost, Director, Emergency Loan Division, and William K. Krause, Jesse C. Joyner, Celeste M. Iacampo, Helen R. Carrier, Lizzette Williams, and Darlene Henderson, as well as FHA county supervisors and clerks throughout the land have provided a very valuable service by helping to make this program efficient, effective, and extremely beneficial.

Also, special recognition is due A. James Manchin, a West Virginian who is a Program Assistant to Administrator Smith and who represented the Administrator last year during the severe tornadoes which struck 23 counties in Mississippi and during the drought in Texas. I congratulate Administrator Smith for utilizing the talents and abilities of Jim Manchin in these important assignments.

Jim was the creative and capable West Virginia State Director of the Farmers Home Administration from 1961-70. Through his diligent leadership and guidance, the Farmers Home Administration aided thousands of West Virginians in improving their quality of life and in many instances their health.

This same type of devotion has been the hallmark of Manchin in his present position with Administrator Smith. He traveled over 10,000 miles in Mississippi and Texas to lend a helping hand and to bring assistance to those in need.

Governor John Bell Williams made Manchin a colonel in the Mississippi Mi-

lita for his service to the State and he received special commendation for his outstanding service in Texas during Hurricane Celia and the drought.

The Farmers Home Administration is providing a most worthwhile service—one which aids our citizens when they desperately need help—and I commend the realistic approach, the dedicated men and women who serve, and the progress which has been so beneficial across our land.

THE ATFD

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 13, 1971

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I have, for some time, been inserting into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD comments relative to the unfortunate raid by the Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms Tax Division of the Internal Revenue Service on the home of Kenyon Ballew.

Today I received a copy of instructions from Chief of Police A. H. Pickles of the city of Leavenworth, Kans., outlining new procedures to be followed by his department in contacts and relationships with ATFD.

When a Federal agency has fallen to so low an estate as this, vigorous action must be taken to correct the situation.

It occurs to me that unless something forthright and vigorous is done, other police departments across the Nation will probably be following the lead of the city of Leavenworth in circumscribing the relationship of their law enforcement agencies with ATFD.

Pursuant to permission granted I insert the instructions at this point:

CITY OF LEAVENWORTH,
DEPARTMENT OF POLICE.

To: All Members of the Department.

From: Alfred H. Pickles.

Subject: Alcohol, Tobacco, & Firearms Division of the Internal Revenue Service.

Effective this date, August 10, 1971, the following procedure shall be used in any department contacts with the ATFD:

If it proves absolutely necessary to request assistance of ATFD because of jurisdictional problems or federal violations, it shall be brought to the attention of the Chief of Police who shall make the request.

If any other government agency can provide the needed assistance, that other agency (such as FBI) shall be called in preference to ATFD.

If ATFD is investigating a Leavenworth Police case at our request, their agents shall be and must be supervised by a member of our department.

These rules apply to firearms cases only.

The above policy is necessitated by recent severe abuse of police powers by agents of the ATFD as well as a lack of police experience on the part of most of their agents. It is our prime law enforcement responsibility to the citizens of Leavenworth to protect their Constitutional rights and recent incidents involving ATFD would tend to indicate some disregard for these rights. I do not intend to have this department share their blame.

MINNEAPOLIS HEALTH HEARINGS

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 14, 1971

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, at the hearings I recently held in Minneapolis, Mr. John Northrop who is a member of the National Association of Foreign Student Affairs testified as to the medical needs of foreign students presently studying in the United States.

According to Mr. Northrop there are approximately 1,600 foreign students at the University of Minnesota out of a total 130,000 nonimmigrant foreign students in the United States. For many of the nonimmigrant students, coming as they do from countries where the GNP can at times parallel a day's cost in this country for hospital care, any type of sickness can be a sharp blow to their financial status. The University of Minnesota does provide insurance coverage for the students but for the wives and families, insurance must be purchased from commercial insurance companies. Because of the high cost to the students many of them gamble with sickness and fail to obtain insurance. If sickness does occur, then the financial burdens become staggering. Coupled with their cost to come to this country, since 85 percent of all foreign students are nonsponsored, medical bills can force these students to remain in this country in order to earn sufficient money to pay off their debts. This is, as Mr. Northrop points out, a tremendous drain on the underdeveloped countries of the world.

Mr. Northrop's comments follow:

MR. NORTHROP'S COMMENTS

I have come to testify on behalf of the approximately 130,000 nonimmigrant foreign students attending our nation's colleges and universities. I wish to express the hope that, in our long-overdue efforts to assure that each of our citizens has the health care necessary for his own and our national well-being, we not ignore those persons from other countries seeking higher education within our borders. I feel the need applies to all lawful nonimmigrants in the U.S., as well as to those aliens seeking citizenship by naturalization, but that the need is most critical for visiting students and for the families that those that are married may bring with them. My reasons are as follows:

First, the foreign students in the U.S. represent a small but highly skilled and significant fraction, of their respective countries' populations. They will be providing much of the world's leadership in the coming decades. In addition, they are potential ambassadors of good will from the U.S. to their countries upon their return, and the health care and the attitudes about health care which they acquire in the U.S. will have a considerable effect on their countries' health and future development.

Second, while they represent a select group above average on any social or economic scale in their own countries, foreign students survive on very limited means in the U.S. Approximately 90% of foreign students are self-sponsored, i.e., not sponsored by any official or governmental agency. Subject often to stringent currency exchange regulations in their own countries, adverse exchange rates, immigration regulations here which deprive

them and their families of significant employment; and almost invariably subject to high and discriminatory non-resident rates of tuition in our state institutions, foreign students are often denied the adequate health care which they need, deserve and can get in their own countries, because of its prohibitive cost. Let us not forget that the average daily cost of being sick and hospitalized in a Twin Cities hospital exceeds the average per capita annual income in many of the countries represented on our campuses.

Third, foreign students provide a highly significant contribution to the education of our own citizens. One of the measures of a great college or university is the depth and scope of its international emphasis and involvement. A significant and varied foreign representation among its student body is, in turn, a part of this criterion. These students from abroad enrich and broaden the lives of those they meet on campus and in the community. Our colleges, our universities, and our nation welcome students from abroad out of not entirely selfless motives; this being the case, we have a responsibility to provide them and their families, with adequate health care.

Finally, students coming to the richest nation on earth expect, and I feel have a right to expect, that their health care needs will be met. Many of them coming from so-called developing countries have had free health care provided to them through national programs. These plans often cover U.S. students studying in their universities. Despite our efforts to explain the U.S. health care system—or rather non-system—to University of Minnesota foreign students, few of them can comprehend either that health care is an individual responsibility which must be acted upon before accident or illness occurs, or that the costs of not having health insurance can be disastrously high.

At the University of Minnesota our concern is primarily for the wives and families of foreign students, since the students, along with all other Minnesota students, are covered by the University Health Service paid for by substantial student fees collected routinely at the time of registration. Moreover, our concern is not so much that students or wives get free treatment for minor injuries or illnesses, but that they be protected from the costs of a catastrophic illness or accident that can cost hundreds or thousands of dollars and a lifetime of indebtedness. On the national level, however, I believe that it is essential for our own and the world's best interests that we, as a nation, take some responsibility for the health care of those persons we invite to our shores.

ANTELOPE VALLEY FAIR

HON. BARRY M. GOLDWATER, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 13, 1971

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. Speaker, last week in Lancaster, Calif., at the annual Antelope Valley Fair, Gen. Robert White of Edwards Air Force Base, gave the following address preceding the raising of the American flag. I would like to share his words with my colleagues:

ANTELOPE VALLEY FAIR

History is a story of painfully slow progress toward a world where every human being can live safely as a free and responsible individual, and able to use his abilities for any constructive purpose that doesn't harm others.

I take pride when I realize that the vast

majority of the people of this Nation are those who believe in the democratic way of life, are those who stand up in the face of threats, in order that we might continue to lead the world as a place of peace and advancement.

But this fair, in our Antelope Valley, is real evidence of the joy at the fruits of our harvest and labor. Similar events take place throughout our entire Nation and they are the finest examples of hard working citizens that band together and form a useful society. That society is America, and its greatness can only be the greatness of its people. Enjoy this fair, be proud of what it represents, and be aware that the flag of the United States that graces the fairgrounds represents you, its people.

With the raising of this flag today, we signal the opening of the 1971 Antelope Valley Fair. For the next several days, this fair will stand as a symbol of progress for all residents of this valley and this State.

But let us not forget the importance of this particular occasion, this moment, as we salute this flag.

Our flag represents a free country, made up of free people coming from all walks of life; people who have in the past, and are still, willing to stand up with pride when they are called upon to do so.

There have always been people who have failed to understand that liberty is not a free right but a priceless privilege that must be earned over and over again.

Though as a Nation we desire peace, there are those times when we are forced to engage in conflict. Had it not been for those men before us, perhaps we could not stand in this gathering today.

A NEW AMERICAN FACTORY FOR THE SOVIET UNION

HON. JOHN G. SCHMITZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 14, 1971

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, Anthony C. Sutton, "Western Technology and Soviet Economic Development," volume III, said:

Taking the fifty-two years since the 1917 Bolshevik Revolution as a whole, one important generalization may be made—that the single most important factor in Soviet economic and military development has been the infusion of Western, primarily American origin technology.

For the past 10 years Anthony C. Sutton, a research fellow at the Hoover Institute, Stanford University, has been engaged in an intensive study of the origin of Soviet technology and its relationship to Western technology and trade. In the light of his finding stated above, the administration's approval of the export of \$162 million worth of foundry tools to assist the Soviet Union in building the world's largest truck factory is simply incredible. At a point in time when we are falling farther and farther behind the Soviets in military power, supplying them with equipment of this kind means that more of their scarce resources can be diverted into construction work in the field of strategic weaponry.

In 1945 a study by the Interagency Committee, coordinated by the Foreign Economic Administration, unanimously concluded that the automotive industry

is a "major force for war." If present plans are carried out, when this plant—expected to produce 150,000 diesel trucks yearly, more than the United States now produces—is completed in 1975, U.S. manufacturers will have invested three-quarters of a billion dollars in equipment for it.

At this very moment thousands of military vehicles being used by the North Vietnamese Communists to bring arms and equipment down the Ho Chi Minh Trail come from the Gorki plant which was constructed in Russia by the Ford Motor Co. in the 1930's. The GAZ-69 light automobile built at the Gorki plant—advertised as being used for hospital, medical assistance, and agricultural purposes—with minor modifications doubles as the base for the SHMEL rocket launcher. The GAZ-54 is used to tow the ZPU-4 anti-aircraft gun. The ZIL automobile plant in Moscow, currently producing howitzer tractors and the base for the BM-13 rocket launcher was originally reconstructed and equipped by the A. J. Brandt Co. of the United States.

The major automobile plants in the Soviet Union, reconstructed and expanded by American firms in the early 1930's and reequipped under lend-lease and through trade with the West, consistently and simultaneously produced both "civilian" and "military" vehicles.

It is time to put a stop to this type of thing. Unfortunately the mood of the Congress, and the administration's acquiescence in trading activities which are detrimental to the security of our Nation, make it necessary to depend on action at the grassroots level. Pressure must be brought to bear directly on the manufacturers who are courting destruction in the not-too-distant future for the sake of immediate profits. Action at the local level can be successful. Several years ago the Young Americans for Freedom succeeded in stopping the construction of a Firestone rubber plant behind the Iron Curtain through a concentrated campaign of economic pressure and exposure aimed at the Firestone Co.

Therefore, I have introduced H.R. 8300 which has been referred to the House Committee on Banking and Currency. This bill requires the publication of lists on a quarterly basis of individuals and firms who export goods or services valued at \$1,000 or more in any calendar quarter to any Communist-dominated nation. At present the Department of Commerce can, and does, withhold the names of companies doing business with the Communists. While publicity for this kind of business may well embarrass the companies cited, the American people have a right to know just who is helping to supply our enemies on and off the battlefield.

DISSENT IN AMERICA

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 14, 1971

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, in an increasingly restless American society disagreement and differences of opinion

with "official" policies have become not only a common activity of great numbers of our citizens, but perhaps a necessity. I find this a positive sign as the American citizen must be able to criticize his Government without fear of retribution. The right to dissent is an important facet of our American heritage that should be protected.

Recently, additional thoughts were added to this controversy in an article, editorial, and letter to the editor on the "Real Patriots" printed in the Pittsburg Post Dispatch. The three excerpts represented an intelligent exchange of ideas and a communication of thought from which this country can benefit. I would especially like to bring attention to the House, the letter of Doug Beasley, wherein he spoke directly to the critical issue of dissent in an illustrative and moving manner.

I thoroughly agree with Mr. Beasley on the necessity of speaking out against the evils in our society as a means of exposing them and eventually eliminating them. That is real love of country—a willingness to admit errors and setting about to correct them, in order that the country may grow and progress.

The Post Dispatch raises the negative situation of dwelling too much on our ills. This is also a point well taken. Both Mr. Beasley and the editorial viewpoint of the Pittsburg Post Dispatch can be followed together. We, as a nation, recognizing our past achievements can work toward the solution of our present problems today.

I believe Congress could benefit from the idea exchange presented in the series of newspaper articles and for that reason I enter the following:

[From the Pittsburg Post Dispatch,
June 30, 1971]

ORATION ON 'REAL PATRIOTS'

(NOTE.—The following is a speech which should (but probably won't) be given instead of, or along with, the usual military orations which will fill the air, come 4th of July.)

Ladies and Gentlemen: We are here today because 195 years ago some American patriots cared enough about the concepts of human dignity and freedom to stake their lives on a new kind of government dedicated to the preservation of these concepts.

I say patriots because these men embodied all that we think of when we use that term: Washington, who led the armies of the U.S.; Patrick Henry, whose famous "give me liberty or give me death" provided the rallying cry for the American rebels; Thomas Jefferson, who drafted the defiant Declaration of Independence; and a host of others.

These men we call patriots, I believe, because they gave unstintingly of their time, their energies, their resources, and in many cases with their lives, in behalf of the new country in which their hopes for a decent future lay.

We are at war again, as we have been many times during these 195 years of our history. And the same kinds of acts are being performed in the name of patriotism today that were done in 1776.

Boys are fighting and dying for their country. Statesmen and politicians are demanding unwavering allegiance to the government's prosecution of the war. Businesses and corporations are proudly proclaiming their support of our democratic government's actions in fighting to preserve democracy

here and abroad. And citizens everywhere are outdoing themselves in demonstrating loyalty to our country by zealously and repeatedly pledging allegiance to the flag.

But are these the patriots of today? Are they carrying on the patriotic defense of their country in the traditions of their forebears of 200 years earlier?

The answer is a resounding NO! The so-called "patriots" of today are about as far removed from the patriots of 1776 as is W. C. Fields from Albert Schweitzer. And the acts which are being performed under the banner of patriotism are cruel deceptions which make the Great Diamond Hoax look like a high school prank.

Our sons in Vietnam are slaughtering and being slaughtered for a cause whose relation to the preservation of democracy in Vietnam is simply a myth, since the democratic concept has not yet taken its first breath in that country.

We are flatly engaged in a brazen interference in a civil war between two totalitarian-oriented factions, and the prediction of which of these will benefit the people of Vietnam more is something requiring considerable boldness, if not fool-hardiness.

To be sure, many, possibly most of our young men have been sent there against their will, or under a misconception instituted and perpetuated by our old men that there was some element of nobleness in their sacrifice. The real patriots are those who have had the guts to stand up and refuse to participate in this monstrous miscarriage of patriotism, many at the price of some of the prime years of their life, in prison.

Nor does patriotism relate in any way to the pious platitudes of politicians and businessmen about the need to have "politics stop at the water's edge" or to "support our government simply because it is of democratic origin." Such nonsense presumes, apparently, that democratic governments do not make mistakes, or that, if mistakes are made, they should not be corrected. The real patriots here are those who have had the courage to speak out against the Nixons, the Johnsons, and the Agnews, who would stifle dissent and equate dissension with treason.

And last, if not least, patriotism is clearly unrelated to the mutterings of smallish minds that we must pledge allegiance to the flag at every possible occasion (twice in one nearby city council). This preoccupation with the symbol and the ritual is tragic for it has blinded many to the fact that, while the flag itself waves on high, the moral stature of our country has been dragged through the mire of Vietnam.

The real patriots here are those who refuse to recite words which they find so clearly hypocritical.

My point is simply that patriotism is not—and in fact never was—blind adherence to any form or ritual, nor is it blind adherence to any course of action which our country's leaders may choose to take. It is time-consuming, selfless and courageous adherence to the concepts on which our country was founded: the equality of stature of all men and the freedom to live their own lives.

Look for those who follow this course; they are the real patriots.

From the Pittsburg Post Dispatch, July 14,
1971]

PUBLIC FORUM: LETTERS TO THE EDITOR
Editor:

Your editorial of July 2 in response to Robert Grinstead's column of June 30 on "Real Patriots" provokes me to add my thoughts.

The American College dictionary defines a patriot as "a person who loves his country, zealously supporting and defending it and its (assumed) interests." Does this mean, no matter what his country does or what effect these actions have on the moral conscience and ethics of the citizen?

Were the citizens of Germany who supported and abetted Hitler in his program of annihilating the Jews in the gas chambers, morally right? Did the Japanese show their patriotism when they registered no objections to the massacres in the Philippines? Were Americans patriotic when they acquiesced in the nuclear destruction of Hiroshima and Nagasaki?

Were all these inhuman actions justified as a means to an end?

Does silence give consent and therefore implicate the nonprotector? Or, should truly patriotic citizens follow their consciences in order to try to protect the honor of their country by speaking out and thus risk censure and being branded unpatriotic? Some would call such action a "Profile in Courage."

Should we, as citizens of the United States, rejoice every time B52s drop hundreds of tons of bombs on a helpless hamlet in Indo-China? And should we ignore the fact that hundreds of innocent women and children and possibly a few enemy soldiers are killed or horribly mutilated? We can pretend to clear our national and personal consciences by brushing off the guilt by saying, "Well, that's war."

The flag represents past ideals and precepts of our country to which a great majority of our citizens pray that, under new leadership, we will soon return.

Douglas Beasley
Walnut Creek

[From the Pittsburg Post Dispatch,
July 2, 1971]

COMMENT: TAKING STOCK

"The real patriots here are those who refuse to recite words (the pledge of allegiance) which they find so clearly hypocritical."

The quote is from our "Human Dimension" columnist on Wednesday's editorial page in this newspaper who supplied his version of the speech "which should (but probably won't) be given" on the 4th of July.

It was a remarkable bit of self-righteousness, throughout, stemming from writer Robert Grinstead's vigorous opposition to the Vietnam war. It was, in fact, more of the bad-mouthing of this country which is fast making us experts in the negatives of the American scene.

Mr. Grinstead said his point is that patriotism is not and never was blind adherence to any form or ritual, nor to any course of action which our country's leaders may choose to take. Patriotism, he described as "time-consuming, selfless and courageous adherence to the concepts on which our country was founded: the equality of stature of all men and the freedom to live their own lives." Those "who follow this course" are "the real patriots," he concluded.

We suggest that, using the above definition, the country is filled with patriots. For there is little of "blind adherence" today; indeed, there is more dissension, more cry for change, more opposition to policies, whether they affect the war or minorities or the peer, than ever before.

America is filled with a vast soul-searching which is being carried to an extreme where we concentrate on shortcomings with no credit for the broad range of achievement.

Where is "blind adherence," for instance, in the uproar today over the Pentagon papers on the Vietnam war, and the argument between the government and press which was carried to the highest court? Or in the numbers of cases brought before that same court to argue "the equality of stature of all men?"

Patriotism, it seems to us, should not be so narrowly defined that it lacks perspective, that it is so engrossed in the country's ills it ignores what has made us healthy.

This country was born out of struggle and it continues to evolve new directions out of struggle. And the Vietnam war, with all its

tragic errors, cannot be used as the sole basis for judging patriotism.

We believe, too, that branding the pledge of allegiance as a hypocrisy is a lamentable distortion, but a human one, of the nation's philosophy.

An eminent editor once reminded that "if we have made any progress from the slime, it is because we are constantly making ourselves hypocrites by setting ideals beyond us. There was a time when we preached the brotherhood of man and practiced slavery; dreamed of justice and hanged a man for stealing a loaf of bread; praised God and burned those who praised Him in a different fashion. Had not hypocrisy pricked our conscience, there we would be still."

The Fourth of July is a good time to take stock on all sides, acknowledging the imperfections but recognizing the achievements, as well.

GO BACK TO SCHOOL—DON'T COP OUT

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 14, 1971

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, as students throughout the country return to school, the fundamental value and contribution of education is often overlooked in the discussion of educational techniques, finances, and the social controversies that have surrounded schools throughout our Nation.

It was with special interest that I noted an extremely timely and practical editorial urging students to go back to school and acquire a sound education. This editorial appeared in the Saturday, September 4, Chicago-South Suburban News which is oriented towards serving the black communities in the Chicago area. The editorial follows:

GO BACK TO SCHOOL, DO NOT COP OUT

Schools around the area are resuming their schedule of classes. Some have already started, others will begin soon. The Chicago South Suburban News urges everyone to return to school. Especially we urge youngsters to finish high school, after that you can decide about college or a job or marriage. But first, get that diploma. Without it your chances grow increasingly dim—with it the horizons of your future expand in all directions.

If you are considering dropping out whether from boredom, poor grades or economic need remember that there are people and agencies who will help with your problems. If you are bored now consider what 40 or 50 years of an unskilled job, or no job at all, will do to your head. If your grades are poor and you are discouraged talk to a counsellor, or a friend, or your minister or somebody else who is understanding and whom you respect. They can probably help. There are tutoring programs almost everywhere—ask your local librarian, YMCA or YWCA director, a neighborhood cop, or call the nearest high school or college. If economics are a problem there are ways around that too. Again talk to some adult that you respect—maybe you should start with your parents—and find out if something can be done to help.

No matter what your problem—there are schools or classes for expectant mothers, night classes for working students, released time programs for students with money trou-

bles, and special arrangements for students with grade problems—you can find a solution. Stay in school because your problems will only grow if you quit.

We also urge adults to return to school. If you didn't finish when you were young do it now. Even if you don't want to work toward a diploma there are all kinds of courses available to increase your skills, open your mind, or simply to help you enjoy life more. Education should be a lifetime proposition, and the theory that "you can't teach an old dog new tricks" has long since been disproven. Who knows? Maybe if you go back to school your children will stay in school, and that all-by-itself is worth whatever time or money you might spend.

An education is a priceless thing. No matter what you may lose as you go along you always have your head on your shoulders, and if your head has something in it, a skill, a bit of information, or the ability to understand, you will always have something to fall back on when the going gets rough. With knowledge you can cope with anything—without it there will always be something that can bring you down. Go back to school, it's the best place to be.

"MAC" EPLEY GOES FISHING

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 14, 1971

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, there are four necessary ingredients to the health and welfare of my congressional district. They are, not necessarily in order, the Long Beach Naval Shipyard, the McDonnell Douglas Aircraft plant, the Queen Mary, and Malcolm Epley's "Beachcombing" column in the Independent Press-Telegram.

For almost 22 years, the people of Long Beach and its environs have enjoyed "Mac's" lively, newsy columns. He concentrated on the community's "good news," those folksy little tid-bits and anecdotes which too often get crowded off the front page.

And "Mac" is second to none in his love for Long Beach. He even wrote a history of the city and was the founder of the Long Beach Historical Society.

But, Malcolm Epley is retiring after more than 40 years as an active newspaperman, in both Oregon and California. He is going fishing, leaving the problems of writing a daily column to someone else.

The community will sorely miss him. In addition to his popular column, "Mac" has made innumerable contributions to his fellow man. He has held or now holds countless key civic positions, including chairmanship of the Long Beach area United Crusade, presidency of the Kiwanis Club, vice presidency of the Boy Scout Council, chairman of the board of the Heart Association, and member of the Southern California Water Committee and statewide Forest Fire Prevention Committee.

Many of his friends will gather to pay tribute to "Mac" on September 29 at a testimonial dinner at the Long Beach Elks Lodge. No one deserves this honor more. It simultaneously pays tribute to a career of skilled professionalism, consist-

ently characterized by excellence, fairness and good humor, and to a splendid man of great humanity, true humility, and out-sized understanding. In fact, to most of us, "Mac" Epley has always appeared somewhat larger than life itself.

I know that "Mac's" many friends in the House join me in wishing him and his wonderful wife Jane all that is good and rewarding in their retirement.

And we hope the big ones are biting.

WE MUST NOT FORGET THE FAITHFUL VETERAN

HON. JACK F. KEMP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 14, 1971

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, in the 9 years we have been fighting in Southeast Asia, approximately one out of five servicemen have received a medal for valor. The breakdown is as follows: Army, 1,273,000—this includes about 800,000 air medals to helicopter crews; Air Force, 410,000; and Navy-Marine Corps, 448,000. This totals 2,131,000 medals for valor and does not include purple hearts.

Some members of the press would have us believe that a large number of veterans have returned these medals, particularly during the May Day veterans demonstration. In checking with the Department of Defense, they have less than 10 medals of valor which have been returned. It is to be mentioned that medals do not belong to the Government, they are personal property, and therefore the Capitol Police are trying to return those that were discarded during the May Day demonstration.

Some press reports indicated thousands of medals were thrown away. The Capitol Police report is able to authenticate two or three silver stars, 25 to 30 bronze stars, and about 50 purple hearts. We can see the medals returned is infinitesimal in comparison to the number given.

I am glad that the Buffalo Courier Express has seen fit to call attention to the faithful veteran who at times might feel as though he is forgotten. Walter C. Reitmeyer is one veteran, seriously wounded, who would have good cause to be bitter. When asked about Vietnam, he said:

In my opinion, it and its people are worth fighting for. One of our most valuable and, I hope, lasting gifts to those people is a democratic constitution.

Mr. Speaker, in the August 1, 1971, issue of the Courier-Express, H. Katherine Smith wrote a poignant story about Walter C. Reitmeyer. I take great pleasure in calling this to the attention of my colleagues and include the article at this point:

VIETNAM VETERAN: BEING FORGOTTEN HURTS
EX-MARINE

(By H. Katherine Smith)

Walter C. Reitmeyer, former first lieutenant in the Marine Corps, has made an excellent adjustment to the loss of his left eye and the amputation of both feet, plus sections of both legs. But he is depressed by the de-

sertion of many friends since his return, handicapped, from Vietnam.

At Buffalo State College, where he was graduated in 1966, he was vice president of the Student Council and was voted the outstanding male member of his class. Since his discharge from the Philadelphia Naval Hospital, few of his classmates have continued their friendship with him. On the GI education program, he is studying at New York University to be a rehabilitation counselor.

"In addition to rehabilitating handicapped persons," he said, "my ambition is to educate the public in recognition of the handicapped as human beings, capable of friendship."

He keeps in touch with a number of wounded veterans he met in the Philadelphia Naval Hospital and he has taught handicapped young persons in New York City. They all have told him that only a few of their former friends remain loyal.

Walter is one of two brothers who served in Vietnam. His brother, Robert, was in the Army from 1966 to '69, attaining the rank of sergeant. Robert was not wounded.

Walter served with the Marine Combat Engineers. He enlisted in May, 1969, and was sent to Vietnam the following December. While clearing a mine field, he was wounded by a 60 pound mortar shell. That was in March, 1970.

After two weeks aboard hospital ships, he was flown to the Philadelphia Naval Hospital. After an operation on his right eye, he was blind for six months.

In Vietnam, Walter was a liaison officer between Marine Combat Engineers and South Vietnamese Popular Forces. He recalls that a number of the South Vietnamese he knew were very brave.

"The North Vietnamese are more mobile than the Americans and South Vietnamese," he stated. "We hold our positions. They attack."

He knew rural Vietnamese civilians into whose villages he accompanied medical teams and GI's who rebuilt homes and schools destroyed by the war.

"South Vietnam is a beautiful country except where it has been scarred by the war," he said, adding; "In my opinion, it and its people are worth fighting for. One of our most valuable and, I hope, lasting gifts to those people is a democratic constitution."

Walter was awarded eight medals and decorations, among them the bronze star for valor, the purple heart, and the Vietnamese Cross of Gallantry.

The veteran visited Japan briefly, spent 10 days on Okinawa, and enjoyed a brief tour in Hawaii.

In Vietnam, Walter was aware of no racial problems among the Marines. His platoon was nearly 50 per cent black. There was complete cooperation. Blacks displayed courage and initiative equal to the whites.

Before leaving for Vietnam the veteran was engaged to Dianne Brooks of this city, a graduate of Bryant & Stratton Business Institute. While he was on leave from the hospital they were married.

Walter lives normally. He walks more than most people, being aware that the more he walks, the more easily he will manipulate his artificial limbs. Currently he is a summer student at U.B. In September he will return to New York University.

Upon completion of his course in rehabilitation counseling he hopes to work for the Veterans' Administration, and would like to be domiciled in Western New York. He and his wife are spending the summer at 702 Dick Rd., Cheektowaga.

The son of Mr. and Mrs. Walter Reitmeyer, the veteran grew up in Lancaster and is a graduate of the high school of that community. At Buffalo State College he studied industrial arts. He designed a house in An-

gola and plans to design the home he eventually will build for his wife and himself.

He paints abstractions and his taste in music ranges from symphonies to modern rock. All are included in his stereo collection. He is 26 years old. Pool and bowling are among his recreations. He is part owner of a racing car driven by Paul Beach.

Although it has taken much from him, Walter Reitmeyer believes service in Vietnam has given him valuable assets:—leadership and readiness to assume responsibility.

RALPH NADER'S REPORT ON CALIFORNIA

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 14, 1971

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, accustomed to Ralph Nader's continuing attacks on the American business community, Californians were, nonetheless, shocked by his indictments against our State. The following editorial from the San Diego Union is an excellent summary of how many Californians assess Mr. Nader's charges and his credentials as an expert in State affairs and I am certain my House colleagues will find the Union's comments pertinent.

[From the San Diego Union, Aug. 25, 1971]

'RAIDERS' IN NEW TERRITORY—NADER'S TACTICS IRRESPONSIBLE

In assessing the Ralph Nader report on the state of California, it is important to use two yardsticks: responsibility and accountability. Mr. Nader is not a Californian, nor are most of the young law graduates who functioned as his "raiders" in compiling his sensational California casebooks. It would be a narrow view, however, to assume that because an outsider has drawn up a series of indictments against public policies in California, they should not be taken seriously.

The Nader reports are so voluminous and wide-ranging in their targets that it will take time for Californians to digest them, to examine the depth and accuracy of the material presented and the validity of the conclusions drawn. In the meantime we are confronted with an unusual phenomenon—a more or less single-handed assault by a private individual on the policies of state and local government in a state noted for its progressive approach to contemporary problems.

The name of Ralph Nader has invaded the public consciousness in recent years as a "consumer advocate" due to prodigious legwork by Mr. Nader and his staff and their talent for getting their reports into channels of mass publicity. His report on California strays far from this field.

In his California studies Mr. Nader's target is not so much the front-office of business firms or agencies responsible for regulating business but the full panoply of public affairs in California—administrators and legislators, planners, property developers, farmers, engineers—almost everyone who has been involved in charting the course of development of California. Even voters who approve bond issues are his ultimate targets.

In outline the Nader report resembles a political platform for "reform" in California. Mr. Nader would no doubt be the first to insist that he has no political ambitions in California and that his study is not designed to serve a partisan cause. However, by intention or not, he has cast himself as an advocate of political reform in a state in which he is not a resident, not a candidate

for office and not responsible to a constituency or party.

The question arises whether Mr. Nader can continue to claim a reputation as an independent advocate of consumer causes when he serves as a provider of grist for a state's political mills—the almost certain fate of his California reports. It would be interesting to know the source of his funds. Reports are expensive.

Mr. Nader has delivered to California a shipment of untested political ore. Some of the individuals in and out of public office whom he has criticized have already pointed to the many errors of fact or bad logic in the cases he makes.

At this point Mr. Nader has not proved that it would be worth the while of the Legislature to sift through the dross to look for the color.

EXAMINING THE PREMISES OF SOCIAL WELFARE LEGISLATION

HON. VICTOR V. VEYSEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 14, 1971

Mr. VEYSEY. Mr. Speaker, in the last decade we have spent billions of dollars on broad social programs aimed at raising the quality of life for the disadvantaged in America. We were told in the 1960's that adequate financing was all that stood between us and realization of "the good life" for all. We still hear arguments based on this premise, but social commentators are beginning to question it seriously.

I applaud the openhanded generosity of America. It is without precedent in the history of the world. But this generosity of the American people carries with it a burden on their elected officials to see that the sacrifices they were willing to make are not wasted.

Because of this, new attention is being given to the need to examine our social programs, and to evaluate their effectiveness. It is in this spirit that I commend to the attention of my colleagues an excellent article which recently dealt with the limits of "rational" approaches to social problems in general.

I intend to pursue this problem in the future, both legislatively and by sharing pertinent material with readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Tomorrow I will include a perceptive article on the concept of accountability in education.

The article follows:

ON THE LIMITS OF RATIONALITY

(By Robert L. Bartley)

WASHINGTON.—The intellectual agenda for the next quite a few years can be summed up in a question: What went wrong with the '60s? The answer will take time, but surely an important part of it is that so often—whether fighting in Vietnam, eradicating poverty or managing the economy—we thought we knew far more than we actually did.

Yet never before the '60s had there been such explicit concentration on methods of knowledge. One of the most conspicuous features of the decade was the cachet of new words like "systems analysis" or "PPBS"—Planning-Programming-Budgeting System. Never before had social-science theory played so large a part in things like warfare, where it gave us "winning the hearts and minds of

the people," or social policy, where it gave us "Community Action."

Not surprisingly, the early '70s are starting to see an exploration of this paradox, a re-assessment of what part should be played in policy-making by both systems analysis and social science. Neither is being rejected, of course, and both may prove more helpful in the future than they have in the past. Yet their practitioners are working themselves into a new modesty, a new understanding of the limitations of their methods.

This is an interesting development in its own right, but it is even more fascinating viewed against a background of political philosophy. For the root question in this reassessment is the power of rationality: Its theme is a new skepticism about man's ability to draw up rational prescriptions for changing society, or at least a new realism about the ease of doing so. And this is also one of the greatest themes of the first men to be called "conservatives"—those who saw the excesses of the French revolution arising from the abandonment of the durable lessons of experience for the frail guide of logic.

A good example of how the contemporary rationalists are reassessing their methods is an excellent new book by Alice M. Rivlin, "Systematic Thinking for Social Action" (The Brookings Institution). Mrs. Rivlin helped develop PPBS in the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, and served there as assistant secretary for planning and evaluation during the Johnson administration. She was also cochairman, with sociologist Daniel Bell, of a HEW advisory panel that urged development of a set of "social indicators" to improve policymaking. She is currently at Brookings, which gave her leave this summer to summarize some of her thinking for the Washington Post editorial page.

In her new book, Mrs. Rivlin sets out explicitly to assess how much progress had been made by applying systematic methods to public policy. PPBS has been accepted as a policy-making tool, she says, and the level of discussion in government has gone up. Yet she concludes, "So far the analysts have probably done more to reveal how difficult the problems and choices are than to make the decisions easier."

This melancholy lesson emerges with force as Mrs. Rivlin traces how systematic analysis can be applied to a few key public issues. In welfare, the reason no one has offered a program that both supports the poor and encourages people to work is not hardheartedness but the genuine difficulty of designing such a program within realistic budgetary constraints. In health, the government set out to help the poor by buying them medical care. The effect was to pour new money into the same human and physical resources, she notes, and "as any student of elementary economics could have predicted, a rapid price increase ensued."

NO SIMPLE ANSWERS

More broadly, she remarks, "Those who cared about better education, health and social services have, until recently, thought the main problem was underfinancing. They thought far too much was spent on the private sector and far too little on public needs. They were confident that an influx of resources into the public sector—for example, federal aid to education—would produce results. But the answer is not a simplistic 'spend more money.' Even the liberals are no longer sure they would know what to do if they had more to spend for social services, or that it would do much good."

If a reader seeks out Mrs. Rivlin and suggests she's really saying the conservatives were right all along, she allows that conservatives may "seize" such conclusions to prevent change. She by all means still considers herself a good liberal, but she thinks the greater danger is that conservatives will have even

better ammunition if liberals continue to propose things that don't work.

Her answer, detailed in the book, is to design government social programs deliberately as experiments, to produce information about what works and what doesn't. Intellectually this depends, she continues, on development of "performance measures" to tell when something works and when it doesn't. For the moment, analysts ought to concentrate their attentions on developing such measures. While there are obvious theoretical, political and even moral problems, as Mrs. Rivlin's book amply acknowledges, these suggestions are sensible enough. But by definition the outcome of experiments is unpredictable; they may or may not produce positive results that can be translated into government action programs.

That increased knowledge can sometimes point away from such programs, in fact, is a thought not lost on at least one school of social scientists. Pondering much the same considerations about public welfare as Mrs. Rivlin does, Edward C. Banfield concludes not merely that the problem is difficult but that it's impossible. Nathan Glazer suggests that health differences between the U.S. and Sweden owe less to different medical care than to cultural differences affecting personal habits. How would HEW change that? And James Q. Wilson writes, "Social science may be at its weakest in detecting the broadest and most fundamental changes in social values, precisely because they are broad and fundamental."

A MATTER OF FAITH

Mrs. Rivlin not only thinks better social science experiments are worth trying; deep down she thinks that sooner or later they will in fact work. If the analysts have so far failed to find the answers, it is that the analysis has not been sophisticated enough, not that the answers don't exist. This view can never be proved wrong, for there is always one more thing to try. But it is not a view that finds much comfort from the lessons of the '60s or from the assessments in Mrs. Rivlin's book. It is a matter not of science but of faith, and it is this faith above all that keeps Mrs. Rivlin's liberal credentials impeccably intact.

If she retains a faith that answers can be found, though, she has no illusions that finding them will be easy. Her whole book is testimony to the opposite conclusion. The cockiness of systems analysts and mystique of their methods have disappeared, she writes. "If any analyst thought it was going to be easy to make social-action programs work better or to make more rational choices among programs, he is by now a sadder and wiser man." Most important of all, if you suggest that no matter how much information is collected or how logically it is arranged, policy-making will still in the end depend on intuitive judgments, she replies, "Absolutely."

This is a key point. If it is understood, rigorous rational analysis can strip away illusions. But if the ultimately intuitive element is overlooked or obscured, the same analysis can create illusions; it can be so helpful in our efforts to persuade ourselves we know more than we do. And there is a case to be made that something like this happened at the height of that mystique and cockiness.

The record of Robert S. McNamara was recently reassessed by James M. Roherty, a consultant to the President's blue ribbon defense panel. Professor Roherty writes that under the McNamara system, policy was "understood as a derivative of technical processes and technical rationality." Yet in fact the shape of policy was determined by implicit judgments expressed in the assumptions with which the analysts began. It's better to recognize that defense policy is inherently political, he suggests, and to make your political and intuitive judgments out in the open.

Again, Daniel P. Moynihan has related the failure of the poverty war's "Community Action" programs to the social-science theories on which they were based. A careful reading of his book finds that the activists were misled not by social science but by their radical *geist*. But the point is, at the time they thought they were doing social science.

This failure to recognize implicit assumptions is an inviting trap even for the most hard-headed analyst. Indeed, a good example of it is "Toward a Social Report," the document produced by that HEW panel on social indicators. Mrs. Rivlin defends its proposals on the ground that more information can't hurt. But it's clear from the report that the consensus of the panel centered on something more ambitious, a "procedure for periodic stocktaking of the social health of the nation."

Yet the report does not analyze its own assumptions about what constitutes "social health." It suggests we measure health, social mobility, pollution, poverty, law enforcement, education and, in some hoped-for way, participation and alienation. Yet most of these things, at least the ones easily measured, were better at the end of the '60s than the beginning, can the same be said of our social health?

TOCQUEVILLE QUOTED

Early in "Toward a Social Report" is a quotation from Alexis de Tocqueville about what today we call rising expectations. "The evil which was suffered patiently as inevitable, seems unendurable as soon as the idea of escaping from it crosses men's minds. All the abuses then removed call attention to those that remain, and they now appear more galling. The evil, it is true, has become less, but sensibility to it has become more acute."

Nowhere in the report, though, is there any recognition of Tocqueville's broader point—that social health consists of some balance between the material conditions of society and its expectations. If you measure the material conditions and ignore the expectations, you will be misleading yourself in a most rigorous way. For the expectations, above all during the '60s, were the volatile element. It seems this one passage from Tocqueville gets closer to the heart of matters than all the social science in the report.

Which is not insignificant, for Tocqueville was one of the leading lights among those men first called conservatives. Some would say he was the best of them, and nearly all would agree that his only peer was Burke. And how better to summarize what the systems analysts and such have so painfully learned by 1971 than to repeat the view of society so clear to Burke in 1791:

"An ignorant man, who is not fool enough to meddle with his clock, is, however, sufficiently confident to think he can safely take to pieces and put together, at his pleasure, a moral machine of another guise, importance and complexity, composed of far other wheels and springs and balances and counteracting and cooperating powers. Men little think how immorally they act in rashly meddling with what they do not understand."

A touch of this temper could have saved us much of the agony of the '60s, but somehow it was lost from the public mind of the time. Lost, it's important to notice, not only from American liberalism—not, after all, its natural protector—but from American conservatism. Those we call conservatives today are not usually disciples of Burke but of Adam Smith. And while differences in substance obscure the similarity of methods, our Milton Friedmans are nearly as handy with rational prescriptions as our John Kenneth Galbraiths. There has been very little indeed of historical conservatism to balance the American traditions of impatience and activism.

Ironically perhaps, at least some systems analysts and social scientists are rediscovering for themselves what has been lost from

American tradition. They are using rationality itself to discover the limits, or at least the immense difficulty, of rational prescription. This is all to the good, but even so; if policy judgments remain ultimately intuitive, there is much to be said for intuitions steeped less in the Galbraiths and more in the Tocquevilles and Burkes.

DISENFRANCHISING BLACK VOTERS

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 14, 1971

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, during the recess, on August 10, 1971, an editorial appeared in the Washington Post which merits the attention of Congress and the general public. Entitled "Diluting the Right to Vote," the editorial set forth the danger of the disenfranchisement of thousands of black voters in Mississippi for the coming statewide elections. Unless the Department of Justice moves to enforce the Voting Rights Act by suspending the impending elections and sending Federal examiners into the State to insure that the recently completed, illegal reregistrations in several Mississippi counties do not destroy the hard-won right to vote of black citizens in these counties, it will be making a mockery of this fundamental constitutional right which the Congress sought to guarantee to all citizens in the Voting Rights Act of 1965. I include the Washington Post editorial in the RECORD at this point:

DILUTING THE RIGHT TO VOTE

The techniques and subterfuges for disenfranchising black voters are endless. They can be overcome only by a federal government alert to detect them and determined to thwart them. But the characteristic response of the Department of Justice under Attorney General John Mitchell has been, as one exasperated federal judge put it, "Pilate-like"—a kind of sanctimonious washing of hands as though it were a neutral arbiter between those who claim civil rights and those who would deny them.

Mississippi is a case in point. Those who take heart from the results of Tuesday's Democratic primary—moderate white candidates overwhelmed a couple of rabid racists—need to face the uncomfortable fact that a lot of qualified Negro voters are likely to be purged from the voting lists when Charles Evers, a black candidate for the governorship, makes his bid for election in November. Twenty-six Mississippi counties have recently undergone a complete reregistration of voters. In a letter to President Nixon the members of the congressional black caucus charged that "in all but one of these counties this reregistration was commenced before approval had been obtained from the Department of Justice pursuant to Section 5 of the Voting Rights Act of 1965. . . . The fact that these counties were willing to undertake this reregistration without prior clearance under section 5 shows that these counties had a purpose of disenfranchising black voters."

It is not irrelevant to note that one-third of the entire black population of Mississippi resides in these 26 counties. It took an immense amount of work to get these black citizens registered in the first place. Many of them were fearful of exercising their right to vote; many live in places remote from regis-

tration offices; all were unaccustomed to participation in the democratic process. Black voters, moreover, faced a dilemma. If they re-registered, they indicated tacitly their acceptance of a requirement they consider discriminatory; if they failed to reregister, relying on the validity of their earlier registration, they might forfeit a chance to vote in November. The deadline for registration in Mississippi is four months before election—a deadline now passed. So, for many black citizens, the chance to vote will depend upon effective federal intervention.

The congressional black caucus has asked the President to send federal examiners into each county that conducted reregistration. The Voting Rights Act provides that registration by a federal examiner is valid if accomplished 45 days before an election. So the remedy proposed by the congressional black caucus can be genuinely effective if the Department of Justice has the energy to get moving on it without further delay.

Congressman Don Edwards, who as chairman of the House Civil Rights Subcommittee conducted hearings on the Mississippi situation, also urged the President to send federal examiners into the state and, indeed, suggested that he instruct the Attorney General to suspend elections there until full observance of voting rights could be assured. The situation in Mississippi is now so confused, and so clouded by violence and mistrust, that federal intervention seems imperative if the November election is to be fair and genuinely democratic. Not only the rights of black voters are in question, incidentally, but the rights of newly enfranchised 18-21-year-old voters as well; they have been registered in some counties of the state but not in others, and only federal examiners can make the registration equitable.

Respect for the right to vote is the cornerstone of any self-governing society. Protection of that right ought to be a primary concern of the Department of Justice. In the Voting Rights Act of 1965, Congress recognized this obligation. It assigned to the Justice Department a responsibility which cannot be discharged by pious declamations or handwringing aloofness. It is time for the department to act.

THE 450TH ANNIVERSARY OF SAN JUAN, P.R.

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 14, 1971

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, the city of San Juan, P.R., is celebrating its 450th anniversary this year. It is one of the oldest settlements in the Western Hemisphere where western culture and the heritage of freedom have flourished unabated.

Throughout the early years of its life, San Juan was subjected to frequent attacks from its enemies. Extensive fortifications were built to protect its citizens from the onslaught of enemy after enemy.

The people of San Juan have drawn from this past a spirit of determination in their beliefs and a commitment to reach their goals despite all odds. The same traditions that built the massive fortifications to keep the city alive is working today to eliminate slums and clear up poverty.

In ancient times it was the gateway

to the Caribbean. The ships of many a nation sought to conquer it. Many a pirate sought to make it his home base. It was valued then for its beauty and grace and its strategic location.

Today, too, everyone seeks out San Juan. Still the gateway to the Caribbean, the travelers come not to conquer, but to be conquered by the local charm and grace. Hundreds of thousands of visitors reach the island every year to enjoy its delightful climate, its old world charm and its sense of Western heritage.

Puerto Rico's close affiliation with the United States brings benefits to both Nations. For the mainland there is the enrichment of a different language and cultural background. The Latin spirit and vivaciousness does much to balance the more stoic puritan ethic that lingers from colonial America.

Puerto Ricans enjoy the benefits of citizenship and the rights of every American, yet their own heritage is preserved. As a small island they enjoy the strength and friendship of this country from which comes much of their food and needed resources for growth and expansion. San Juan is the key link in this friendship as the capital, principal port and chief commercial center for the island.

Mr. Speaker, let us join in the joyous celebration of San Juan's 450th anniversary. I am sure that the vigor and self-determination that has characterized the city for four and a half centuries will continue to live for a long time to come. This Nation and this world will surely be much the better for it.

THE SAD CASE OF ATTICA

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 13, 1971

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, the sad case of the prison rebellion at Attica has ended, but not the blame-fixing. This will go on for days and become more confused with each reassessment of the problem and the reasons for it. The tragedy is that it happened at all. Soft dealing with criminals is now standard procedure in our country and crime continually gets worse. Quite probably there is a direct connection.

It is very unfortunate that the news media is playing up the convicts and their revolt and placing stress upon known troublemakers like Bobby Seale and Attorney Kunstler. In too many accounts they and the inmates are beginning to emerge as heroes of this tragic occurrence. It seems to me that the real heroes were the hostages whose lives were at stake and some of whom paid with their lives when the convicts refused to reason with the officials. What about their families? Are they not entitled to credit for their lonely vigil and for the grief which some of them now have to bear? Why not give credit to these men who stood for law and order and their families rather than for those who have done nothing

throughout their lives, but create problems for Americans who believe in orderly government and in respect for the law?

THE DETERIORATING DEFENSE POSTURE OF THE UNITED STATES

HON. JOHN E. HUNT

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 14, 1971

Mr. HUNT, Mr. Speaker, I am gratified that reports from at least some segments of the press took notice of the very important testimony elicited at recent hearings of the Special Committee on Defense Priorities regarding the deteriorating defense posture of this country.

Two articles in the September 3 issue of the New York Daily News—by James Wiehart and Henry Maule—alerted its readers to the warning issued by Dr. William Kintner that the Russians may be using the strategic arms limitation talks as a delaying tactic to gain decisive nuclear superiority over the United States.

This was only one of several dramatic points made by Dr. Kintner and the other witnesses, Dr. Frank Armbruster and Lt. Gen. Arthur G. Trudeau. But, by comparison with the news blackout laid down over an earlier special order in the House dealing with the same issue and involving 88 Members of the House, this constitutes a real breakthrough.

It is absolutely essential, in my opinion, that the American public be made aware of this side of this important issue.

The articles follow:

RUSSIA GIVEN 45% ICBM LEAD

(By Henry Maule)

LONDON.—The Soviet Union has nearly 45% more land-based intercontinental nuclear missiles than the United States, the authoritative International Institute for Strategic Studies reported today.

It said the Soviet Union has 1,510 ICBMs compared with 1,054 of the United States.

At the same time, the institute said Red China has entered the nuclear missile race with an operational ballistic device of mass destruction.

(In Washington, a foreign policy expert warned that Russia may be using the strategic arms limitation talks as a delaying tactic to gain a decisive nuclear superiority over the United States, THE NEWS BUREAU reported.)

(William R. Kintner, director of the Foreign Policy Research Institute in Philadelphia, said the Russians, using the Communist tactic of negotiating with one hand and arming with the other, have increased their nuclear missile strength from 1,100 to 1,900 during the continuing talks with U.S. negotiators in Vienna and Helsinki.)

HAS INTERNATIONAL STAFF

The London-based international institute made its assessments in a wide-ranging report on world defense and security. The institute, which describes itself as independent of governments, draws its staff from 15 nations.

The institute, whose findings are closely studied by many governments and by President Nixon in particular, said that Soviet deployment of ICBMs has slowed and may have reached its planned level. But it said

America is modernizing its nuclear arsenal, replacing Minuteman I missiles with more powerful Minuteman 3s.

The Soviets are also challenging the supremacy of America's underwater nuclear strike force, according to the institute.

America with its 41 nuclear powered submarines and 656 submarine-launched ballistic missiles (SLBMs) continues to hold a comfortable lead.

But last year Russia stepped up its underwater force to 440 SLBMs for its 20 new nuclear submarines, which are being built at the rate of seven or eight a year. This construction schedule could erase the American lead by 1974.

Red China, meanwhile, had lagged far behind the two superpowers up to last year, depending on outdated Soviet-made bombers for delivery of nuclear weapons.

But, the institute reported, China has succeeded in producing a medium range missile and has apparently deployed about 20 of them in the northwest and northeast areas flanking the Soviet Union.

And a new missile site detected in China's Sinkiang Desert last year may be connected with the development of a bigger, continent-spanning rocket. The American and Soviet missiles can travel up to 8,000 miles.

Despite its apparent advance in nuclear weaponry, the institute said, China still depends heavily on its vast population.

The institute, in its annual report, "The Military Balance 1971-1972," also made the following assessments:

Russia has strengthened her military forces along the tense China-Soviet border to 41 divisions. . . .

HE SAYS SOVIETS ARM BEHIND SCREEN OF TALK (By James Wiegart)

WASHINGTON.—A foreign policy expert warned that the Russians may be using the strategic arms limitation talks as a delaying tactic to gain a decisive nuclear superiority over the United States.

William R. Kintner, director of the Foreign Policy Research Institute in Philadelphia, said that the Russians, using the standard Communist tactic of negotiating with one hand and arming with the other, have increased their nuclear missile strength from 1,100 to 1,900 during the continuing talks with U.S. negotiators in Vienna and Helsinki.

The Soviets now have almost 1,400 land-based ICBMs—about one-fourth of them huge SS-9s with 25-megaton warheads—compared with 1,000 much smaller U.S. land-based Minuteman missiles, Kintner said. The Russians also are rapidly catching up to the United States in submarine-based nuclear missiles, he added.

POSES CHOICE

"Unless we do something very quickly," he told an unofficial congressional Committee on Defense Priorities, "an American President could be faced with the quandary of having to decide whether to give in to Soviet demands in any conflict around the world or to launch a nuclear first strike."

The chairman of the committee, Rep. Floyd Spence (R-S.C.), said that the hearings were being held to study what he called the deteriorating U.S. defense posture. They got off to a disappointing start today, however, when the star witness, William R. Van Cleave, failed to show.

Spence said that Van Cleave, a former Defense Department adviser to the U.S. delegation to the arms talks, called him this morning and said that he was unable to appear because he was "sick." But Van Cleave, who resigned from the delegation because he believed that the United States was making too many concessions to the Soviets, told several committee members last night that he looked forward to today's hearings.

THE SOVIET SUBMARINE FORCE

HON. JOHN G. SCHMITZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 14, 1971

Mr. SCHMITZ, Mr. Speaker, in a recent interview in U.S. News & World Report Adm. Elmo Zumwalt, U.S. Chief of Naval Operations, pointed out that the greatest threat to our naval forces was posed by the Soviet submarine fleet. Admiral Zumwalt stated that the Soviets now have three times the number of submarines that we do and that they are building new submarines at roughly 2½ times the rate we are.

In order to acquaint my colleagues with the Soviet submarine force I would like to insert in the RECORD at this point an outline of the Soviet submarine fleet which appeared in the August 1971 issue of U.S. Naval Institute Proceedings.

The article follows:

THE SOVIET SUBMARINE FORCE

(By Lt. Cmdr. Robert D. Wells, U.S. Navy)

Long a strong submarine power, the Soviet Navy today is well into its third generation of post-World War II submarines. Striving to keep up technologically with the Western naval powers, the latest Soviet SSBN designs show the impact of the successful Polaris submarine on Soviet strategic thinking. Despite their frequent dependence on Western imagination and naval design experience, however, the Soviets have managed to develop and maintain a huge submarine fleet of about 380 units, deployed in the four fleet areas. On the following pages, the Proceedings presents an introduction to the present-day Soviet submarine fleet. Unless specified otherwise, the data given is from Weyer's Warships of the World, 1971.

SSBN Y CLASS

Displacement: Surface, 7,300 tons; Submerged, 8,300 tons.

Speed: Surface, 22 knots; Submerged, 36 knots.

Missiles: 16 Sawfly.

Torpedo Tubes: ———.

Range (if conventional): ——— miles.

Length: 425 feet.

Beam: 38.1 feet.

Draft: 29.6 feet.

Year first ship begun: 1968.

Year last ship completed: ———.

Number of ships in class: 28.

This class of ballistic missile submarine is of substantially the same configuration as the U.S. Navy's Ethan Allen-class SSBN, and all the evidence points to a ship with operational capabilities roughly comparable to its American counterpart. If past Soviet practice is a reliable guide, the ship itself is of somewhat greater horsepower than an American SSBN. The missile installed is the surface-to-surface Sawfly, a solid-fuel successor to the Serb. First operational in 1968, this class numbered 17 units by April 1971, with 15 more reported under construction.

SSBN H CLASS

Displacement: Surface, 3,500 tons; Submerged, 4,000 tons.

Speed: Surface, 25 knots; Submerged, 25 knots.

Missiles: 3 Serb.

Torpedo Tubes: 6 (bow).

Range (if conventional): ——— miles.

Length: 344 feet.

Beam: 32.9 feet.

Draft: 24.7 feet.

Year first ship begun: 1958.

Year last ship completed: ———.

Number of ships in class: 9.

An obvious relative of the diesel-powered Gulf-class SSB, the nuclear-powered H-class SSBN carries a primary armament of three Serb submerged-launch ballistic missiles in its enlarged sail. Two nuclear reactors driving separate screws give the H-class submarines a speed of 25 knots. The first examples appeared in the early 1960s, and nine or more were produced. Both the submarine and the missile are markedly inferior to their contemporaries, the American Polaris boats, but they served to give the Soviet Navy a foothold in the SSBN race.

SSB G CLASS

Displacement: Surface, 2,700 tons; Submerged, 3,200 tons.

Speed: Surface, 17.5 knots; Submerged, 16.0 knots.

Missiles: 3 Sark.

Torpedo Tubes: 10.

Range (if conventional): 22,000 miles.

Length: 328 feet.

Beam: 28 feet.

Draft: 17.1 feet.

Year first ship begun: 1958.

Year last ship completed: 1964.

Number of ships in class: 22.

The first Soviet submarine designed from the keel up to carry ballistic missiles, the early version of the Golf-class SSB (Golf I), is fitted with three tubes for the Sark, surface-launched, ballistic missile in its conspicuously large sail. The first ships of this class were completed in the late 1950s and 22 are now reported to be operational. Diesel engines and two screws give the Golf class a surface speed of 17.5 knots and an operational range of over 22,000 miles. The original Golf configuration required that the sail be above the surface for missile launching, but the Golf-II modification permits firing three Serb missiles while submerged. Far less capable than the Yankee class, the Golf submarines and their 500-mile missiles nonetheless present a formidable threat.

SSB Z V CLASS

Displacement: Surface, 2,000 tons; Submerged, 2,500 tons.

Speed: Surface, 18.5 knots; Submerged, 15.0 knots.

Missiles: 2 Sark.

Torpedo Tubes: 6.

Range (if conventional): 13,000 miles.

Length: 292 feet.

Beam: 26 feet.

Draft: 15.9 feet.

Year first ship begun: 1956.

Year last ship completed: 1957.

Number of ships in class: 3.

Once reported numbering as many as ten ships, this class is now said to number but three, which suggests that as the new and powerful Yankee-class submarines enter service, these diesel-driven conversions from an attack type are being retired from service or returned to their original role as attack submarines. Even though armed with but two ballistic missiles, they served usefully in the strategic missile role until better ships became available.

SSGN E II CLASS

Displacement: Surface, 5,000 tons; submerged, 5,500 tons.

Speed: Surface, 20 knots; submerged, 30 knots.

Missiles: 8 Shaddock.

Torpedo tubes: 6 (bow).

Range (if conventional): _____ miles.

Length: 394 feet.

Beam: 32.9 feet.

Draft: _____ feet.

Year first ship begun: 1962.

Year last ship completed: 1968.

Number of ships in class: 25.

SSGN E I CLASS

Displacement: Surface, 4,500 tons; submerged, 5,000 tons.

Speed: Surface, _____ knots; submerged, _____ knots.

Missiles: 6 Shaddock.

Torpedo tubes: 6 (bow).

Range (if conventional): _____ miles.

Length: 377 feet.

Beam: 39.9 feet.

Draft: _____ feet.

Year first ship begun: 1961.

Year last ship completed: 1962.

Number of ships in class: 10.

The Echo-class submarine has been identified in two configurations, Echo I and Echo II. The Echo II, shown in this photograph, is a nuclear-powered, missile-firing submarine carrying eight storage and launch tubes for the Shaddock, surface-to-surface, cruise missile which has a 400-mile range. An obvious relative of the Juliet class and analogous to the U.S. Navy's former SSGN, Halibut (which carried five Regulus air-breathing missiles), the Echo is credited with a speed of 30 knots submerged, and carries six bow torpedo tubes. An estimated 25 of the class have been built, in addition to ten Echo I class with six, rather than eight, launching tubes.

SSG J CLASS

Displacement: Surface, 2,800 tons; submerged, 3,550 tons.

Speed: Surface, 16 knots; submerged, 16 knots.

Missiles: 4 Shaddock.

Torpedo tubes: 6 (bow).

Range (if conventional): 15,000 miles.

Length: 285 feet.

Beam: 33.2 feet.

Draft: 23.0 feet.

Year first ship begun: 1962.

Year last ship completed: 1967.

Number of ships in class: 15.

The Juliet-class SSG, analogous to the U.S. Navy's Regular-armed Growler (SSG-557) and Grayback (SSG-574) is a diesel-powered submarine equipped to launch four Shaddock, air-breathing, surface-to-surface guided missiles from individual launch tubes mounted on the hull. Reportedly, 15 of these boats have been built. The stubby Juliets have a surface speed of only 16 knots, and are conspicuous on the surface because of their unusually high freeboard. To fire the missiles, the boat must be on the surface and the tubes elevated about 15 degrees.

SSG W "LONG BIN" CLASS

Displacement: Surface, 1,300 tons; Submerged, 1,800 tons.

Speed: Surface, 16 knots; Submerged 14 knots.

Missiles: 4 Shaddock.

Torpedo Tubes: 6 (bow).

Range (if conventional): 13,000 miles.

Length: 272 feet.

Beam: 24 feet.

Draft: 14.1 feet.

Year first ship begun: 1960.

Year last ship completed: 1961.

Number of ships in class: 5.

One of the first Soviet submarines to be equipped with surface-to-surface missiles is the NATO-named "Long Bin" modification of the Whiskey-class submarine. Longer and heavier than the standard Whiskey, this modification has included the fairing of the sail area to include fixed storage and launching tubes for four air-breathing Shaddock missiles. The "Long Bin" modification followed the single and twin-cylinder Whiskey SSG modifications. Although obsolescent, about five of the Long Bins are still operational.

SSG W CLASS (TWIN CYLINDER)

Displacement: Surface, 1,100 tons; Submerged, 1,600 tons.

Speed: Surface, 17 knots; Submerged, 15 knots.

Missiles: 2 Shaddock.

Torpedo Tubes: 4.

Range (if conventional): 13,000 miles.

Length: 239 feet.

Beam: 24 feet.

Draft: 14.1 feet.

Year first ship begun: 1959.

Year last ship completed: 1960.

Number of ships in class: 5.

Now about five in number, this variant on the Whiskey class of attack submarine is characterized by a pair of watertight missile cylinders, one on either side aft of the sail. The weapon reportedly is the 400-mile Shaddock. An earlier version had only a single cylinder, mounted aft, but this design, to which perhaps only one submarine was converted, is no longer reported as operational.

SSN C CLASS

Displacement: Surface, 4,300 tons; Submerged, 5,100.

Speed: Surface, 20 knots; Submerged, 30 knots.

Missiles: 8.

Torpedo Tubes: _____.

Range (if conventional): _____ miles.

Length: 300 feet.

Beam: 32.9 feet.

Draft: 24.7 feet.

Year first ship begun: 1968.

Year last ship completed: _____.

Number of ships in class: 5.

One of the latest classes of nuclear-powered Soviet attack submarines, the Charlie class, said to number about five vessels, is armed with eight anti-shiping missiles, presumably all in the bulbous bow. These ships are reported to have a submerged speed of 30 knots. Another new design, the Victor class, reported to consist of ten ships, is also nuclear-powered, but is armed with torpedo tubes rather than missiles. No photographs of that class have been released.

SSN N CLASS

Displacement: Surface, 3,500 tons; Submerged, 4,000 tons.

Speed: Surface, 20 knots; Submerged, 30 knots.

Missiles: _____.

Torpedo Tubes: 6 (bow).

Range (if conventional): _____ miles.

Length: 384 feet.

Beam: _____ feet.

Draft: _____ feet.

Year first ship begun: 1958.

Year last ship completed: 1964.

Number of ships in class: 15.

The Soviet Navy's first nuclear submarine, the November-class SSN, appeared in the fleet in the late 1950s. Believed to have included at least 15 units, the construction program for the November submarine reflected confidence in this first-generation design. Armed with six or more torpedo tubes and carrying 32 torpedoes, the November units are assumed to have an operational depth capability in excess of 750 feet. Two propellers drive the November subs at about 30 knots and the operational range is essentially unlimited. The November units are the most frequently sighted of the nuclear attack submarines. One November-class SSN sank at sea in April 1970.

SS F CLASS

Displacement: Surface, 1,690 tons; Submerged, 2,300 tons.

Speed: Surface, 18 knots; Submerged, 18 knots.

Missiles: _____.

Torpedo Tubes: 8 (6 bow, 2 stern).

Range (if conventional): 20,000 miles.

Length: 292 feet.

Beam: 27.0 feet.

Draft: 15.9 feet.

Year first ship begun: 1958.

Year last ship completed: 1966.

Number of ships in class: 43.

The Foxtrot-class, diesel-powered SS first appeared in 1958. Credited with an operational range of 20,000 miles, the Foxtrot submarine can do 18 knots surfaced or, for brief periods, submerged. Forty or 50 of this class have been built, equipped with six torpedo

tubes forward and two tubes aft. Foxtrot submarines are often seen outside of Soviet coastal waters, and at least one of this class was surfaced by U.S. fleet units during the Cuban missile crisis. Two F-class were among the small Soviet task force that visited Cuba in the summer of 1969 and four others are now in the Indian Navy. A possible successor, the diesel-powered Bravo class, has recently been identified.

SS Z III/IV CLASS

Displacement: Surface, 1,900 tons; Submerged, 2,900 tons.

Speed: Surface, 18 knots; Submerged, 15 knots.

Missiles: _____

Torpedo Tubes: 8 (6 bow, 2 sterns).

Range (if conventional): 20,000 miles.

Length: 292 feet.

Beam: 29.6 feet.

Draft: 15.9 feet.

Year first ship begun: 1952.

Year last ship completed: 1954.

Number of ships in class: 22.

The Zulu-class, diesel-powered submarine, of which over 20 units have been built, is apparently the immediate predecessor of the Foxtrot design. Open sources credit the Zulu submarine with an operating depth of 750 feet and a cruising range of 20,000 miles. Reportedly mounting six tubes forward and two tubes aft, the Zulu submarine, like the Foxtrot, carries 24 torpedoes. Like all Soviet submarines, the Zulu class is also credited with a minelaying capability. Some years ago a number of this class were modified to carry a pair of ballistic missiles in an enlarged sail section. (See Zulu V-class SSB).

SS R CLASS

Displacement: Surface, 1,100 tons; Submerged, 1,600 tons.

Speed: Surface, 17 knots; Submerged, 15 knots.

Missiles: _____

Torpedo Tubes: 6 ASW.

Range (if conventional): 13,000 miles.

Length: 239 feet.

Beam: 24.3 feet.

Draft: 14.5 feet.

Year first ship begun: 1958.

Year last ship completed: 1961.

Number of ships in class: 13.

The Romeo-class submarines, of which about 20 were built (of these, 13 are currently credited to the Soviet Fleet), were designed to be an improvement on the Whiskey class. Built between 1959 and 1963, the ships of this class carry four to six tubes forward and two aft, and are credited with an operational range of 13,000 miles. The snorkel induction stack atop the superstructure is a prominent recognition feature for these boats, several of which have been transferred to the Egyptian Navy. Occasional Soviet units have been sighted on patrols in the Mediterranean Sea.

SS Q CLASS

Displacement: Surface, 650 tons; Submerged, 740 tons.

Speed: Surface, 16 knots; Submerged, 16 knots.

Missiles: _____

Torpedo Tubes: 4 (21-inch, bow mounted).

Range (if conventional): 7,000 miles.

Length: 184 feet.

Beam: 18.1 feet.

Draft: 17.1 feet.

Year first ship begun: 1954.

Year last ship completed: 1957.

Number of ships in class: 15.

A short-legged coastal patrol vessel, the Quebec class had a fairly long production run in the middle 1950s. Similar in general characteristics to small submarines found in the navies of other European powers, the Quebec class apparently fulfilled a need for a modern submarine suitable for operations in confined waters. Diesel-powered in its initial design, the basic Quebec boat is credited with

a surface speed of 16 knots. A number were converted to some sort of closed-cycle propulsion system which has proven to be less than satisfactory, contributing to the nickname within the Soviet Fleet of zashigatel or "cigarette lighter." As many as 25 may have been constructed in this class, although the number still operational is now reported to be only 15.

SS W CLASS

Displacement: Surface, 1,100 tons; Submerged, 1,600 tons.

Speed: Surface, 17 knots; Submerged, 15 knots.

Missiles: _____

Torpedo Tubes: 6 (4 bow, 2 stern).

Range (if conventional): 13,000 miles.

Length: 246 feet.

Beam: 24 feet.

Draft: 14.1 feet.

Year first ship begun: 1950.

Year last ship completed: 1958.

Number of ships in class: 170.

The most numerous submarine in the Soviet inventory, the Whiskey-class, diesel-powered submarine began appearing in the early 1950s. The first new design, feet-sized boat to be produced after World War II, the Whiskeys show the impact of the German type XXI U-Boat on Soviet submarine design. The standard Whiskey boat is equipped with six torpedo tubes and carries 24 torpedoes. The original Whiskeys were equipped with deck-mounted guns, but all remaining fleet boats have had their guns removed. The Whiskey subs are frequently seen deployed in all four Soviet fleet areas. A number of these boats have been modified for special uses, including SSG, SSR, and oceanographic research. Others have been transferred to other countries, including Albania, Bulgaria, China, Egypt, Indonesia, North Korea, and Poland. About 170 are now reported to fly the Soviet flag.

SSN W CANVAS BAG CLASS

Displacement: Surface, 1,100 tons; Submerged, 1,600 tons.

Speed: Surface, 17 knots; Submerged 15 knots.

Missiles: _____

Torpedo Tubes: 6 (4 bow, 2 stern).

Range (if conventional): _____ miles.

Length: 246 feet.

Beam: 24 feet.

Draft: 14.1 feet.

Year first ship begun: _____

Year last ship completed: _____

Number of ships in class: _____

According to Siegfried Breyer's Guide to The Soviet Navy, several of the Whiskey class were rebuilt in 1963 and 1964 to serve as relay stations for mid-course guidance of the Shaddock missiles with which many Soviet submarines and surface ships are armed. The number of such conversions is not given.

EULOGY TO LOUIS ARMSTRONG

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 14, 1971

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, Louis Armstrong was perhaps America's greatest ambassador. I would like to share with my fellow Members of Congress the eulogy delivered at his funeral by Fred Robbins, a Mutual Radio Network interviewer and television personality. It is a beautiful eulogy and truly represents the man we loved and will always remember as his music will always endure.

EULOGY FOR LOUIS ARMSTRONG

Alas, poor world, what treasure thou hast lost! Whom the Gods love, die young, no matter how long they live.

One of the world's greatest men is gone, one of the last of the true giants, who was an artist of such extraordinary ability that he is above all possible praise. With deep sadness, it's a great honor for me to pay him homage with these few words . . .

He didn't learn to sing in Milan . . . he got his voice training with a New Orleans newsboy quartet that used to chirp on the curbstone for pennies. He didn't learn to play the trumpet in a conservatory . . . he practiced on a battered old bugle in the New Orleans' waife home for boys. His professors were the sons of 'Old Man River', the musicians who worked the Mississippi river boats. He was born 'back 'o town', in the slums, with every possible obstacle before him, and yet his genius took him across the world to triumphs in concert halls, command performances before kings and presidents, audiences with popes, and millions of words of critical acclaim by music journals of every country.

His great records have spread the gospel of jazz to every nook and corner of our planet. His influence on music, singers and musicians has been tremendous. There's a little bit of pops in every one of our best popular artists, and wherever jazz is played, it's Louis' music they're playing. He was the source.

Jazz is a team that is much abused, but if it has any meaning at all, it means exactly what happens whenever he lifted that horn, whenever he threw his head back and curled his voice around a song. Jazz is America's great cultural contribution to the creative art of the world . . . he was its symbol and its foremost contributor . . . he made it part of a global culture and was nothing less than a true legend in his lifetime. He was our most gifted and infinite creative musician . . . a genuine American folk hero.

Pops' true greatness came most of all from his simplicity and his love for music, he was in love with his horn and it was in love with him. Only such a love affair could have brought forth such a big beautiful tone, with such warmth and spirit it melted everything he touched. And how he bubbled with spirit and pleasure when he sang. His famous smile was radiant, incandescent. It seemed to light up the stage!

And he personified the word "genuine" in everything he was and did as an artist and a man. He was the greatest ambassador of good will our country ever had . . . certainly the most famous American . . . he knew what communication was about and he spoke to millions through his music and his exhilarating performances in almost every part of the globe. He used to say, "A note's a note in almost any language, and if you hit it . . . beautiful . . . they dig it!"

For he believed that the world needs love . . . then and now . . . and no one spread more joy to the world than Pops did, through his matchless magic as a musician, as a singer, as a master showman, and he was loved in return.

How he was loved! By people everywhere . . . by royalty, poets, peasants, in the Middle East, the Far East, in South America . . . in Africa, where he was carried into the stadium on a canvas throne . . . in Sweden, where thousands would meet him at the airport and wait all night around his hotel . . . He was deified all over Europe . . . in Russia his records are collector's items . . . and when he played as a soloist with the Royal Philharmonic Orchestra in London, before the Royal Family, Sir Laurence Olivier introduced him by saying, "Listen to this beautiful, this noble character, for that's what he is, play some rather basic music."

And what a sense of humor he had! It was

a mother wit . . . It was earthy . . . nurtured in the back streets of New Orleans, on the coat carts, on the riverboats . . . it was honed and sharpened all over the world through the thousands of people he met, and the things he experienced.

He was a marvelous storyteller. He had a funny story about anything and everything and everybody! You could give him any subject, or mention a name, and he'd unroll a story that would have you rolling on the floor. Anyone who knew him has his own favorite that Pops has told him.

And with it all, in this amazing career that spanned 55 years, and brought him such continuous universal recognition and honor and fame, he was basically a modest, unpretentious, simple man, devoted to his wonderful wife, Lucille, who gave him thirty years of great happiness, his home here in Corona, and his friends and neighbors.

It was my great pleasure to be at his home last Sunday, and spend part of his 71st birthday with him, as I have in the past. He was in excellent spirits, said he had been gaining weight, was able to warm up on his horn, and was spending his time transferring his records onto tape. He was looking forward to going back to work in the fall. It was heartwarming to see some of the young boys from the neighborhood drop in to pay their respects, and typical of the graciousness and humility of pops, as he thanked them for doing so. They were part of yet another generation that warmed to the magnetism of this remarkable man.

He always believed in staying before the public. He loved having his record of "Hello Dolly" on the top 40, and playing before high school and college audiences.

"I'm not worried about my younger generation public no way", he told me, "We play high schools, universities, and all the kids come, and they just rave . . . they still dig 'Ole Satch'." He would tell youngsters "You've got to appreciate all kinds of music to be a good musician yourself . . . classical and everything . . . it's good to always listen to the other fellow. Music is music . . . ain't but two kinds of music, good or bad. So I try to play as good as I can at all times, and if it sounds good to me, it's got to sound good to everyone else."

He told me once, "I don't have time to worry about getting older . . . the way we work all the time, travel all the time, here and there . . . you don't even think about that. The main thing is, just live . . . enjoy life. You have to stay young to play music, and feel what you play."

His credo was simple: "I never tried to prove nothing, just always wanted to give a good show. My life has been my music, it's always come first, but the music ain't worth nothing if you can't lay it on the public. The main thing is to live for that audience, 'cause what you're there for is to please the people."

Well, he pleased the people alright! More than that, Louis Armstrong captured the essence of human relations in what he did . . . The feeling, the mood, the spirit, the hope of mankind.

So, move over, Gabriel, 'cause here comes "Satchmo" and "The Saints are Marching in!!". And so "Pops" takes his place as the "King" . . . At the head of that big jam session in the sky, in that special niche in heaven that God keeps to hold our idols . . . With Billie, and Fats, and Johnny Hodges, and Bird . . . With Tommy and Jimmy and Bessie . . . and Big Sid . . . and Ziggy, and Jack Teagarden, and Bunny . . . With Edmund Hall, and Billy Kyle, and Pee Wee Russell, and Dinah and Velma, and Sidney Bechet . . . With Davey Tough and Mildred Bailey, and Coleman Hawkins, and Ben Webster . . . With Nat Cole and Claude Thornhill . . . and Jimmy Lunceford . . . Glenn Miller and Wes Montgomery, and Tad

Dameron and Bud Powell, Charley Shavers, and on, and on, and on. . .

Louis Armstrong was a loveable, beautiful, darling man . . . with a beautiful soul. He loved all kinds of people, and all kinds of people loved him. He had a full, rich, rewarding life. It was an epic! . . . And he had a ball!! He spread a lot of sunshine around and all those he touched are richer for it, and the world is a whole lot better for his having been in it.

For as long as there are ears to hear, his music will be played and enjoyed and studied . . . and he will endure.

He was truly the only one of his kind, a titanic figure of his and our time . . . a veritable Picasso, a Stravinsky, a Casals . . . a Louis Armstrong. In his musical autobiography, Writer Gilbert Millstein quotes seven lines from a novel called "The Circus of Dr. Lao", by Charles Finney, which fit Louis' life perfectly:

For he wanted to make one hell of a show,
And the things you'll see in your brains
will glow

Long past the time when the winter snow
Has frozen the summer's furbelow.
For this is the Circus of Dr. Lao . . .

And youth may come and age may go;
But no more circuses like this show!
It was one hell of a show! Goodbye, Pops!

LOTTERY

HON. JACK BRINKLEY

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 14, 1971

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, my friend and neighbor has sent me a letter which he wrote to President Nixon relating to busing. The message is plain and is an excellent composite of many, many other letters which I have received with respect to this crisis which is real and personal in so many of our homes.

A democratic system falls short of its mark when it requires from some that which is not required of others. My House Joint Resolution 43, reintroduced on January 22 of this year, meets the democracy test. It provides as follows:

The involuntary busing of any student to a school or the required attendance of any student at a school outside the student's local school zone for the purpose of achieving racial balances or quotas is prohibited.

May I commend my resolution to the membership and may I commend Mr. Harrell's letter in justification thereof. The letter follows:

COLUMBUS, GA., September 9, 1971.

The Honorable RICHARD M. NIXON,
President, United States of America,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: It is very frustrating to attempt to write to one in your high office, knowing ahead of time that my thoughts will probably never be transmitted to you. But by some small miracle, perhaps an aide will read this letter before it goes into 'file 13,' and perhaps by some greater miracle someone in authority will read it, at least sympathetically.

I am determined to be heard because I represent the voice of a great cry for help that is being sounded throughout this Nation today. The cry is loud and clear but to this point in time, it has fallen almost entirely on deaf ears or has been abated. The voice is that of your constituents. It has the

right to be heard and you, sir, have an obligation to listen.

The cry is for common sense to prevail in the assignment of our children to their respective schools. The cry is against such foolish nonsense as busing to achieve racial quotas.

Why must practically every facet of our lives today be embroiled with RACE? Why has the education of our children been taken out of the hands of the educators and placed at the mercy of a group of Federal judges? What price must be paid for the social revolution?

The school decisions being handed down across this Nation are surely social in nature and not educational. What is next? Where will it end?

I am white. I am against prejudice whether it be against black or white. I came from a poor family and I have had my share of hardships. I was taught, as you were, never to give up. By the Grace of God, I was able to receive a college education, the hard way.

The education, I thought, would protect my family from the hardships which I had to endure in my younger days.

Through hard work, I have been able to buy a modest home in a modest subdivision. We live within a mile of two (2) elementary schools. I have a daughter that entered the second grade this year. She has been assigned to a school five miles from my home. Why? Is social revolution so important that it must be achieved at the expense of a small percentage.

I say a small percentage because our school system has been ordered to operate on a 70-30 ratio. The assignments by the local school board were made on a basis of those students living within a certain radius and those having registered at that school last April. In other words, a student could live next door to a school and not be able to attend that school if he did not have the good fortune to register there last spring under the school system's former choice of school plan. After the 70% was chosen in this manner, the remainder were bused to a formerly predominant black school. This year's plan seems firmly fixed. But what about the future?

As far as I can determine, that same 30%, relatively speaking, will continue to be bused each year (70% black). Why? If we are compelled to live under a 70-30 ratio, why can't the busing be rotated? Why can't a white child have at least two years out of three in his neighborhood school? Why must the same few be forced to carry the brunt of the hardship caused by school transfers? Isn't this what the social revolution is all about—the majority depriving the minority of its rights and privileges? I pay my proportionate share of taxes. I am a good citizen and have always lived within the law. I am, therefore, entitled to all the rights and privileges appertaining to the use of public property of my fellow Americans, regardless of where I live. If the busing is not rotated beginning next year, I feel that my constitutional rights will have been violated. It is immaterial in my opinion that those bused might come one block from a school or one mile.

I urge you before the 1972-73 school year begins to have the Justice Department examine and remedy any inequities in the Muscogee County School Plan as it was implemented and is now in practice. I pray for equal treatment of black and white . . . complete equality in assignment of schools within our court ordered 70-30 ratio.

The school situation nationwide is pathetic. The same old complacent attitude exists for the 70% whites not being bused this year as has always existed, that is, when you've got a good thing going don't rock the boat.

Most national problems are solved without the knowledge of the average citizen. The school problem cannot be handled in the same manner. The problem touches on the most sensitive nerves of the parents of school children. The school problem is eating away at the nerve fibers of the parents of the displaced children of this Nation. We, as parents, will protect our offspring through our natural instincts.

I am a compassionate man, but I will do everything legally and in my power to protect my rights.

Mr. President, for our children and for the sanity of our nation, won't you please use whatever powers and influence you possess to help solve our dilemma.

There appeared in the September 3, 1971, edition of the Columbus Ledger, a concise but accurate statement reflecting the chaotic situation which has now enveloped this nation. Because it is very appropriate and relevant, I quote it in its entirety:

This nation, through the pronouncements of President Nixon and Supreme Court Chief Justice Warren Burger, would appear to have placed an official sanction on confusion.

The epitome of high-level double-talk was reached Tuesday when Chief Justice Burger issued a 10-page statement which implied that lower court judges were misinterpreting the edicts of the Supreme Court on the matter of busing of students to achieve integration ratios.

This near-unbelievable piece of legal jargon was presented shortly after the Chief Justice had refused to stay an order requiring extensive busing in the Winston-Salem-Forsyth County, N. C., school system.

Has our legal system reached the point where there is no communications between the Supreme Court and its subordinate appellate levels? Is it possible that Justice Burger and those judges of Federal district courts are that much at odds over the "law of the land"?

Regretfully, it appears that the answer to both questions might just be affirmative.

In the administration, President Nixon has repeatedly voiced his support of the neighborhood school concept. He has limited his support of busing to "the minimum necessary extent".

Still, Secretary Elliot Richardson of HEW moved to enforce a massive busing program in Texas. There was apparent disagreement between him and Nixon, but on Tuesday statements were released by the White House indicating that HEW and Nixon were of a single mind on the busing question.

And we ask, is it possible that a President can have such strong convictions in one direction and still permit cabinet-level actions which negate those statements? Is there a communications gap among those who shape the day-to-day affairs of this nation?

These answers, too, appear to be affirmative.

Is it any wonder, then, that muddled crises in education are so common? Doesn't such high-level confusion open the door to all kinds of challenge from embittered individuals and groups?

Rulings from the higher courts have been so varied, statements from administration officials so totally opposed to one another, that they create a kind of national chaos which can rend a community or city apart.

Never, since the Supreme Court decision of 1954 striking down the separate but equal school concept, has this nation been so thoroughly embroiled in dissent over school matters. Busing is not just a regional issue, it is national in scope.

Thankfully, because of the tireless efforts of many dedicated public servants—some who sit on court benches and some who toil without pay and often without thanks on school boards—most of the schools of this

state and nation will be able to open on or near schedule.

The public system will function, not because the courts or national leadership have intervened, but because so many refused to give up.

We applaud the efforts of those who have kept the welfare of education and the children whom it reaches foremost in their sight. It would be easy to have a national surrender to emotion.

Now, it is time for the high courts to stop their double-talk. Now that schools will soon be operating, it is the time to clear the air. Now is the time to remove those irritants so despised by so many.

The Supreme Court and the federal circuit courts and the administration should get together, finally. There ought to emerge very soon a unified stand on the matter of public schools, replacing the jigsaw puzzle approach now in use.

Somewhere the buck must stop. We anxiously await the calming of the educational waters.

Yours very truly,

J. EARL HARRELL.

LEGISLATION TO EXCLUDE FROM TAXES THE FULL PAY OF POW'S AND MIA'S

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 14, 1971

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased that my good friend and distinguished colleague from Illinois (Mr. RALLSBACK), is today introducing with 35 cosponsors legislation identical to my bill H.R. 517, to exclude from taxes the full pay of all members of the Armed Forces who are prisoners of war, missing in action, or in a detained status during the Vietnam conflict.

Present law exempts the entire amount of taxable income derived from military service for enlisted personnel and warrant officers, and the first \$500 of taxable income for commissioned officers serving in a combat zone. Since many of the known American prisoners of war are pilots and, therefore, officers whose monthly incomes exceed \$500, I feel that such tax relief is more than justified in their cases. This small financial gain cannot in any measure compensate the servicemen involved or their families for the physical hardships and mental anguish they are suffering. Though we have deep sympathy for their plight, it is hard for anyone not directly involved to comprehend the horrible uncertainty, despair, and loneliness which many of their families have had to endure for a period of time longer than the total U.S. involvement in World War II.

I am very pleased to advise that favorable reports on H.R. 517 have been received from both the Treasury and Defense Departments and have asked the eminent chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, Mr. MILLS, to schedule hearings on the bill as soon as possible. I know the Ways and Means Committee has an extremely heavy workload in the coming months, particularly in view of the President's recently announced

new economic policy, but hope that it will be possible for the committee to consider this legislation in the not too distant future, in view of the humanitarian nature of the measure.

As my colleagues will recall, the members of the *Pueblo* crew were forgiven their Federal income tax for the period of their internment in North Korea and we should do no less for our Vietnam POW's. I would like to thank all those who have joined in sponsoring this legislation and hope it will be enacted this year.

MUSKIE: THE LONGEST JOURNEY BEGINS

HON. PETER N. KYROS

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 14, 1971

Mr. KYROS. Mr. Speaker, the cover story of the September 13 issue of *Time* magazine is about Senator EDMUND MUSKIE as the frontrunner for the 1972 Democratic presidential candidacy. As Labor Day has brought an end to the summer and an increase in political tempo, it is most appropriate that *Time* should focus on Ed MUSKIE. For Senator MUSKIE, who has just begun a wide-ranging tour across the Nation, will be at the center of Democratic politics this fall.

Those of us from Maine can only be proud that one of our native sons has become such an important figure in American politics. And as the article in *Time* makes clear, Ed MUSKIE's eminence in politics is built upon a record of substantial achievement and upon his widely recognized intelligence and integrity.

The article is particularly interesting because of its discussion of the unique measured cadence and thoughtful pace that MUSKIE brings to the American political scene. It also details his self-imposed demands for the highest quality legislative and staff work.

I insert the article in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I think it will make interesting reading for all of us.

The article follows:

MUSKIE: THE LONGEST JOURNEY BEGINS

We have won elections in Maine. We have won more than anyone thought we could. But is that all there is? We now have a chance to reach out to the country, to the world.

The speaker was Edmund Sixtus Muskie, the scene his state party's annual August clambake near Brunswick. The occasion was both a remembrance and a farewell. For it was just 17 years ago this month, at the age of 40, that he became Maine's first Democratic Governor in 20 years. This week Muskie embarks upon the longest and most difficult journey of American public life—the run for the presidency of the U.S. The race is starting earlier this year than ever before, a full seven months before the first primary in New Hampshire in March, eleven months before the Democratic Convention begins in Miami Beach in July, 14 months before the election. The costs of running have never been higher: between \$30 million and \$50 million. Yet Edmund Muskie embarks with

an enormous advantage over his Democratic opposition: he is the front runner.

For Muskie the journey begins in earnest this week in California, which, with at least 271 convention delegates, will be a crucial state for any Democratic candidate. On Labor Day, Muskie's schedule had him seeking support among Catholic labor leaders in Los Angeles. He will talk strategy with Democratic leaders in Santa Clara, San Francisco and San Diego, pause for a hospital tour in Watts, then head north to line up more party support in Oregon, another vital primary state.

The trip is the first in a series of forays that will take Muskie in the next few weeks to West Virginia, Florida, South Carolina, Tennessee, Illinois, Iowa, Nebraska and Wisconsin. In October he will concentrate on New York and New England, but he will stop in Mississippi, Ohio, New Jersey, Kansas and Missouri as well. By Nov. 1, he will have visited 14 of the 23 states—counting the District of Columbia—that will hold primaries next year. His strategy at this early stage is to drum up intersectional support and create enough political momentum to last through the hazards of the primaries and finally through the balloting next summer at Miami Beach's convention hall.

SEARCH FOR A WINNER

With so many other candidates in the field, Muskie plans to hold the center. If his earnest, sometimes ponderous manner does not project a specific magic, neither does it repel any constituency within the party. His hope is that his personal style will be so suited to the Democratic need for unity that he will become the inevitable candidate. He is counting on building a party-wide feeling that he is the man who can engineer victory in '72 by pulling together the right and left, young and old, white and black.

As early as Muskie's lift-off seems in comparison with past political schedules, he has in fact been slow, even sluggish in going after the nomination seriously. Some politicians thought his congressional Election Eve TV speech last November gave him a virtual lock on the nomination. On that occasion, Muskie spoke right after Nixon's shrill broadcast, taped in Phoenix, in which the President obliquely linked his Democratic opponents with radical rock throwers. With the aid of onetime Robert Kennedy Speechwriter Richard Goodwin, Muskie conveyed an air of quiet and genuine outrage: "Honorable men have been slandered. They imply that Democratic candidates actually favor violence . . . That is a lie and the American people know it is a lie. How dare they!"

MORAL STATURE

The speech may or may not have contributed to the Democratic gains next day at the polls, but it unquestionably endowed Muskie with a certain moral stature and cast him as an earnest and moderate spokesman for the party. For the first time, he jumped ahead of Nixon in opinion polls. Both Democrats and Republicans believed that Muskie would waste no time moving to sew up the nomination, somewhat in the way that Barry Goldwater established his claim on the G.O.P. in early 1964.

Such expectations reckoned without the Muskie style, compounded of the hesitation, privacy and conviction that are simultaneously his strengths and his weaknesses. Another man—John Kennedy with his single-minded strategic will, or Lyndon Johnson with his visceral instinct for power—might have seized the chance, pressed for delegate guarantees throughout the country. "If he weren't so damned cautious," says an unannounced candidate, "he would now overwhelm the field."

True enough, Muskie went through the candidate's motions, stepping up his speaking

schedule, traveling to Europe, the Middle East and Russia last January. But he displayed little of the killer instinct. He is a ruminative man who for most of his political career has proceeded with an almost elaborate deliberation, a perhaps understandable quality in a Democrat from traditionally Republican Maine. "I hated," says his wife Jane, "to see Ed so undecided, as he was a great part of last year. It was as if he was fighting inside himself." Says one aide: "He looks for seven sides to a four-sided question."

Now that he has begun to move, Muskie must consider some truly complex partisan geometries. So far, three major candidates and eight lesser contenders are in the running.

In the first rank with Muskie are:

HUBERT HUMPHREY

Never expert at hiding his feelings, Humphrey clearly wants to try again. "I've got my sails up," he told reporters when he turned 60 last May. "I'm testing the waters." He allowed that he might enter the New York and California primaries next spring if the early heats fail to produce a winner. His centrist campaign contributors are waiting for him, still holding out on Muskie or anyone else; Humphrey has asked them to keep their purses locked until November. Labor still likes him. He is well known and has a following among party regulars, although he ran second to Muskie (37% to 15%) in a Gallup poll of Democratic county chairmen. He is a close third in polls of registered Democrats (after Muskie and Edward Kennedy). But his 1968 defeat hurts badly, he is probably a too familiar face, and his nomination might touch off a schismatic fourth-party movement to the left.

EDWARD KENNEDY

He has repeatedly forsworn any notion of running, although he has stopped short of a Sherman statement. He has made none of the quiet moves of a man who, despite public coyness, means to become a candidate. He almost certainly will not enter any primaries—but in eight states his name, as a prominently mentioned contender, may automatically appear on the ballot. He has kept his name and face before the public, with a trip to India last month. Another is planned shortly to Russia. His national health insurance program has organized labor's support, and its greatest appeal is to older people, who were among those most deeply offended by Chappaquiddick. Kennedy can afford to wait out the primaries and see whether Muskie stumbles. If that happens, Kennedy, with his name and following, could conceivably be the man that the convention would turn to. Observes a Nixon political aide: "Suppose he gets out there and says, 'Help me finish what my brother began.' You can't say how people would respond." But trying for the presidency might involve, for him, an unacceptable personal risk.

In the heavily populated second level of Democratic contenders, declared or possible, are:

SOUTH DAKOTA SENATOR GEORGE M'GOVERN

The first announced candidate, McGovern, has support among the young for his long stand against the war—a stand that makes his something of a one-issue candidacy. Knowing that, McGovern is now focusing more on economic issues. He is trying to organize the primary states down to the grass roots; his campus organizations (more than 300) are the best in the field. But he is anathema to organized labor, has a tendency to shoot from the hip (his prompt labeling of the President's wage-price freeze as "economic madness," for example), and suffers from an image as "the Wally Cox of the campaign."

INDIANA SENATOR BIRCH BAYH

He faces even more trouble in establishing the credibility of his candidacy. A Gallup poll of registered Democrats last month made him the choice of only 2%. His Senate record is impressive—he organized the fight against the Haynsworth and Carswell Supreme Court nominations, helped lead the battle for amendments on presidential succession and the 18-year-old vote. But as one politician says: "He looks like the fellow who is running for Lieutenant Governor." He has good financial backing and a strong professional organization.

WASHINGTON SENATOR HENRY "SCOTT" JACKSON

His best asset is the clear line drawn between himself and the rest of the field. Although liberal enough on civil rights, he is a hard-liner on national defense, Viet Nam and law-and-order; he is the Democrat whom Richard Nixon wanted as his Secretary of Defense. The White House believes that he would be a tough opponent because he would cut into Nixon's conservative strength. But his nomination, even more than Humphrey's, might trigger a fourth-party split on the left.

OKLAHOMA SENATOR FRED HARRIS

He is preaching economic self-interest in his effort to put together an old-style populist coalition of whites and blacks among those with lower and middle incomes. The arithmetic of populism is persuasive, but it is probably easier to count such factions than to coalesce them, for enormous racial and ethnic fears would have to be overcome. Harris suffers from being little known, and to reach the masses with the kind of campaign he envisions would cost money he does not seem likely to raise.

NEW YORK MAYOR JOHN LINDSAY

He has glamour and attraction for the young, blacks and other minorities. Since he just last month quit the Republican Party, his candidacy would be called opportunistic. It would most severely damage McGovern, although Lindsay's TV presence and the fact that his popularity seems to increase as he gets farther from home, could hurt Muskie in California.

EUGENE M'CARTHY

He is scouting now, will probably announce his candidacy this fall. In 1968, he had the perfect foil in L.B.J., but now the villain is Richard Nixon, and McCarthy would have to share him widely. He still has a following from his 1968 crusade, as one politician says: "There are some people who think that only they and Gene understand things." The Gallup poll of Democrats gave him the support of only 6%. A long shot for the nomination, he could lead a leftward fourth party in the November election—a move that might split the party sufficiently to ensure Nixon's reelection.

ARKANSAS CONGRESSMAN WILBUR MILLS

The power broker of the House, he is shopping around. His presidential chances are slim, but he might establish himself as broker for Southern and Border State delegations, and then bargain for second spot on the ticket.

WISCONSIN SENATOR WILLIAM PROXMIRE

He gained a measure of national recognition for leading the successful Senate fight against the supersonic transport, but otherwise lacks any broad constituency. He speaks often of the need for reordering priorities, cutting funds for the military and the space program in order to upgrade health and education. Proxmire believes that the economy will be the most important factor in the 1972 election and is waiting to see how Nixon's new policies fare. If he enters the April 4 primary in his home state, he may deny a victory there to any major candidate.

MEASURE OF CADENCE

Set against these personalities, Muskie is at once an unusually simple and an unusually complex man. For a politician, his public and private personalities fuse to a remarkable extent—he is what he seems, whether his mood is lofty or merely testy. Yet he is a difficult man to understand. "You don't really know Ed Muskie," says one friend. "You may think you do, or you may sense him. But you don't know him." To some he is a political platitude, espousing honesty, sincerity, hard work, independence and loyalty. But he really believes in such ideals and lives by them.

Muskie moves and works in a measured cadence—slow, methodical, studied. Says Gene Letourneau, a friend who sometimes hunts birds with him in Maine: "When Ed goes out in the woods, he is just as cautious as when he makes a big political decision. He wants to know where he's going. He always has the compass out."

His critics call such qualities indecisiveness. His staff finds the charge peculiar. They know Muskie as a tough, demanding boss with extraordinarily high standards that reflect an almost excessive decisiveness. On the draft-reform bill this year, for example, there were some 65 amendments in the Senate. On each one, Muskie demanded a staff memo. Adding to the burden, Muskie made a major speech on the bill that required six redrafts. He is a cool, cerebral and persistent plodder, insisting on thorough research, wary of hasty conclusions, suspicious of headline-grabbing pronouncements. Says George Mitchell, his deputy campaign director: "He's simply not a guy who will do things because someone says he should. He demands to know the reasons."

His Vesuvian temper is legendary. One of his biographers, Theo Lippman, Jr., reports that "he gave us ten interviews for the book [Muskie], and in the last one, we brought up the subject of his temper. He lost his temper." The Republican National Committee, as part of its research on Muskie, has an affidavit from a Maine telephone operator swearing that during a Muskie vacation a few years ago, a telephone repairman had to go up to the Senator's cottage three times to fix a phone that had been ripped off the wall.

"He does blow his stack occasionally," says Jane Muskie, "but then it's over. It's probably a damned good reason why he doesn't have an ulcer." With all his temper, observes former Senator Albert Gore, "Muskie is a gentle man. He has a whimsical sense of humor that doesn't go over the heads of people like Adlai's sometimes did." Set against his cautious decision-making processes, his temper would be a doubtful target for his political opponents. No one who knows Muskie can imagine him making a major decision in a fit of rage.

Although their characters are very different, Muskie and Nixon share some qualities. Both are ill at ease in small talk. During his trip to the Middle East and Europe last January, Muskie was obviously uncomfortable in making little toasts and speeches at the endless diplomatic receptions. Like Nixon, he relished his meetings with heads of state—Kosygin, Brandt and Anwar Sadat. Employing a Nixonian phrase, Muskie says he liked "the mental combat."

SHADOW CABINET

In part it was Muskie's caution that caused him to delay for months in reorganizing his staff, tooling it to the needs of a presidential candidate. As his campaign director, Muskie hired 42-year-old Berl Bernhard, a bright attorney who used to be staff director of the U.S. Civil Rights Commission. Bernhard quickly proved to be a demanding and effective organizer with a touch of humor.

It was a good choice, for Muskie is absorbed by issues and bored by the details of campaign organizing. All he requires from his manager is that operations run smoothly. But he uses his staff intensively as intellectual instruments. Twice a month, his legislative aides prepare a 30- to 40-page, single-spaced briefing book that covers major foreign and domestic events of the previous two weeks. Muskie's latest book contains a long selection on the Middle East, another on developments since Nixon's China initiative, a third on the balance of payments. Chief Legislative Assistant Dan Lewis assembles the material, indexes it and puts it into a looseleaf notebook for Muskie's use.

Muskie has assembled a shadow Cabinet for advice and tutoring. Former Ambassador Averell Harriman, former Defense Secretary Clark Clifford and former Assistant Secretary of Defense Paul Warnke brief him on foreign affairs and national security. On economics, he consults Arthur Okun and Walter Heller, from Lyndon Johnson's Council of Economic Advisers, and Pierre Rinfret, a New York-based economic consultant, who also advises Nixon on occasion. The Johnsesque cast of the group does not help Muskie's image, but Deputy Campaign Director George Mitchell insists that the Senator consults a much wider variety of specialists, whose identities have not yet leaked out.

Muskie's intelligence is tenacious rather than spectacular. Says one of his economic advisers: "What I've seen of Muskie so far, I like very much. He sits still better, listens better than Hubert Humphrey, for example. If you are talking about a quick flash of insight of the kind Jack Kennedy had all the time, none of the Democratic candidates have that. It took us a while to get Muskie to home in on the subject, but after we finally captured his attention, he was terrific."

To handle communications, especially television, Muskie has Robert Squirer, who will try to recreate the success of Muskie's 1970 Election Eve broadcast. "He has a totally integrated personality for television," says Squirer, who met Muskie in 1968 when he was one of Humphrey's television consultants. Squirer believes that Muskie has a great advantage over the other potential candidates, except John Lindsay, in using TV. Humphrey, says Squirer, "can't stop talking. He's too much, too hot for the medium. Bayh is interesting on the tube, but it is difficult to find 45 consecutive seconds of Bayh that make sense. Jackson is not good on television and neither is McGovern. Harris may be the best of the lot, but his personal appearance is not good. He has to lose about 30 pounds. Now he comes across as a big, toady frog."

Squirer likes to look past the convention to the general election. "I'll tell you what I dream about," he says. "I dream about Muskie-Nixon debates. I don't say that television can win it for Muskie, but I do think Muskie can win it on television."

THE MONEY THING

A principal problem now is raising the \$1,000,000 that Muskie will need to sustain and build his operation before the New Hampshire primary. Muskie dislikes rattling the tin cup. When the subject comes up, he grumbles: "This money thing—my God."

But money troubles have already caused two staff cuts, necessitated salary slashes among campaign workers—some simply became unpaid volunteers—and spawned hard-to-come-by loans that will have to be repaid promptly. Muskie has enlisted talented money-raisers—former Democratic National Committeeman Paul Ziffren in Los Angeles, Northeast Theater President Sumner Redstone in Boston, United Artists' Arnold Picker in New York. But some major sources of Democratic campaign funds are still wary. "These guys," says a Muskie agent, "want to make invest-

ments, not contributions." They want a sure winner. Not until the fall and winter, if Muskie remains high in the opinion polls as the primaries approach, will some checkbooks begin opening.

Muskie's men are trying to set up organizations in all of the primary states. They want to be ready for a campaign in any one of the 23, although they know that entering all of them would cost a preposterous \$12 million. They also know that as the campaign gathers momentum, all the other candidates are going to be gunning for the front runner, trying to knock him out in states where they think they can beat him.

Muskie will present himself to voters as a healer and a unifier—striking the same "bring us together" theme that Richard Nixon sounded in his Inaugural Address. "I think the country wants to believe in itself again," says Muskie, "not only in its purpose or moral values, but also its quality to achieve whatever it sets as a national goal." He uses the word manage repeatedly, suggesting that besides suffering from racial and ideological ills, the nation has become rather incompetent. "We're not even sure we can manage ourselves or do anything that requires management," he says. "We have doubts about whether we can manage our welfare program, manage our environmental problems, manage our city problems. This is a rather traumatic American doubt. In the area of management, we have always felt that we surpassed other peoples, and now we are not so sure of it any more."

THE MARCISZEWSKI

It is characteristic of Muskie to emphasize expertise rather than ideology. His Maine background enforced a sense of the practical. The son of a Polish immigrant tailor who anglicized the family name from Marciszewski, Muskie grew up in the mill town of Rumford. Fifty miles from the sea, Rumford is not part of the Maine that Americans see on postcards or during holidays. It lies in the sometimes impoverished wood country, among the mills that are at the heart of Maine's economy. Muskie's mother still lives there in a ramshackle neighborhood.

If his boyhood was somewhat straitened, it was not particularly deprived or, as some biographers claim, deeply clouded by bigotries against "Polacks." Muskie took some heckling as a Polish child in predominantly French-Canadian Rumford, but it was nothing traumatic. Like the Muskies, the other townspeople were largely Roman Catholic. Muskie was an earnest student, and was popular enough in high school to become president of the student council. He joined the debating squad and the basketball team—as a substitute. At Maine's Bates College, working his way through, Muskie was elected class president and graduated *cum laude*. His grades were equally good at Cornell Law School, where he graduated *cum laude* in 1939.

After Navy duty in the Atlantic and the Pacific during World War II, Muskie returned to practice law in Waterville. In 1948 he married Jane Gray, a bookkeeper, salesgirl and occasional model in a local fashion shop. Attracted by the New Deal, Muskie had joined the Maine Democratic Party and successfully ran for the state legislature in 1946. Democrats were such a novelty that he soon became the Democratic house floor leader. In 1954 he was elected Governor, partly because thousands of down-Easters were simply looking for an alternative to granitic Republicanism.

In an effort to attract new income and jobs to the state, Muskie formed the Industrial Development Agency, which in subsequent years has become a villain to environmental-

ists. Otherwise, he earned a reputation as progressive Governor and rapidly became the state's most popular personality. In 1958, after two terms in the Governor's mansion, Muskie ran for the Senate against the incumbent, Frederick Payne, who had had the bad luck to be involved in the Bernard Goldfine scandal.

"MR. CLEAN"

In his 13 years in the Senate, Muskie has become known for his thoroughness and competence. "He is the best of us all," says Montana's Senator Lee Metcalf. "If I rated all Senators on a scale of 100, Muskie would be first." As a legislator, Muskie has probably made his greatest impact in promoting environment-protection bills even before ecology became a crusade. As chairman of the Air and Water Pollution Subcommittee, he wrote the 1963 Clean Air Act, the initial major federal statute aimed at curbing air pollution. It was the first of a series of antipollution bills whose authorship earned him the title "Mr. Clean." In 1965 he wrote the Water Quality Act, establishing federal Water Pollution Control Administration and creating a water quality standards program.

Although Muskie is the acknowledged Senate authority on environment legislation, Ralph Nader's raiders last year issued an air-pollution report that sharply criticized his 1967 clean-air amendments for establishing regional instead of national air-quality standards. "Muskie," said the Nader paper, "has never seemed inclined (either politically or temperamentally) toward taking a tough stand against private industry." The findings were accurate in some ways but unfair to Muskie in others. Even the raiders conceded that in 1967 Congress would not have approved national emission standards. Muskie's proposals have steadily gotten tougher as public concern over pollution has made stronger laws possible.

VOTING RECORD

There is one area in which Muskie has been lenient on industry. On the issue of free trade against protectionism, he has generally been a mild protectionist, reflecting his Maine constituents' fears of foreign competition in the shoe and textile industries. Otherwise, Muskie's voting record in the Senate is far more liberal than his current centrist image would suggest. Americans for Democratic Action gave him a 91% "right" grade on the last session; Kennedy, Bayh and McGovern all scored less than 90%. The AFL-CIO's COPE (Committee on Political Education) scoreboard from 1959 to 1970 gave him 60 "right" votes and only two "wrong"—a pro-labor record matched or surpassed by only eight other Senators.

On questions of civil liberties, his record is equally liberal. He denounced the Nixon Administration's District crime bill, with its no-knock and preventive detention provisions. He has attacked the FBI for its surveillance of an Earth Day rally he addressed last year.

Muskie has joined in proposing a special White House office on drug abuse and a program that would spend \$340 million—nearly double the present federal expenditure—to establish local treatment centers for drug addicts. He can also count legislative contributions over the years in housing, urban affairs, revenue sharing and welfare reform.

In 1966 Muskie saved L.B.J.'s Model Cities program from Senate defeat by an exercise of homespun eloquence. The bill passed by a surprising 53-22 majority. Says Senate Majority Leader Mike Mansfield: "Senator Muskie is the only Senator I've known in my 19 years here who has been able to change a large number of votes to get a certain piece of legislation through."

His record on Viet Nam, however, is a liability in the eyes of many Democrats, espe-

cially those who tried to get the 1968 Democratic platform committee to adopt a strong antiwar plank. In January of 1968, Muskie wrote a private letter to L.B.J. urging a bombing halt as a step toward a negotiated settlement. Seven months later he defended the President's policy by supporting the convention's majority plank on Viet Nam, which leaves him open now to a charge of political expediency. Muskie tries to minimize the zeal with which he backed the plank.

Since Viet Nam is no longer the political issue that it was, voters may not be much bothered by the fact that Muskie did not oppose the war earlier. Besides, he was hardly alone. It was, one close associate says, "a case of Muskie not trusting his basic instincts. He sensed something was deeply wrong, but it was another case of his feeling he didn't have enough facts. In the future, he will trust his own instincts to a greater degree."

THE LAST VACATION

Muskie and his growing family occupy a colonial house in suburban Bethesda. A light drinker who likes an occasional Manhattan or martini, he avoids the Washington cocktail circuit, preferring to entertain small groups of neighbors at dinner. Among his best friends is Michigan's Senator Philip Hart, and the Harts are frequent dinner guests.

Muskie likes to read at least two hours a day—mostly committee reports, although he recently found time for *Future Shock* and *The French Lieutenant's Woman*. But the campaign increasingly encroaches. He is an amateur photographer with a taste for artistic shots, like dew on a cobweb. He takes his Roman Catholic religion seriously, and his staff has learned that a sure way to infuriate him is to make up a schedule that does not include time for Sunday Mass. He is an old-fashioned, even Victorian father, although not a strict disciplinarian. "I can remember being spanked only two times," says his oldest son Steve, now 22.

For four weeks before Labor Day, Muskie sequestered himself and his family in his rambling house at Kennebunk Beach. It was probably the last real vacation he will enjoy until after the Democratic Convention, and Muskie savored it. He would rise at 6 for a swim in the icy Atlantic, then jog back through the coastal fog. Then he would light a fire in the fireplace and read until lunchtime. After eating, he would slip through a hole in the hedge to the next-door Webhannet Golf Club, where he would play what a friend calls "medicare golf." Muskie broke his back in a fall 18 years ago while fixing up his house in Maine. As a result, his golf swing is awkward. Still, in an intense, failing exercise, he somehow manages to shoot in the mid-90s. One of the first times he played, he shot a hole-in-one, and he has been trying ever since to regain that glory.

What Edmund Muskie is now attempting politically is surely as difficult. His role as front runner is working quietly in his favor, and he has none of the slickness and insincerity associated with many politicians. But there is a real danger in his candidacy: he could become vaguely boring. An Olympian independence, a Lincolnian candor can become dull in the unpredictable psychology of a long campaign.

Muskie's moral left, his air of personal and political authenticity could be effective against Richard Nixon in the general election. The question now is whether Muskie will survive that long, or be eliminated in one of the primaries or at the convention. His campaign has, like the candidate himself, a certain steadiness, equilibrium rather than passion. Whether it is enough to be the sober centrist in a divided party remains to be seen, as does Muskie's capacity to adapt, grow and learn now that the race is beginning in earnest.

VISIT ALASKA

HON. NICK BEGICH

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 14, 1971

Mr. BEGICH. Mr. Speaker, on July 13, 1971, the Christian Science Monitor published several articles describing the beauty and charm of Alaska.

Alaska, more than any other state in the Union captures the adventure and expression of a growing country. Truly America's last frontier, unspoiled by the problems of overpopulation, pollution, and concrete jungles, Alaska is a place where man's individual efforts bear fruit in a dramatic and beneficial way.

It is hard to appreciate the majestic beauty of Alaska without visiting our State. However, the three articles that appeared in the Christian Science Monitor offer a brief look into the special and unique characteristics of Alaska. At this point, I insert these articles into the RECORD so that my colleagues in Congress can better appreciate the charm of Alaska.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, July 13, 1971]

WHERE TO FIND ALASKA '71—SEWARD HIGHWAY LINKS ATTRACTIONS

(By Shari Wigle)

If you are looking for Alaska '71 you'll find it on the Seward Highway.

The 128-mile route puts it all together by linking the state's largest city with a world famous sportsmen's peninsula, gold mines and glaciers, massive peaks and wooded plateau.

In earlier years Alaska-bound travelers took ships to Seward and boarded the train to the booming town on Cook Inlet. These days Anchorage sourdoughs climb into cars and campers and hit the asphalt trail south.

The highway starts near the Arctic and Northern Lights intersection of shopping malls and hamburger franchises. Jets en route to this "air crossroads of the world" scream overhead as you drive past Airport Road through the borough to Rabbit Creek where most motorists turn off. The reason—a panorama of the metropolis' rising skyline framed by mountains and inlet. Here in the city's shadow streams abound with pink salmon.

On the way the road becomes a beach drive winding between Turnagain Arm and the Chugach range. Waters of the arm, named by Captain Cook when he failed to find the Northwest Passage there, rise in record high tide second only to Bay of Fundy, Nova Scotia. Across the paralleling Alaska Railroad tracks and the inlet, is a rugged shore of the Kenai Peninsula, your destination. Also, the volcanic Aleutian summits tower to the west.

About 40 miles into the trip a cut-off leads past A frame chalets hugged by spruce to Alyeska, an all-year ski complex. The site of the 1963 Olympic Trials, the resort hosts an annual international airlines ski race. A mile plus chair lift elevates to 4,000 feet for a sight you can't get on wheels—sylvan slopes, Girdwood Valley, and eight glaciers, some skiable.

Back on Seward Highway the deserted buildings of Portage, resembling an old movie set, are reminders of the 1964 earthquake. A five-mile side road ends at the drive to Portage Glacier which stages an unscheduled show. Huge chunks of ice calve

off and splash into Iceberg Lake. Some of these blue-white cubes float to the edge of the parking lot near a visitor center where naturalists explain the Pleistocene happening.

The desolate Turnagain Flats and icy scene changes into streams meandering through rich meadows dotted with azalea, violets, blueberries, parks of aspen and birch. About four creek crossings later there's a junction. If you turn right the almost 20 miles of gravel will be worth it. Seventy-six years ago steamers of gold seekers rushed to Resurrection Creek from Seattle and San Francisco.

The town of Hope was born, then abandoned for the Klondike strike of '98. Today the village has placer mine tours and a Pioneer Café where you can buy everything from groceries to gold pans. We opted to admire the area's apple trees rather than meet brown bear and equal size mosquitoes on the trails.

Ninety miles into the trip at a large Y, you turn left for Seward. At nearby Moose Pass, the animals sometimes run along the railroad tracks which once again parallel the highway. During the journey's last leg the road skirts Kenai Lake and then Snow River, going through a canyon and along a creek lined with hemlock and spruce. Similar scenes are captured on canvas at a roadside gallery also featuring native crafts. Nearby at Muskwa Village experts will polish and facet the rocks you found.

Seward is a place where you can buy expensive jade and nugget jewelry, dine on steak and seafood, then use the laundromat in the theater building and the campers' showers in the barber-beauty shop. At this southern railroad terminus tourists can inspect "Seward," a car from the train which carried President Harding to Nenana in 1923.

Hands of the old City Hall clock haven't moved since the 1964 quake, but the community has bounced back remarkably with a \$10 million dock and small boat harbor. Fishermen can charter boats and get their catches canned, smoked, or frozen.

The 2,000 residents welcome guests at hostilities and two municipal campgrounds open to October 1. If you have a couple extra days for your return, top off your Alaska '71 venture by trying one of the state's marine roads, a Seward Highway extension. You park your car on the ferry M/V Tustumena. Then from the top deck take in more of the giant 49th state while sailing to Anchorage around the peninsula with stops at Kodiak Seidovia and Homer.

HOW A CHILD TAKES TO CRUISE LIFE— A PRESENT LONG REMEMBERED

(By Kate Keating)

NEW YORK.—When we approached child Number 3 with a proposal that she spend her 11th birthday aboard a cruise to Alaska, she "bought" the idea—lock, stock and vessel.

So, it was with excitement at an all time high that we checked into Air Canada for our flight to Vancouver in early summer with our luggage well packed with warm clothes.

We toured about Vancouver all too quickly for our P&O Line ship was to sail shortly. The Arcadia had started the cruise from San Francisco thence to Los Angeles and Vancouver.

Bed was not to be considered even though the hour was well past 2 a.m. according to New York time on which our stomachs were still set. We had grouped with some people, some of which were even under 10 and proceeded to explore the Arcadia the way a cat does a new home. Out of numerous possibilities we chose a sheltered pool that promised protection from the wind but exposure to the sun; a strobe-lit, pop poster-swathed retreat dubbed the "Pop Inn"; and the "Lookout" Lounge, advantageously perched on the promenade deck with magnificent

view forward to be seen from great deep high backed leather chairs.

The next morning we woke to the delivery of juice, biscuits, and tea by our cabin steward, Adey, whose function, we decided, other than imposing some sorely needed standards of tidiness, was to make certain that we never missed breakfast.

And we never did. There were such British matutinal dishes as fish cakes with anchovy sauce, smoked haddock, and lamb chops, all of which we viewed with an amount of American awe but with very little subscription, sticking to less flamboyant standards. Lunch and dinner menus throughout offered many varieties of West Coast salmon which we never refused.

Our first port, Ketchikan, was reached through fir tree-lined narrows, and there we had the fortune to run into a former local TV newscaster who packed what had become a sextet of three parents and three juveniles into his ancient station wagon for a tour of the local spots. He took us to a quiet lake in the lush Tongass rain forest and especially delighted the young ones in our company with a drive to the two totem pole parks at each end of town.

The Arcadia took up her gangway in mid-afternoon and glided out into the channel for passage to Juneau. Throughout the cruise, spots of greater significance were identified over the ship's speakers, first by a Mrs. Porter, who lives in Ketchikan when she's not commenting on cruise ships, and then later by Alaskan pilots.

Juneau was reached under determined clouds of drizzle, but we had our first sight of glaciers, of which we were later to see many. Martha rode up front with the pilot of a Southeast Skyways' seaplane for an aerial glimpse of the Taku Glacier in Juneau's backyard and was as amazed as I with the aggressive blues of glacial fissures and the browns of accumulated debris. We explored the now defunct Juneau Gold Mine tunnels in an old covered rail car.

The next day we were on our way to Lynn Canal and Glacier Bay where the air took on a nip of the glaciers and the ship's shop did a booming business in Hong Kong car coats for \$6.15. Only the hardy were to be found sunning at poolside now, but being veterans of summer at the Maine shore, we were definitely among the hardy.

Martha, at an in-between age that has yet to be successfully labeled, shunned the activities for children of which there were many. During the day, she often frequented with her entourage the "Pop Inn" where a juke box provided five sides of terribly contemporary music for a quarter. That was a "buy" and with her spending money of a dollar a day, she satisfied her passion for hard rock.

We disembarked at Victoria, ferried through magnificently serene islands to Vancouver to head back to New York with the Seventh Avenue IRT looming large for me and preferably, camp in the Adirondacks, for Martha. But our return was rich with a new closeness found in new scenes, an experience that is to be recommended for every parent with every child. There is pleasure in being a parent and in that of being a child but often we can't see the forest for the trees. It helps to get out of the forest occasionally.

U.S. GUIDES—SHIP TRIP THROUGH TONGASS (By Josephine Robertson)

Passengers coming aboard one of the Alaska ferries may be surprised to find a U.S. Forest Service Station in the main lounge.

From there a uniformed naturalist, who may be either a man or a woman, using a public address system, turns the trip into a guided cruise. Through intermittent broadcasts travelers are introduced to the history,

geology, wildlife, and ecology of the Tongass National Forest.

The program, which was tried out for a short time on one ship in 1969 met with such a favorable response that last summer, eight naturalists will be manning the four ships.

Year around the ferries ply a route from Seattle northward, stopping at Prince Rupert, Ketchikan, Wrangell, Juneau, Sitka, Haines, and Skagway, a journey of 1,200 miles one way and taking three and a half days. It is a tortuous route, winding around craggy islands, seemingly endless forest and magnificent scenery that suggests the Norwegian fjords.

These are working ships, designed to transport people, freight, and vehicles from one point to another in a vast area with few roads. As there is not much in the way of entertainment aboard, the passengers welcome the interesting commentary on the passing scene.

This service was worked out as a joint project of the Division of Marine Transportation, the State of Alaska and the U.S. Department of Agriculture, of which the Forest Service is a part.

Most of the route is through the Tongass National Forest, the nation's biggest, with 16 million acres of woodland, glaciers, salmon streams, and big game country. The journey is described as a "trip by ship through the forest in which many of the travelers will never set foot."

Answering questions, along with the broadcast messages, is one of the responsibilities of the naturalists. A small boy asks, "What does this mean—port and starboard?"

Part of the broadcasts are from prepared text. In Clarence Strait, north of Ketchikan, the speaker points out that we are in the same latitude as the British Isles; that the coastline of Alaska is longer than the coasts of all the other states together; that each of the 250,000 residents might, theoretically, have 2½ square miles; that the coastal climate in southeastern Alaska is surprisingly moderate, averaging between 20 to 50 degrees and so is not a forbidding land of ice and snow.

When something special comes into sight, the prepared text is laid aside.

A black fin is seen cutting through the water. The call goes out—"killer whale!" We may see the tall flukes of a big humpback whale, or the sleek black and white dall porpoise, or the ever-curious hair seal.

When fishing boats are sighted, the naturalist tells about trollers, gillnetters, and purse seiners out to harvest salmon. He tells the mysterious saga of this great fish, the pink salmon that goes from streams to unknown waters shortly after hatching, and the others that may linger three or four years before heading for the sea. All at their appointed time, return to struggle back upstream to the spawning place.

Again an interruption. This time a lordly Bald Eagle. And so it goes.

THE MASSACRE AT ATTICA

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 14, 1971

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, the massacre of 40 persons at the prison in Attica, N.Y., will go down in the annals of history as a monstrous abortion of the word "corrections."

In March of this year I predicted that such atrocities would occur when I introduced legislation designed to forestall

such tragedies. I said then that America's prison systems generally and New York's in particular were brutal, savage, dehumanizing failures. I introduced legislation calling on the Congress to appropriate \$1 billion for upgrading the Nation's prisons to be appropriated between 1971 and 1975. This is the minimum amount necessary to begin a broad range of modern treatment facilities to replace those monuments to society's failure, our hopelessly outdated prisons.

The events of the past few days have highlighted the fact that there are in the Nation's prisons not enough guards, not enough programs, not enough space, not enough cells, and too many prisoners jammed into them. With buildings based on modern penological architecture, properly guarded and properly controlled by electronic equipment we might have averted the needless slaughter at Attica. The State correction leaders obviously did not learn from events such as the eruption of the Tombs in April, the findings of a Federal judge who ordered reforms in the State prison system when he found that inmates were subjected to cruel and inhumane punishment, and the rebellion of the State's own professional correctional personnel at the shortcomings in the system.

New York as other States such as Arkansas, California, and Indiana ignored recent congressional investigations of the Nation's prisons which uncovered a litany of guard corruption and ineptitude, inmate suicide, torture, sexual exploitation, beatings, maddening solitary confinement, and even murder in their institutions.

Now the price for this crass attitude toward prison conditions is being paid for by inmates and guards alike. I offer the sympathy of my office to the friends and families of those slain and hope that this travesty will shock the Nation and the Congress into action to cure the conditions that exist in the Nation's prisons, not only in New York, but the rest of the Nation as well.

I plan to renew my efforts to pass into law the legislation I introduced in March 1971, the "Juvenile and Adult Correctional Facilities Improvement Act." The Nation's top correctional officials estimate it would take \$18 billion to rebuild the Nation's prison systems to the point where there would be no more Atticas. My legislation is a solid step in providing the funds and expertise necessary to do just that.

Mr. Speaker, I insert the remarks I made on the introduction of my bill to be printed at this point in the RECORD. I ask Members to read them as a reminder to all of us of the distressful conditions in our Nation's prisons.

STATEMENT OF REPRESENTATIVE JOHN M. MURPHY ON THE INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO PROVIDE FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE TO STATES AND LOCALITIES FOR THE CONSTRUCTION AND MODERNIZATION OF JUVENILE AND ADULT CORRECTIONAL SYSTEMS

Since my first years as a Congressman my colleagues have known of my intense interest in the problems of crime, juvenile delinquency, narcotics addiction, the pornography racket, the criminal abuse of firearms, and the havoc that has been wreaked

on the nation and our citizens as a result of these social evils.

Because my city is one that has always suffered a great deal from these evils I have decided to assume a leadership role in the development of Federal legislation to cope with these many problems where it is appropriate.

For the past several weeks I have held lengthy meetings with one of the nation's outstanding professionals in the area of Federal criminal laws who has had years of experience in writing and guiding through the Congress some of the major crime bills that are now laws of the land. He is now a member of my staff and with his help, I have developed a legislative program which I intend to introduce during the coming weeks.

While these bills will have great benefit for the citizens of my district and the inhabitants of the city and state of New York, they are nationwide in scope and are intended to solve some of the critical problems facing America today.

Criminal acts against persons and property costs the United States \$24 billion annually, and will continue to spiral, unless, together with the need for law and order, we also see the need for comprehensive rehabilitation of delinquents and offenders.

For this reason, the first bill which I introduced today for appropriate reference I have called the "Juvenile and Adult Correctional Systems Improvement Act of 1971." It is directed at that small army of habitual criminal offenders who have, year after year, spewed forth from a correctional system that can only be described as a monstrous abortion of the word "correction."

Under my proposed legislation, \$1 billion is authorized to be appropriated between the fiscal years 1971 and 1975. This is the minimum amount necessary to begin a broad range of small modern treatment facilities to replace those monuments to society's failure, our hopelessly outdated prisons and reformatories and training schools.

The field of corrections, especially youth corrections, is at a critical stage at this period in time. It faces two serious problems that threaten the complete and total disintegration of state correctional systems.

First, money and facilities are totally inadequate to meet the demands placed on correctional institutions by our communities.

Second, the validity of the treatment techniques of present day corrections is in serious doubt.

As the President's Crime Commission pointed out:

"... for the large bulk of offenders, particularly the youthful, the first or minor offender, institutional commitments can cause more problems than they solve. Institutions tend to isolate offenders from society, both physically and psychologically, cutting them off from schools, jobs, families and other supportive influences and increasing the probability that the label of criminal will be indelibly impressed upon them."

In most cities, tender, unsophisticated youthful offenders are incarcerated in the nation's dungeons because no alternatives exist. Unfortunately, this happens in most cases to poor youngsters in ghetto areas where the lack of any social welfare resources requires the police to send the children to court and the courts, having no other alternative, send them to state training schools and so-called "correctional" institutions.

Some uninformed self-styled experts have called these institutions "tuition-free schools for crime." The statement is of course partially correct.

The bulk of our institutions are schools for crime.

The repeater rates have proved that beyond question.

But to label them "tuition-free" displays an incredible lack of understanding of the true nature of the problem.

The truth is, in 1969, \$258.2 million was spent on public institutions serving delinquents at a per capita cost of \$5,031.

In one of our Northeastern states the average yearly cost of maintaining a delinquent in the state training school is \$12,400. And this state admits a failure rate of 75 percent.

The original cost of a prison cell exceeds the cost of a patient's bed in a big city hospital—up to \$25,000 per inmate.

I would call these exorbitant tuition fees, and they are fees that are being paid by the American taxpayer.

I would remind my colleagues that the tuition for a full year of room, board and education at Harvard and Yale is in the neighborhood of \$4,200.

The important thing for the Congress to remember is that our traditional forms of institutionalization are totally ineffective in rehabilitating the majority of our chronically delinquent youth.

The return rate for young people released from the nation's "crime schools" ranges as high as 80 percent.

As the 1968 Uniform Crime Report of the F.B.I. pointed out:

"The younger the age group, the higher the repeating rate, has been documented many times, as it is here . . . of the offenders under 20 released in 1963, 71% were rearrested by 1969, 72% of those 20 to 24, and 69% of the offenders 25 to 29 years."

The bill that I introduce today may be considered an overly ambitious one by some people. However, I would point out that administration officials in the business of corrections estimate that it would cost as much as \$18 billion to revamp the nation's prison systems to the point where they would begin to return offenders to the streets of America capable of living a life free from crime.

The extent of such an estimate indicates that my proposed appropriation is a modest one in view of the size of the problem we are facing.

Our total correctional system, including adults, is presently costing \$1.5 billion a year. I would have to agree with those who have condemned the system as a brutal, savage, dehumanizing failure.

One of the most disastrous aspects of this situation is the nation's jail systems. I have visited many such institutions in my own state and I agree with those who say that they are "festering sores in the criminal justice system."

Over ninety percent of the nation's juvenile courts do not have any separate juvenile detention facilities at their disposal; and it is these juveniles whom we now imprison with hardened adult prisoners at their most impressionable age.

As long as I have been interested in corrections I have been appalled by the fact that we annually deposit 100,000 children in these filthy cesspools of crime where they are sodomized, brutalized and ultimately crystallized into finely honed criminals more disturbed, more deviant, more hardened and more dangerous than ever.

For this reason, I have stipulated in my bill, that in order for a state to receive the funds made available in this legislation that all state plans should provide a detailed accounting of the numbers of juveniles who are confined with adult felons and a specific time schedule for the elimination of this practice. While this would apply to all institutions, it is currently most acute in our jail systems.

It has also become plain through the recent hearings of the Senate and House and the findings of the President's Crime Commission that our jails and institutions contain thousands of people, most of them young people, who should not be there. They should

not be isolated geographically and psychologically from their families and friends and from the normal activities of young persons such as schools, jobs and other positive influences in the community.

This is why my bill emphasizes programs of a community based nature such as halfway houses, work release programs, and the like. The bill is designed to provide monies to increase probation and parole staffs to realistic levels so that a single officer is not neutralized and demoralized by the overwhelming burden of having to maintain contact with caseloads that run into the hundreds.

There is no better example of the need for correctional reform than my own city and state of New York. The entire nation knows of the disastrous conditions in many of the jails, reformatories and prisons there.

A brief review of the performance of New York's correctional system last year conjures up in most American's minds the infamous Tombs, a decrepit dungeon, 200 percent above inmate capacity with three men jammed into tiny cells.

Inmates committed suicide to escape the misery of incarceration there.

Finally, out of desperation, these men declared open revolt over guard brutality, overcrowding and interminable confinement awaiting trial.

Then the nation's television cameras zoomed in on this ancient "black hole of Calcutta" for all America to see what can rightfully be called the shame of New York.

The investigation that followed drew comments from the inmates that portrayed a "dungeon of fear" that rivaled Dicken's description of Newgate Prison as a story of man's inhumanity to man.

The riots in the Tombs overshadowed similar conditions in other New York institutions. Children's shelters were exposed as institutions with "horrible" overcrowding and all the evil effects such a condition brings with it.

Officials of the city's office of probation were accused of criminal neglect in the operation of the Spofford Juvenile Center where hundreds of youngsters were held under conditions described as "shocking and inhumane," a place where violence, drug abuse and homosexuality were commonplace.

A Federal judge was forced to order reforms in the state prison system following a finding that inmates were subjected to "cruel and inhumane punishment."

Riker's Island was found to be a place where teenagers associate with accused felons and spend hours learning the tricks of the criminal trade ranging from the narcotics traffic to the most lucrative crimes that have been conceived up by the adult criminal mind.

New York's correctional system is one where even the professional personnel rebel at its shortcomings.

The Director of Psychiatry of the city's correctional department resigned claiming that the department's mental health program for its twelve thousand inmates was "disgraceful and inadequate."

Even a correctional officers' union, 2,400 strong, condemned the "19th Century conditions in city penal institutions where inmates were sleeping on floors and herded in jail corridors" like so many cattle.

We witnessed the spectacle of the city's beleaguered Commissioner of Corrections helplessly admitting that "the city's penal institutions are in a crisis situation."

And as a final admission of defeat, the Director of the New York State Division for Youth told the Congress that it would probably be better if young delinquents in New York State were not detected, apprehended or institutionalized because too many of them get worse in the care of the state.

I want to make it clear at this point that the city and state of New York are not the only jurisdictions with a crisis situation in their correctional systems. The same can be said of hundreds of cities, scores of states, and, in fact, the country as a whole.

During long weeks of hearings last year the Senate and House heard from correctional experts and prison investigators from every part of the nation. And no matter what part of the country they came from the story was the same.

They outlined a litany of guard corruption and ineptitude, inmate suicide, torture, sexual exploitation, beatings, maddening solitary confinement and even murder in our institutions.

And these experts concede conditions are the worst in our juvenile institutions.

There is abundant evidence that in every part of the country, inmates young and old, are exploited, beaten, and dehumanized in ways that could have been understood in the Middle Ages, but is hard to believe in the 20th Century.

The correctional administrators who run our institutions need help. This is evidenced by increasing numbers of violent jail and prison riots. And this is certainly evidenced by the conditions uncovered during Congressional hearings over the past two years.

Nothing less than a major overhaul of our institutions can serve to protect the American people from the dangerous criminals that are released from our institutions every day.

Crime is our most serious social problem.

There are over 400,000 offenders in our juvenile and adult institutions with new recruits coming in every day.

There will be more such offenders in the years to come because our latest statistics indicate another drastic rise in juvenile delinquency in 1969—the twenty-first consecutive year of increases in youth crime.

Operating the criminal justice and correctional systems alone will cost us \$9 billion annually by 1975.

My bill calls for \$1 billion over the next five years to establish reform, to make certain that the billions we already spend in corrections, on the present system of institutions, are not wasted in making worse criminals out of prison inmates.

We know today that over 70 percent of ex-inmates do repeat in new crimes.

Over 90 percent of the offenders incarcerated will be released in a few years. If we continue to neglect and abuse these men in our institutions, thousands of them will again prey on the public with vengeance their only motivation.

The one billion dollars proposed by this legislation is a small sum to pay to insure the reversal of the present crime situation which at least to a considerable degree can be traced to the fact that our prisons today are factories of crime.

This is not simply "brick and mortar" legislation.

It is not simply paying Federal funds to states and localities to build more prisons.

This is designed to improve the entire correctional system in the Nation, including every phase of what is subsumed under the concept of modern day penology.

The bill stipulates that to obtain Federal money, states and localities have to develop systems where treatment and rehabilitation rather than custody and punishment are the order of the day.

It stipulates that to obtain Federal funds states must eliminate the practice of confining juveniles with adult felons.

It requires that to obtain Federal funds the states and localities must make an effort to train and procure professionally qualified personnel for the institutions.

It requires that to obtain Federal funds the recipients must advance proposals to

develop employment and vocational training programs for inmates in cooperation with private industry.

It requires that to obtain Federal funds states and localities must develop a cooperative effort in the handling of offenders between all agencies for the administration of justice, law enforcement, and corrections.

I think the amount of money I ask is a small price to pay for a reduction in our crime rates and for more effective control of our crime problem.

I hope this bill will receive prompt and favorable consideration by both Houses of Congress.

WEATHER BOY PROVIDES UNITED STATES WITH OFFICIAL DATA

HON. STEWART B. MCKINNEY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 14, 1971

Mr. MCKINNEY. Mr. Speaker, combining a hobby with service to one's country is an unusual feat and I know that my colleagues will be interested to know that a young constituent of mine has done just that.

Fifteen-year-old Vincent Mobilio of Stamford, has been a weather hobbyist for 5 years and because of his proficiency in this field, he now operates the Sherwood Weather Station for the National Weather Service.

I know that I do not have to begin to tell you, Mr. Speaker, of the importance of such a contribution since the study of our atmosphere is such a determining factor in a great number of our scientific endeavors.

I know that the Members of this House will join me in saluting Vincent not only for his work in this area but for offering further proof that the coming generation is indeed in good hands.

Mr. Speaker, Vincent's activities were recently highlighted in a fine feature story written by Bob Masullo for the Stamford Advocate. I share that article with my colleagues at this time:

WEATHER BOY PROVIDES UNITED STATES WITH OFFICIAL DATA

(By Bob Masullo)

Every day of the year at precisely 5 p.m., 15-year-old Vincent Mobilio can be found in the yard behind his home checking a thermometer.

Vincent, the son of Mr. and Mrs. Ernest V. Mobilio of 38 Sherwood Rd., checks several other weather instruments also and records what they indicate. He does this for the federal government.

He operates Sherwood Weather Station for the National Weather Service, the second official station in Stamford. The first, and only other city station, is at the Stamford Museum and Nature Center.

Considered one of the youngest weathermen in the nation, Vincent has been a weather hobbyist for five years. He was sanctioned to operate his station two years ago.

"I first got interested in weather when I went to the museum and saw all the instruments they had there," he said. "Then my parents gave me a small weather kit for a Christmas present and I've been getting more and more instruments ever since. I've done a lot of reading on it too."

Gerald Rasmussen, museum director, encouraged young Mobilio to study weather.

Vincent regards him as a most valuable mentor.

The daily readings taken by Vincent include the temperature at the time, high and low temperatures of the preceding 24 hours, amount of precipitation and wind velocity. He sends the readings monthly to the state climatologist.

Among the instruments owned by the young man are an anemometer, barometer, wind vane, thermometer shelter psychrometer (measures relative humidity), several thermometers, rain gauge and a volameter (measures wind speed).

Together they have a value of more than \$600. They were purchased by Vincent out of his allowance.

He did not say what his allowance is, but noted that nearly all of it is spent on weather instruments.

"I'm planning to take pollen counts soon," he said. "That's the next piece of equipment I'll get."

The weather service is grateful for Vincent's recordkeeping. Using this statistics along with those of the museum, it is able to get a more accurate picture of climate conditions here than if they just had one set of figures.

In addition to the government records, Vincent also provides a weather service for subscribers. For a dollar a year he sends them monthly summaries of weather conditions that provide guidance for a variety of uses.

"There is one doctor who subscribes to my service because he does a lot of gardening," Vincent said. "He can tell, by the amount of rain, how much watering he has to do."

Other subscribers include business firms that have special use of weather records. One is a fuel oil company. However, Vincent notes that he really has only a few subscribers.

"They heard of me by word of mouth," he said. "I'd like to get a few more."

The young man's bedroom is neatly filled with books, weather instruments and charts and a few sea shells—a scientific interest in shells is another hobby.

"No, I don't want to make a career out of weather," Vincent said in response to a question. "I want to be a doctor, an allergist."

This year Vincent will begin his sophomore year at Rippowam High School. Naturally enough, his favorite subject is science.

PAROCHIAL SCHOOL AID

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 14, 1971

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, last December I called attention to the danger of the collapse of the Nation's private school system unless some public financial aid was forthcoming.

Without parochial and other private schools to help in basic education—and in some of our communities the number of children involved is large—the entire responsibility will fall on the local taxpayers through the public school system.

My own city of Buffalo is an excellent example of a community where the school budget will skyrocket if the parochial school system is allowed to collapse.

I recognize fully the long standing concern for the separation of church and state. But that is not the issue here—the issue is our entire basic education system.

I also recognize that the taxpayers in general have no obligation to support parochial and private schools.

On the other hand, without the facilities provided by the parochial and other private schools, the needs of the public school system will be far greater. The financial burden of building and supporting these additional facilities will fall upon all the taxpayers—not just the parents of former private school students.

Where parochial and private schools are concerned, families who choose to send their children to these schools recognize that they take on a double obligation. Besides paying the tuition for the private school, they still have to pay school taxes for their share of the cost of the public school system even though they do not send their children to public school.

It seems to me completely reasonable—as I have contended for years, even while I was in the Buffalo Common Council before coming to Congress—that there be some public financial help for the parochial schools.

Nineteen years ago I recall consulting on this matter with the diocesan head of education in Buffalo, seeking his support for my proposal that the common council memorialize the State to provide aid so that private schools could keep their heads above water.

At that time, I could not obtain adequate support from the diocese. Now today, we have the crisis at hand which I then saw so clearly down the road.

In community after community, including mine, the parochial schools are being closed because of the lack of teachers, plus the financial inability of the diocese to keep them operating. At the current rate of closings, the public schools cannot begin to accommodate the influx of students.

Who will suffer? Both the students and the public: The students because of the decline in education quality that goes with overcrowding; the public in the already overburdened pocketbook to finance expanded public school facilities.

I was gratified to read the remarks of President Nixon during his recent speech in New York City in which he pledged his support for aid to parochial schools.

As part of my remarks I include the related excerpt from his speech. I also include two editorials:

[Excerpt from Aug. 17, 1971 speech by President Nixon to Knights of Columbus convention in New York City]

... The challenge of peace, the road to the new prosperity will require all the character we have. You and I know that the American people have what it takes to compete.

But when we talk about character of a nation we must never forget that that character depends upon the individual character of 200 million Americans. Where does that come from? It comes from the home. It comes from the churches. It comes from the schools of this nation. There is where the character of the next generation, the coming generation, is being forged.

We must see to it that our children are provided with the moral and spiritual and religious values so necessary to a great people in great times. And, as Cardinal Cooke has pointed out, at a time we see those private and parochial schools which lay such stress on these religious values, as we see

them closing at the rate of one a day, we must resolve to stop that trend and turn it around. You can count on my support to do that.

Every man, even one who serves as President of the United States, relates an issue to what he knows in his own experience. I myself did not have a Catholic education. My secretary did . . .

She is a very fine secretary. But she also has very great character. She grew up in a family of modest income, a large family. She went to a Catholic school, a Catholic grammar school and a Catholic high school. Just looking at my secretary, and I think John Mitchell and John Volpe will bear me out, if that is what Catholic education does, I am for more of it. . . .

[Statement by Governor Rockefeller, March 2, 1971]

Some have asked how we can support more aid to private schools this year with the public schools having such problems. The answer is blunt and pragmatic:

Without help, many of these non-public schools face actual collapse.

And when they fall, their burden falls directly onto the public schools.

In New York City alone, there are 448,000 students in non-public schools.

Far better to give some help to keep these schools afloat than to have their costs descend on already overburdened public schools.

[Editorial from Buffalo Evening News, Dec. 3, 1970]

CATHOLIC DIOCESE TIGHTENS BELT

The financial retrenchment and consolidation program adopted by the eight-county Catholic Diocese of Buffalo is a regrettable but apparently unavoidable necessity.

The cutbacks are of primary concern, of course, to the members of the diocese. But in a larger sense they affect the whole community, whose educational, health and charitable resources are certainly dependent on diocesan institutions and programs. Thus, the public at large has special and urgent reasons to join in hoping the diocese will weather its present difficulties with a minimum of disruption and curtailed services.

The diocese's financial problems, especially as they relate to education, come as no surprise. Parochial schools throughout the United States are facing a growing crisis as operating costs continue to rise. In his education message last March President Nixon noted that non-public schools in America were closing at the rate of one a day and directed that a special study be made of the problem. He stressed that preservation of these schools is important both to avoid adding \$4 billion a year to the cost of operating the public schools and to "promote diversity in education."

With those same considerations in mind, more and more states, including New York, have been seeking means of providing public aid for private schools. Now, the latest announced parochial school closings and consolidations in Buffalo will properly strengthen support for repeal of the Blaine amendment and for exploring further means of providing indirect help for financially troubled nonpublic schools consistent with constitutional limitations. They should also spur greater interest in developing programs involving part-time use of certain public school facilities by private school pupils.

The Catholic diocese clearly is going through a difficult financial period. However, the current economies coupled with plans for increased parish fund-raising to retire the diocesan debt should result in a fiscally sounder and stronger diocese, one better able to fulfill its spiritual mission and to maintain its manifold services to the community.

[Editorial from U.S. News & World Report, July 19, 1971]

A CONSTITUTIONAL WAY TO AVOID DISCRIMINATION IN AIDING SCHOOLS

(By David Lawrence)

The Supreme Court has just handed down a decision which plainly says that it is unconstitutional for federal, State or local governments to provide financial assistance to parochial schools even when the aid is restricted to the teaching of secular subjects. Another ruling at the same time, however, permits the Federal Government to finance the construction of facilities at sectarian colleges as long as they are not used for worship services or religious instruction.

Many States have been troubled for years with the question of helping private schools, including those run by churches, which have been educating a considerable number of children. They are especially concerned now because costs have risen in all schools. As attendance at parochial schools is diminished, enrollments in public schools increase and additional tax money is needed.

The Court decisions are based on the idea that to give federal or State funds to a church-related school is a violation of the First Amendment, which declares that "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion."

Unquestionably, the Federal Government and the States will be spending more and more in future years for education in America. But it is illogical to assume that appropriations should be made solely for students in public schools and that money for education should be denied those attending parochial schools when the principal purpose is to give help to the American citizen in educating his children.

The big mistake thus far has been in dealing primarily with the schools themselves as the basis for the test of eligibility for public funds. The money should be furnished to individual citizens to allow them to educate their children in whatever schools they may choose.

Some States already have laws to make tuition grants either to parents of children attending parochial schools or to the schools themselves, and other States are planning similar arrangements. "Auxiliary services"—such as bus transportation, health care, school lunches, secular textbooks and driver-training courses—also are provided for parochial school students in a number of States. These have been upheld by the Supreme Court on the ground that they benefit the child rather than the church sponsoring the school.

All this argues that a system could be devised whereby each citizen, when his children reached a certain age, would be given a certificate for use in an educational institution of his own choice. This grant would have a financial value equivalent to a fixed tuition fee. Collectively the amounts would be substantial so that the schools would have funds to continue operations and maintain their educational standards.

The certificate could be submitted for admission to any school or college, private or public, and would be cashed only when presented at the school itself. It could be stipulated that, in order to be eligible, schools and colleges would be prohibited from practicing racial discrimination and that the certificates could not be accepted by any institution which does not fulfill this requirement.

The important fact is that parents would get help in paying for the education of their children, and the private educational system of the country would have additional money to meet rising costs.

The question before the States nowadays is how money can be provided for all kinds

of schools which do not practice racial discrimination. Those that happen to be run by a church are being penalized. To give financial aid to one group of parents for education of their children in public schools and deny it to another group whose children attend church-related schools is in itself a form of discrimination.

While the Constitution forbids government at all levels from becoming identified with the establishment of any religion, it certainly doesn't allow governmental interference with the processes of any religion. In fact, it bars government from "prohibiting the free exercise" of religion.

Many parents send their children to parochial schools because they feel this type of education helps them become better citizens. Government ought not to be in a position of telling parents what schools they may pick in which to educate their children. The only criterion should be whether the school is accredited by the educational authorities of each State.

There is a constitutional way to assist the private schools which are educating a sizable number of the nation's youth. This can be done not by furnishing money directly to the schools but by tuition grants to the parents. Funds for education come from taxes paid by all citizens, including those whose children are not educated at public expense. Surely it is not unconstitutional for the States to allow parents to benefit from their tax money through these grants.

DESERVED CREDIT FOR JAKE CARLTON

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 14, 1971

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, Col. John T. Carlton, executive director of the Reserve Officers Association, is one of those quiet, self-effacing individuals who gets things done while giving the credit to others. He is one of the most effective among the people in Washington who are charged with administrative responsibility for the many organizations in the Nations' Capital. The current issue of *The Officer* tells us some of the things about Jake Carlton which he would never do for himself. I am glad to submit it for reprinting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

COL. JOHN T. CARLTON, USAR

More than a quarter of a century ago, an Army Reserve officer whose journalistic career had been interrupted by World War II, arrived in Washington, D.C., the mecca of all ambitious reporters. Commissioned a second lieutenant of cavalry on graduation in journalism from the University of Georgia, John T. Carlton had seen service in Alaska and then in Okinawa and the Ryukyu Islands where he served as a Staff Officer to Gen. Simon Bolivar Buckner and Gen. Joseph Stilwell and was awarded the Legion of Merit.

"Jake" Carlton as he was known to large segments of Washington and the ROA, had a reputation as an enterprising and energetic reporter. As correspondent for the Cox Newspapers he became a member of the Congressional Standing Committee of Correspondents, the journalistic honor fraternity of Sigma Delta Chi and Sigma Chi. Leaving journalism, he became Administrative Assistant to Sen. George Smathers of Florida, and later to the revered Sen. Walter F. George. He also was on the staff of the Spe-

cial Senate Committee studying Foreign Aid.

Throughout this time Carlton, who had risen to the rank of Colonel, remained active not only in the Army Reserves but ROA where he had been President of the Atlanta Chapter, Georgia Department Officer and National Public Relations Officer. Elected ROA Executive Director in 1957, "Jake" Carlton turned all his talents and energies to the cause of Reserves in general and ROA in particular. He is credited by many with being the spark plug in the movement which brought ROA from its less than impressive rented headquarters to the handsome and prestigious Minute Man Memorial Building at No. 1 Constitution Avenue, N.E. Preeminently well-equipped for the job, he watches over Reserve Affairs and ROA like a hawk from his spacious fourth floor office.

CRUEL CUTBACK FOR FORT WAYNE'S NEIGHBORHOOD YOUTH CORPS

HON. J. EDWARD ROUSH

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 14, 1971

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, the summer job program of the Neighborhood Youth Corps has given hope to many young people in Fort Wayne, Ind. However, now that school has begun, many of these hopes have been dashed. The funding for Neighborhood Youth Corpsmen who are attending school this fall has been drastically and cruelly reduced. This summer, 1,000 young people were provided with jobs. Only 34 of these students are able to continue in their jobs as school begins, because Indiana lacks the \$280,000 needed for the Neighborhood Youth Corps program.

These are only numbers; however, the lives of hundreds of young people in Fort Wayne and elsewhere in Indiana are gravely affected. Throughout the summer, I have been receiving letters from the students who, by now, have been affected by the cutback. Their letters, below, speak for themselves:

DEAR MR. J. EDWARD ROUSH: Why can't Fort Wayne Neighborhood Youth Corps have more funds for more fall jobs. So I am asking you to help me get a job for the fall if you can.

Thank you.

YOLANDA WALKER.

DEAR SIR: I want very much to be part of the "In School Session" with the Fort Wayne Neighborhood Corp. I want to work while I am in school very much. I know school is very important and I won't let my grades go down because of the work.

Thank you for your help.

Sincerely,

JAMES A. YOUNG.

DEAR MR. J. EDWARD ROUSH: I would like to know why can't more pupils work for the fall job. I think this is a lot of help. Need for school supply and other uses. Would you please help me get a job for this fall.

Thank you.

PATRICIA TAYLOR.

DEAR MR. ROUSH: I am one of the people who work for the Neighborhood Youth Corps, and we would like for a lot of others to get a chance to work that are willing. But we all will like to know why can't the Fort Wayne

Youth Corps have more funds for more fall jobs? Please help me and other to get a job this fall.

Thank you.

DARLENE SIMMONS.

DEAREST EDWARD ROUSH: Why can't Fort Wayne's Neighborhood Youth Corps have more funds for more fall jobs. Please help me get a job this fall. I'm very poor, most poor of all the other workers.

P.S. Help the ones who need it.

MISS GLORIA HENRY.

DEAR SIR: I'm writing this letter concerning the Neighborhood Youth Corps. At the NYC this fall there are job openings for only 34 people. I need a job very bad, to help support my family. I am in a family of 9 and I only have a mother and she can't work. No one else in my family works, but I would like to, but chances aren't good because there aren't enough funds available.

Please do something to get more funds for NYC.

Yours sincerely,

FANNIE FIELDS.

DEAR EDWARD ROUSH: We really need more money for fall jobs because it's a lot of blacks and whites that really need a fall job. And I'm one of the Black's.

Thank you very much.

MICKY MARTIN.

DEAR MR. ROUSH: We would like for you to give us more money. Because the children need jobs so they can work. And I know you do want us to work. And I hope you will give us what you can. And we will be proud to know you did help us and you did what you can. And I think you would want help us children stay out of trouble. And we would like you to give more money for us to take care our self. And to help our mother buy us school clothes for us. We need jobs to take care our self. So some will not drop out of school. I did have much to say but I have enough to convince you that we need more money. And we need more work. This is the first time I had a job. Because it means a lot to me.

Sincerely,

JANICE HARRIS.

DEAR MR. ROUSH: Please help me and the other people who would like to work get a job. Can the Fort Wayne Indiana Neighborhood Youth Corps have more funds for more fall jobs. Mr. Roush, please help me get a fall job.

Thank you.

EUNICE LEE BILLINGSLEY.

DEAR MR. ROUSH: We would like you to give more money for us to take care of our self. And to help our mothers buy thing like cloth for school and other thing. And some peoples don't like it when children drop out of school. They need job. I hope I have enough to convince you, we need money, more.

Your Truly,

ROSELINE SMITH.

DEAR MR. ROUSH: I like the summer jobs this year. It helped me very much. I was able to buy my school clothes. My parents have a very small income and it is 6 of us kids. The summer job was a very big help to me and my family. Thanks so very much for making it possible for me to work this summer.

I hope this program can continue on so I can help my family. I am tired of living poor.

Thank you very very much.

Your truly,

PATRICIA HALL.

THE ANNUAL MEETING OF THE GORGAS MEMORIAL INSTITUTE OF TROPICAL AND PREVENTIVE MEDICINE, INC.

HON. TIM LEE CARTER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 14, 1971

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, as a physician I have always been interested in medical research; and since I have been a Member of the House, I have come to be something of a student of tropical and preventive medicine research.

Perhaps, now, the greatest institution of the indicated character in the world is the Gorgas Memorial Institute of Tropical and Preventive Medicine, which has supervision with Federal funds of the Gorgas Memorial Laboratory in Panama City, Republic of Panama.

The enabling act of 1928 creating the laboratory and authorizing appropriations therefor was one of the many important items of legislation for which Gov. Maurice H. Thatcher was responsible. He is now the sole surviving member of the Isthmian Canal Commission, which supervised the building of the Panama Canal.

At the recent September 1 annual meeting of the institute, Governor Thatcher was elected life honorary president of the institute, and reelected as general counsel, a position he had held since 1939.

A luncheon followed for the officers, members of the executive committee and the scientific advisory staff—all serving gratuitously. At the conclusion of the luncheon, Adm. Clarence B. Galloway, U.S. Navy, retired, who is president of the institute, called on Governor Thatcher for some remarks. The latter thereupon spoke briefly. His talk—recorded in the minutes of the meeting—was unique, and in its way something of a gem. I am now including it, under leave accorded, together with the Panama Canal spillway article about the indicated meeting, as parts of my own remarks:

FROM MINUTES OF ANNUAL MEETING OF GORGAS MEMORIAL INSTITUTE OF TROPICAL AND PREVENTIVE MEDICINE, INC., WASHINGTON, D.C., SEPTEMBER 1, 1971

After the meeting at GMI adjourned, the assemblage repaired to Engle's Restaurant, where luncheon was served.

At the close of the luncheon, President Galloway called on Governor Thatcher to say something to those present. The latter arose and spoke briefly. His remarks ran thus:

"I would only say that I am deeply grateful for the courtesies accorded me in the Annual Meeting today and for years past. At the time, years ago, when I obtained in the Congress passage of the basic enabling act for the establishment of Gorgas Memorial Laboratory and an annual appropriation for its maintenance and operation, I certainly did not expect to live as long as I have lived, nor that I would be privileged for such a lengthened period to serve the Institute and Laboratory in the manner I have served them.

"I have enjoyed very much the association with all those who have served the Institute and the Laboratory in an official or

scientific manner. The contacts thus involved have been to me most pleasing. My experience with the Congress of the U.S., not only when I was a member, but ever since, has been—I may say—successful and rewarding. The congressional area has indeed been my briar patch. Thus, thru the years, I have been able to obtain the enactment of measures of amendment and for increased appropriations for the maintenance and operation of the Institute and Laboratory.

"I feel that we are, all in all, a dedicated and most useful humanitarian group. We may well consider that we have labored far better than we have realized; and all of us should be very grateful for what we have done in our respective contributions. Throughout the life of the Institute and Laboratory, ourselves and those preceding us, have been motivated by a sense of objectivity and selflessness.

"The work of the Institute and Laboratory have greatly expanded. For 43 years, I have been able to render gratuitous service to these institutions; and others have rendered similar service. I have, indeed, been most grateful for these contacts and associations. I have never known finer men and women than those who have been thus involved. The world owes them much.

"In this connection, I am reminded of what Sam Jones, the famous Evangelist in a past generation, used to say in his pungent sermons. It was this, and I quote, 'When I knock at the pearly gates and ask for entrance, St. Peter will inquire, "Sam Jones, what did you ever do down there that qualifies you to enter here?" I'll answer by saying, "I sometimes helped the Salvation Army down there"; and he will say, "Come in Sam; come right in!"'

"So, when each of you serving the Institute and Laboratory finally seeks entrance to the celestial realm, you may tell St. Peter that down there you used to serve the Gorgas Memorial Institute and Laboratory and he will say, 'Come right in, friend; come right in!' (Applause and standing ovation).

[From the Panama Canal Spillway, Sept. 3, 1971]

MAURICE H. THATCHER RECEIVES
NEW HONOR

Maurice H. Thatcher, the last surviving member of the Isthmian Canal Commission, who celebrated his 101th birthday August 15, has been elected honorary lifetime President of the Gorgas Memorial Institute of Tropical and Preventive Medicine, Inc.

He was elected at the 48th annual meeting in Washington, D.C., "in recognition of more than 40 years of devotion to the creation and development of the Gorgas Memorial Laboratory." Thatcher was the author of the original Act establishing the Gorgas Memorial Laboratory.

New members elected by the Corporation to the Board of Directors were Carl Albert, Speaker of the House of Representatives; Tim Lee Carter, physician, Congressman from Kentucky; and James W. Watts, MD., Professor Emeritus of Neurological Surgery at George Washington University Medical Center.

The board re-elected Rear Adm. Calvin B. Galloway, Medical Corps, U.S. Navy (Ret.), as president for another 1 year term together with current officers.

During the meeting a report was made by Martin D. Young, Director of the Laboratory, reviewing the research activities during the past year and a report by Pedro Galindo, Chief of the Laboratory's Virology Department on Venezuelan Equine Encephalitis.

Dr. Martin M. Cummings, Director of the National Library of Medicine and member of the board of directors of the institute, spoke on the concept of regional medical libraries.

Plans are being made by the institute to establish the Gorgas Memorial Regional Medical Library for Panama and Central America on a plot of land ceded by the Republic of Panama.

The institute is a nonprofit parent organization of the Gorgas Memorial Laboratory located in Panama. The Laboratory has conducted biomedical research since its establishment in 1929 as a living memorial, envisioned by the late Dr. Belisario Porras, a former President of Panama, in recognition of the work of Maj. Gen. William C. Gorgas in the fields of sanitation and tropical health.

FOR PROSPERITY WITHOUT WAR AND WITHOUT INFLATION

HON. LAMAR BAKER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 14, 1971

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, President Nixon's timely message to Congress on our Nation's economic future merits the immediate attention of all Americans. All of us must now assume our share of responsibility for a healthy, stable peacetime economy.

I and my fellow Members of Congress now bear a special responsibility. We must give priority to implementing the President's economic goals outlined in his address, placing the best interests of our Nation above political ideology or partisan identification.

In announcing the 90-day wage-price freeze, President Nixon displayed courageous leadership. His action has helped curb spiraling inflation which has steadily eroded the value of our American dollar at home and abroad.

It is now up to us, our Nation's elected representatives, to insure the beneficial results of this new economic policy will continue permanently.

The President's program is not automatic. It requires prompt congressional action. We must pass legislation to implement proposed tax reductions and an effective system of wage and price stabilization.

The taxpayers of America stand to benefit most from the President's proposals. It is they who will suffer most from congressional delay or inaction. In 1972, combined effect of cuts already scheduled, plus enactment of the President's program, would mean a \$7 billion reduction in individual tax payments, income and excise. Consumers would receive an additional \$4.9 billion in purchasing power. Repeal of the 7-percent auto excise tax, another proposal to greatly benefit the consumer, will also require congressional approval.

While we as Members of Congress act to control expenditures in our economy as a whole, we need to set our own government house in order. At the close of fiscal year 1971, excessive Federal spending had created a deficit of \$23.2 billion, further contributing to inflation. The President's plan would reverse this trend by postponing pay raises for Government employees, reducing the Federal payroll by 5 percent, and cutting foreign aid by 10 percent.

The responsibility Congress must assume is outlined in a well-written, perceptive editorial which appeared in the September 10, Nashville, Tenn., Banner. The article stresses the need for a prompt bipartisan effort in both Houses of Congress and unselfish cooperation by all segments of the economy.

We have the support of a clear majority of Americans as we begin our work. A Gallup poll has showed 75 percent of the American people support the President's plan. In my own Third District of Tennessee, a poll taken before the freeze revealed nearly two-thirds of my constituents favored some type of wage and price controls to combat inflation.

As the editorial suggests, the new economic program will require hard work and perhaps some temporary sacrifices on the part of all Americans. But that will be a small price to pay to overcome inflation, unemployment, and the decaying dollar that have sapped our economic potential.

So that my colleagues may share the insight displayed in the editorial, its text follows:

FOR PROSPERITY WITHOUT WAR AND WITHOUT INFLATION

On the important economic policy front—with which it dwelt primarily—President Nixon's address to Congress Thursday could have been called an interim State of the Union message.

It was reassuring. It was admonitory. It stimulated as a reminder of the greatness of both the nation and its way of life, under discussion. It was both promising and prophetic; specifically in its announcement that the current 90-day wage-price freeze would not be extended, but that some other workable system of wage and price stabilization would be devised—with the help and advice of Congressmen, business and labor leadership, and agriculture.

Now that he has announced expiration of the present controls for Nov. 13, he can lose no time in spelling out the system designed to replace them. The details must be supplied as soon as possible after the consultations, beginning with labor leaders today.

He called on both Congress and the nation for the same bipartisan support in meeting the challenges of peace that are customary in time of war; to help assure fulfillment of the objective: A new prosperity without war and without inflation.

Lawmakers responded with applause again and again—an augury, surely, of the needed support for affirmative action on the proposals made and the objective outlined. And a reasoning nation, the constituency whose material welfare is at stake, could not have missed the spirit and logic of this call to duty. It was as the President put it, another instance for unselfish and courageous response—on the part of a people "joining together in placing the national interest above special interests."

There are innumerable factors entering into the national economy—the structure of the free enterprise system. There are governmental details materially affecting it, too, policies and programs with immediate bearing on it—and, as in the case of inflation itself, the overriding determinant on whether the direction is to be up or down.

Hardly can there be any question that Federal policies throughout most of the '60s and the fiscal irresponsibility thereof, vastly compounded the inflationary ravages. They diminished the value of every dollar earned, whether as wages, profits, or dividends. They multiplied the government's

own predicament whether in domestic financial particulars or in losses and balances of payments deficits overseas.

To reverse that disastrous course still is a primary challenge of statesmanship, and the President was embarking on it in a major way when he clamped on the controls prescribed for a 90-day trial run. He is working at it in further stabilization efforts promised.

He was voicing elementary realities when, after reviewing the outpourings of U.S. resources—material and blood—throughout the world in the years since World War II, he declared it is time to give attention to the American interests here at home.

Congress is back in session, and there are legislative responsibilities—just as essential to implement with law and policy adjustment, taxwise and otherwise, as was the initial step of executive obligation. The President is mindful of that, and respectful of the prerogatives there. In the light of these he outlined again his proposals of tax reduction in its specifics, with collateral considerations addressed, as well, to the free enterprise making of jobs by the hundreds of thousands.

Just as importantly, he does not deem the program sought—and its necessary appurtenances—a partisan undertaking.

It is not in any sense a punitive proposal, nor designed in bias against any element of the nation's economic team. It is clearly a case of facing the facts, recognizing the dangers to all in any replay of inflationary factors out of control—and moving, as he desires it, together, to redeem the total national interest from this threat.

He spoke the public's sentiment assuredly when, in the spirit of the work ethic, he emphasized that a job is better than welfare, for any proud American.

It is the President's obvious desire, by intelligent adjustment and reform where necessary, to restabilize both the nation's economy and the dollar. Stabilization of the one would accomplish the same for the other; they stand firm, or totter, together.

There are collateral, simultaneous, and equally courageous steps for Congress to take; respecting not only general policy, but, and specifically, necessary tax adjustment and broad corrective measures to control expenditures. In other words, it can be said that just as the President moved to apply wage and price controls in the private sector, so is it essential to apply these same reasoned disciplinary restraints on the Federal Government.

Mr. Nixon put that challenge where it belongs—with colleagues whose legislative judgment can add up, by their action, to progress of the economic rehabilitation sought. The opposite of that, on the lawmakers' part, would lead to retardation of it.

TRAGEDY OF ATTICA PRISON

HON. WALTER FLOWERS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 14, 1971

Mr. FLOWERS. Mr. Speaker, the tragedy of Attica Prison will be with us for a long time for it represents the bloodiest prison disturbance in U.S. history. And, of course, recriminations will be coming from all sides about the handling of the problem. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that within an admittedly cloudy picture, there are a few truths which come through clearly. The prisoners revolted against the authority of society. They

took hostages to enforce their revolt, and placed conditions on their release which were unacceptable to the preservation of order in our society. Had those conditions been met, the fabric of all of our correctional institutions would be ripped apart.

After several days of negotiations—and as the situation continued to deteriorate—the decision was made to bring order back to the prison. Many lives were lost and nothing can change the horror of this stark truth. The families of the hostages who were killed, and who have been injured cannot be consoled by words. But who among us can say logically that this decision and action upon it did not save even more innocent lives.

Mr. Speaker, the great issues of law and order, protection and rehabilitation will continue to be debated. The age old questions of how much freedom and how much order are required in our democracy will continue. But in the Attica situation, one thing is absolutely necessary and of the utmost importance to us all: swift, vigorous application of the criminal law to the prisoners who perpetrated these barbaric deeds. Nothing will suffice but the most demanding retribution from those who have so clearly proven their lack of standing in the family of man. Anything less will permit a sequel to Attica—in some other place at some other time. That cannot be tolerated. In this instance, the arm of justice must be firm and it must be swift.

WHEN FORT WAINWRIGHT CLOSES

HON. NICK BEGICH

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 14, 1971

Mr. BEGICH. Mr. Speaker, the most recent issue of the Arctic Oil Journal published an interesting and provocative editorial regarding Fort Wainwright, Alaska. I include a copy of this editorial in the RECORD:

WHEN FORT WAINWRIGHT CLOSES

Fort Wainwright, the farthest North major military installation in the United States, and possibly the Free World, is going to be closing. That is not an item of conjecture or a weak prediction . . . it is a statement of fact! The Federal Government tried to close Fort Wainwright around ten years ago when it was still Ladd Air Force Base, but the resulting hue and cry raised by the surrounding populace, and the efforts of the late Senator E. L. Bartlett kept it open. But now, as the military's need for this installation diminishes, it is becoming apparent that the Government is preparing its closure. Many generals and highranking political figures keep telling us that there are no plans to close Fort Wainwright at present. While some people accept this statement and remark that it only takes a short memo at the right level to institute closure proceedings, we feel that Fort Wainwright has already begun to close, and it is only a matter of time before the padlock is put on the gate. This can be shown in many ways if you interpret the facts correctly. Just two months ago, all of the Army's defensive Nike missile sites in the Fairbanks area were shut down. These were supported by Fort Wainwright. After that the twenty-year-old pipeline from

Haines to Tok supplying the Fort was shut down permanently as not worth rehabilitation and repair, due to the reduced requirements of the Fairbanks area military installations in recent years. And the more impressive fact that for the past year or so, whenever a Civil Service employee at the Fort transfers, retires, or quits, there have been virtually no replacements hired. And so a continual, gradual thinning of the work force is taking effect.

The time, then, is now to decide what is going to be done with this massive installation. The main area of the Fort is 13,644 acres, and although the many shops, houses, facilities and roads, cost more than half a billion dollars to build, the actual cash value today would be in the neighborhood of \$250 million. A similar complex built today would cost more than three-quarters of a million dollars. Now, when you add to this 645,000 acres in the bombing and gunnery range, and 260,000 acres in the maneuver area, you can see that we're talking about somewhere close to a million acres of land. All in the Interior Central section of Alaska!

Many people, civilians, politicians and military, have suggested at one time or another that Fort Wainwright would make an ideal location for our State Capitol. The runways, the buildings, the support facilities, and the housing all are there. Some businessmen have suggested that when Fort Wainwright closes, the ideal organization to buy it and take it over would be a consortium of the oil companies for use as a staging and supply area. It would provide them with all the housing, office, and warehouse space they would ever need, and they would base not only their current operations there, but all their future operations encompassing all of Alaska and Canada.

But we have another idea. Currently the United States Congress is in the final throes of decision in putting together a just package for a fair and equitable settlement to the Alaskan Native Land Claims. They speak in terms of millions of acres and millions of dollars. But the land in question could be land not owned by the State or individuals, and not selected by the State. In short, it would be, for the most part, land nobody else wants. It would take the millions of dollars that they would be receiving just to make the land habitable or accessible.

Wouldn't it make a better and more common sense program to give the Alaskan natives something that would benefit not only the Chiefs, but the Indians as well, to coin a phrase? We're speaking, of course, of the Congress of the United States deeding as a major portion of the Native Land Claims, the entire complex known as Fort Wainwright and its environs to them, with sufficient funds to operate it for a period of time, such as five or ten years, or until they became self-supporting. They would have for a Native hospital one of the finest and most modern hospitals in the State of Alaska. This would not benefit only the natives but the others as well, as it would remove a great strain from the civilian hospitals which, as we know, are almost always overcrowded. It would give them housing and schools. But more important, it would give them dozens of shops: welding shops, carpentry shops, painting shops, vehicle and aircraft maintenance shops. In fact, virtually every kind of shop that is needed in society today. Each of these shops could be converted to a first class vocational school. Even the mess halls and the Post bakery could be utilized to provide culinary schools. Nor would these schools have to be limited to the basic trades. A pre-medical school could be established adjacent to the hospital for serious students of medicine. The Research Center could be utilized. Schools of Art, Music and Drama, especially those promulgating the Native's own culture would be included. A Junior College could be set up. There is no limit.

The impact of this would be so great that we could reverse the existing trend, where we have been sending Alaskan Natives to the South 48 to Indian schools. We could now allow the South 48 to permit their Natives to come here, on a space available basis, of course, to the largest and most modern training center of its kind in the world.

We do not envision an Indian Reservation type of installation. Instead, Fort Wainwright would become another city, like College or North Pole, just bigger and more modern.

This, then, is our solution not only to the problem of what to do when Fort Wainwright closes, but part of the finest settlement of the Native Land Claims that could be conceived. Not a few million acres of barren tundra, and some money for the bank that would take years to raise the life standard of all Alaska's Natives, but a sensible program in which they, themselves, will have the opportunity to upgrade and update their civilization and standard of living to that of all American citizens!

THE NEED IS FOR ENFORCEMENT, NOT NEW ANTIGUN LAWS

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 14, 1971

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, antigun voices again are being raised in the land. There are the hysterical outcries of those who want to abolish private ownership of weapons. There also are the voices of distressed police officials disturbed at the ever growing problems of crime. Whatever the source, they focus on demands for additional antigun legislation.

It is well to recall that the 1968 Gun Control Act was presented as a major step toward the curtailment of crime. Yet, since the enactment of that measure, the crime rate has continued to soar. Subsequently, in the Nation's Capital, the city government approved some of the stiffest antigun ordinances in the Nation. Despite this, no one can argue there has been a significant improvement in the crime situation in the city of Washington.

It is highly regrettable, but there have been a number of recent cases where policemen on duty were killed with guns. The antigun elements always seize on these incidents to begin their chant for more repressive legislation. They ignore the antigun laws already in effect and say the times have changed and therefore, we need new gun control laws. In some way they continue to reason that crime will drop if guns are more stringently controlled.

Generally, there are three categories of people who own weapons. Police, security guards, and others in like category.

By far the largest group is those who own weapons for the protection of their families and homes and for sporting purposes or as collectors.

Criminals also own guns.

Clearly, the only weapons owners who would feel the brunt of stricter antigun legislation would be the millions of Americans who own weapons for the protection of their homes and families or for sport or as collectors. Restrictions

upon this group would not be a deterrent to crime in the slightest. These are not the men and women who go about the streets robbing store owners, holding up citizens and shooting policemen.

Nor will more stringent gun controls stop ownership of weapons by the criminal. The chances are his weapon was stolen or purchased on the black market. Anyone with sound reason knows that any gun owner intent on crime is not going to rush to his nearest police station to register his weapon and then go out and rob or shoot someone.

The cold, clear facts do not support the contention that licensing and registering weapons, or limiting the ownership of weapons to police and military will automatically reduce crime.

What has occurred during debate of this highly emotional issue is that the true facts have too often been obscured from the American people who have been told that guns make criminals and that antigun laws will control crime. Just how prohibitive legislation of this type can be is best demonstrated in New York which has the Nation's toughest gun laws. According to an April 1971 report from a high ranking New York City official, there are a total of 24,354 pistol licenses in force, of which 564 are issued to persons who do not require them as a condition of employment.

Thus, out of a city of over 8 million people, 564 legal permits for handguns have been issued. When one considers that New York has a murder rate of almost double the national average, it is clear that even the tough gun laws have had little effect toward curbing crime. States and local communities not fighting ownership are among the lowest in crime rate.

Guns are not the only example of problems associated with crime. The drug problem is much worse. The use of drugs is much more widespread. This very serious problem has reached into the public schools where millions of young lives are threatened with ruin. Should we have harsher laws on drugs? Shoplifting is rampant. Should there be new laws against shoplifters? The sad truth is that the enactment of additional laws is not the real cure for the problems of crime. The failure lies in lack of enforcement, not in the law.

Congress has passed new laws to deal with virtually every feature of the crime problem. Congress has appropriated hundreds of millions of dollars to assist the States and local communities in fighting crime. But crime continues to grow.

Until we are ready to attack the real root causes of crime—poverty, illiteracy, lack of economic opportunity, discrimination, outdated judicial machinery, inadequate enforcement of existing laws, and disregard for authority and order, we shall not find the answer to crime. But the immediate need is for law enforcement. There should be greater efforts to apprehend criminals. There should be a speedup in court processes. There should be tougher bail procedures. The habitual criminal knows that if he is apprehended, which is unlikely, and if he is brought to trial, which may take years,

he is more likely to receive a slap on the wrist than a harsh sentence. In that kind of an atmosphere crime is good business. The youngsters who see all this and who are attracted by the glamor find it easy and exciting to turn to a life of crime.

Firarms laws, no matter how stringent or comprehensive, are not going to stop crime with weapons. The 1968 Gun Control Act was intended to help keep weapons out of the hands of criminals, unsupervised juveniles, drug addicts, and those mentally irresponsible. The act is comparatively new. It has not in reality been thoroughly tested. It may need revision in order to achieve the greatest effectiveness. One serious weakness has just been dramatized by the shooting of a collector of black powder weapons by Internal Revenue Service agents. They broke into his home without proper warrants and without uniforms and shot the individual when he resisted. There have been other instances of extremely high-handed and irresponsible Gestapo type action by IRS agents. This cannot be tolerated.

On the other hand, it is possible there are features of the act which should be strengthened. Consideration could well be given to outlawing the so-called junk handgun. These are cheap, foreign imports which can be bought along most highways and which are more likely to fall into irresponsible or criminal hands.

There are responsible approaches to the problem of crime committed with firearms. The loud voices which claim stricter antigun laws offer a simple solution to crime in America are misleading the public. Taking guns from law-abiding citizens will not end crime. Firearm laws, no matter how restrictive or comprehensive, are not in themselves an answer to social maladies. The millions of law-abiding Americans who own guns for legitimate purposes will be the only ones stung by additional antigun laws. The criminals would retain their weapons just as they have done under the 1968 Gun Control Act.

It is not guns but criminals that commit crime. It is criminals that should be controlled.

VOLUNTEER WEATHER OBSERVER CITED

HON. NICK BEGICH

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 14, 1971

Mr. BEGICH. Mr. Speaker, floods, thunderstorms, lightning, and high wind can be as much a part of Alaska's climate as snow. Mrs. Aileen Jones, the National Weather Service's volunteer weather observer in Ketchikan, Alaska, has been accurately observing these phenomena along with daily observations of temperature and precipitation since 1956. On August 19, it was announced by the Department of Commerce's National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) that Mrs. Jones is one of 25 volunteer weather observers selected nationwide to receive the John Campanius Holm Award.

John Campanius Holm Awards, created in 1959 by the National Weather Service (formerly the Weather Bureau), are presented annually to honor volunteer observers for outstanding accomplishments in the field of meteorological observations. The award is named for a Lutheran minister who is the first person known to have taken systematic weather observations in the American colonies. In 1644 and 1645, the Reverend Holm made records of the climate without the use of instruments near the present site of Wilmington, Del.

Mrs. Jones was recognized for taking complete and accurate weather observations at Ketchikan and for her dedication and enthusiasm in reporting unusual weather occurrences in that area.

Mrs. Jones acted as relief observer before she became a full-time observer in 1956. Each month she prepares a weather summary which is used by the local newspaper, radio, and television.

She has been an elevator operator in Ketchikan's Federal building for many years, and is active in the bowling league. In 1970 Mrs. Jones received the Weather Service's 15-year length-of-service award.

The spirit in which Mrs. Aileen Jones serves is very much in keeping with the spirit and enthusiasm that is part of all Alaskans.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to your attention the fine service Mrs. Jones renders, and I would also like to take this opportunity to express my personal thanks and appreciation to Mrs. Jones for a job well done.

REDUCTION OF U.S. CARRIER FORCE PROPOSED

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 14, 1971

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, on a recent trip to southern California I had the good fortune to meet and talk with Mr. Gerald W. Johnson. At that time he told me that he was in full agreement with me on the issue of reducing the size of our Armed Forces and thus lowering our military budget. Over the last few years Mr. Johnson has personally made a study of the problem of naval carriers and he graciously sent me a summary of his findings.

In his summary, Mr. Johnson argues that the vulnerability of these carriers makes them, in effect, tripwires for nuclear warfare. I find his arguments compelling and incisive and hope my colleagues will give careful consideration to his views.

The summary follows:

THE CASE FOR REDUCTION IN THE SIZE OF THE U.S. CARRIER FORCE (By Gerald W. Johnson)

On July 29, 1967 five days after arriving on station in the Gulf of Tonkin preparations were underway to launch an air strike against North Vietnam from the 60,000 ton attack carrier Forrestal. This ship, the U.S.

third largest carrier, had just completed a major overhaul at the Norfolk Navy Yard before sailing and was declared to be "as modern as any aircraft carrier in the world". The crews were well trained and were anxious to join in the attack. On this morning, the planes were loaded and manned prepared to takeoff when suddenly a five-inch rocket was fired from one of the planes facing diagonally inboard on the starboard aft portion of the flight deck. The rocket crossed the deck striking another loaded and fueled airplane which immediately burst into flames. As a consequence of this blaze a bomb dropped from the wing of the burning aircraft into a pool of flaming fuel.

Following normal procedures, the fire-fighting crew began to spray the bomb with foam to keep it cool to prevent detonation, of course other efforts were underway to bring the fire under control. While all of this was going on, the bomb suddenly exploded blowing a large hole in the flight deck, dispersing the fire-fighters, and initiating other fires on the flight deck as well as hangar deck. In a few moments a holocaust had developed with planes burning and bombs exploding on the flight deck as the disaster propagated. The explosions produced holes in the flight and hangar decks through which burning fuel carried the fire progressively deeper into the ship. One of the worst naval disasters since World War II was in the making.

The fires and damage were ultimately limited to the section of the ship astern of the island. After burning for 10 hours, the conflagration was brought under control and the ship was able to begin its return journey to port.

When the consequences were finally assessed, 134 men had been killed; 62 men were injured; 26 planes had been destroyed and 31 damaged out of a total complement of about 80 planes; and the damage to the ship amounted to more than \$100,000,000.

In terms of the operational capability of the ship, it had been reduced to zero. Perhaps the best summary was given in the New York Times of July 31, 1967: "Her flight deck seared and punctured, her 83-plane air wing all but wiped out and perhaps 125 of her crewmen dead, this mammoth aircraft carrier steamed out of the combat zone. On the ship are seven holes in the buckled flight deck, the aircraft arresting gear is demolished and the catapults are severely damaged. The carrier will be out of action at least six months . . . Capt. Belling indicated that early in the fire there was the real possibility the ship would be lost. Eventually the flames ate through six of the ten decks below the flight deck."

The obvious lesson from all of this is that even after 25 years of research, development and experience, the vulnerability of the carrier has not been reduced in any important way. The Forrestal incident emphasized this point in a decisive manner for here one five-inch rocket external to the main envelope of the ship put out of operation for months with heavy losses one of the most modern elements of the U.S. Navy strike force.

If this were the only event suggesting the extreme vulnerability of these ships perhaps it could be overlooked. But only eighteen months later, on January 14, 1969 explosions and fire swept the large 85,000 ton nuclear powered aircraft carrier Enterprise killing 24 of her crew and resulting in \$36,000,000 in damage to the ship and its associated aircraft. Three large holes were blown in the flight deck and fires raged on the flight and hangar decks. The ship was out of service for six weeks, which in peace time may seem modest, but in war it could be critical. However, the main point again is that all that was required to knock a capital ship—a backbone unit of the fleet—off the line was one five-inch rocket on the flight deck.

This extreme vulnerability of carriers was common experience during World War II for both the Japanese and U.S. fleets. Review of that history shows that usually a relatively small number of hits, i.e. one to five, were sufficient to cause loss of operational capability of the ship as a minimum and in some cases the loss of the ship itself.

What saved the carriers during World War II, at least those that were that fortunate, was the fact that because detection and surveillance techniques were relatively primitive the ships could "hide" in the vast expanses of the ocean or in squalls. However, almost always, whenever a carrier was located and seriously attacked, even when it was ringed by massive defensive systems involving destroyers, cruisers, and sometimes battleships, it burned.

All of this was recognized by objective naval experts both out and in uniform and since World War II steps have been taken to reduce the dangers—one of which was the substitution of jet fuel for gasoline. In spite of all the steps it was possible to take, from the two examples quoted, it seems that the improvements have not been very impressive or very important. In these cases two modern attack carriers were removed from combat capability, and one almost lost entirely, by one five-inch rocket fired inadvertently on the flight deck—in neither case was the firing the consequence of enemy action.

While the vulnerability of these ships has not been reduced in any important way, surveillance and attack techniques have improved dramatically. Even casual examination of the Soviet Naval developments and deployments will show that they have not been unaware of these facts. Carriers today have no chance whatsoever to hide at any time of the day or night, in any weather conditions, or at any distance. They are frequently trailed by Soviet fleet elements, overflown by aircraft at will, and watched in operational modes in the Gulf of Tonkin and elsewhere. To be in a position to take advantage of the no-hide possibility of the U. S. carrier and in recognition of their extreme vulnerability, over the past few years the Soviets have built and deployed long range homing missile systems equipped with 1-ton warheads based on submarines (some nuclear powered), aircraft, and surface ships. Such systems will have no trouble taking out carriers and, if necessary, their escorts as well.

A dramatic demonstration of the capability of the short range deployed systems was afforded off Port Said on October 22, 1967. On that date, the Israeli destroyer Elath was on patrol some 14 miles from the Egyptian base near Port Said. According to published Israeli reports, two streaks were seen approaching Elath but seemingly initially off-course. Elath had time to increase speed, turn, and fire a few bursts of her machine guns. At a certain point, the first missile changed course apparently guided by a homing device, and slammed into the destroyer midship. Moments later the second missile struck the engine room. "It had a warhead of a ton with half a ton of explosive. The boilers and engines were silenced, and the central part of the ship was destroyed and burning." One hour and a half later, missiles three and four were launched from the harbor of Port Said. The third missile sunk the ship and the fourth impacted and exploded in the water where the ship had been. Thus, the first combat use of the Soviet Styx missile fired from Komar patrol boats succeeded in achieving effectively four hits out of four firings from a distance of 13.5 miles with disastrous consequences to an alerted and maneuvering destroyer.

The great danger here is not that the enemy might take out a carrier or two, but rather that there is the real possibility of

another Pearl Harbor kind of operation in which practically all of our carriers, anti-submarine as well as attack, could be burning at the same time. The Soviets have the capability to do this today. Of course, as we have seen, the best time to accomplish such a blow would be in a time of tension when our ships have been placed in a combat configuration and are deployed. An interesting observation with respect to carriers, as contrasted with other types of warships, is the fact that as higher states of alert are established the strike capability of the ship becomes increasingly vulnerable.

In the event of such a disaster, the President might be persuaded that his only recourse would be to release the nuclear strike forces—with all that that implies. One can well imagine the pressures that would be generated on an incumbent administration when it was announced that Nimitz, John F. Kennedy, Dwight D. Eisenhower, Forrestal, and America were all on fire as a consequence of a treacherous Soviet attack. To use these units with their impressive symbolic labels as trip-wires for a nuclear assault would seem to represent the ultimate folly.

The conclusion must then be that for the U.S. to rely on its carriers either to deter or fight a conventional war with a major power like the Soviet Union is a course most dangerous to national security. If the U.S. Navy continues, as it seems to be doing, to base a substantial amount of its faith and to make its major fleet investments in these forces, it is on the road to defeat. There is no effective way the carrier can be "fixed". Therefore, no new carriers of the present conceptual design should be built, and the total number in service should be reduced substantially for use only against weak powers like North Vietnam, Lebanon, or the Dominican Republic, which is the only remaining possible rationale for their existence. Only through drastic measures such as these can funds and people be diverted to more effective and productive means of improving the defense posture of the United States.

RAINBOW RIDGE

HON. THOMAS M. REES

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 14, 1971

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, American parents are generally concerned—and have the duty and right to be—about the quality of television programming geared for viewing by their youngsters, particularly those of the highly impressionable preschool and grade school ages.

Happily there have been some—although all too few—programs, such as "Sesame Street," which have given the adult American public an heartening inkling of the good that can be accomplished by concerned members of the television industry.

Now, I have recently heard reports of a new program which both entertains and educates youngsters. Its title is "Rainbow Ridge," and it is a joint production venture of Dick Clark Enterprises and Alan Hamel Productions. The program is in syndication and will be available to television viewers starting early in 1972.

"Rainbow Ridge" has strong ecological overtones. It is set in beautiful, unpolluted countryside, where the wonders of nature are clearly visible and joyous.

In this setting, the first episode of "Rainbow Ridge" shows its young viewers the actual birth of a butterfly, as it emerges from its caterpillar state; it also takes its young viewers to a rodeo, carefully explaining the training required of competitors, and the regard for the safety of the animals involved. In addition, the first showing entertainingly instructs youngsters in the value of cleanliness through a song, "Kids Can Be Smarter Than Germs If They Want To." Another song relays the message, "Take Care of This Earth—It's the Only One We Have."

"Rainbow Ridge" teaches youngsters how to count, utilizing objects of nature by way of illustration. The first episode also gives, with great imagination, examples of the usage of the letter "b," employing that letter to demonstrate such items as a barn, a bird, a bee, a bell, and a beet.

Mr. Speaker, I think you'll agree that such a programing concept is a definite step in the right direction. Mr. Clark and Mr. Hamel have undergone considerable expense in creating and producing this program, and they have conscientiously undertaken the responsibility of seeing to it that "Rainbow Ridge" emerges as a program which informs while it entertains, and does so in such a manner as to merit the enthusiasm of not only children, but parents as well.

I take this occasion to congratulate Mr. Clark and Mr. Hamel on their achievement, and I hope that other television producers who seek to reach our youngsters with their programing will similarly realize the responsibilities and opportunities involved.

ADDRESS BY SECRETARY JOHN A. VOLPE

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 14, 1971

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

MAJOR ADDRESS BY U.S. SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION JOHN A. VOLPE TO THE FIFTH INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON URBAN TRANSPORTATION, PITTSBURGH HILTON, GATEWAY CENTER, PITTSBURGH, PA., SEPTEMBER 8, 1971

I am indeed honored and privileged to have been invited to open this distinguished international conference here this morning. Let me be quick to welcome the many visitors here from throughout the world. As our globe undergoes increased urbanization the vital information we share in conferences such as this is truly invaluable. We learn much from all of you, and we are delighted to share information developed here.

Let me also express appreciation to the hard-working organizers of this conference who have helped so much in calling public attention to the great needs in urban transportation.

I am delighted to announce this morning the largest single grant ever made by the Department's Urban Mass Transportation Administration; \$50 million to the Port Author-

ity of Allegheny County for a rapid transit system here in Pittsburgh.

These funds supplement an initial \$8.7 million grant made to the Port Authority in June of 1970. They are part of a total five-pronged \$228 million project that will see a new-type rapid transit line, two rapid transit busways and the rehabilitation of two existing rail transit lines.

We intend to help Pittsburgh help itself. We are working with the city—and the county port authority—to bring this area first-class mass transit service for all their residents.

And let me be quick to point out that we are not investing this sizeable allocation of funds simply because we happen to like Pittsburgh, or for some whimsical, theoretical, experimental purpose. This area has shown the need, has done the planning, has enlisted solid community support and confidence, and has come to us with a program that was ready for funding.

This area came to us with the strong support of two very dedicated and hard-working United States Senators—Minority Leader Hugh Scott, who has been with us at every turn as we developed expanded public transportation legislation—and Senator Richard Schweiker who knows full well that we will not unbind the crisis of the cities without effective alternative transportation facilities for all the people. Indeed, the entire Pennsylvania congressional delegation has given us solid backing—and Representatives Jim Fulton, Joe Gaydos and Bill Moorhead from this area have been in the forefront.

So while I came to Pittsburgh bearing good news, I make the distinction between that and bearing gifts. This is not a gift. This is not Federal largesse. This is a reflection of our very sincere obligation to improve the quality of life throughout the Nation. We can do this only by working with the States, working with the cities, working with the Port Authorities and transit authorities across the land.

While this grant to the Allegheny County Port Authority does hold the distinction of being the largest single grant ever to come from the Urban Mass Transportation Administration, we do not intend for that to be a long-standing record. This Administration has made a commitment to the cities of America. We are committed to balanced transportation. We are committed to the basic multi-modal transportation philosophy that is the only way to provide mobility to 200 million people spread (in varying densities) over a million square miles of land.

And that brings me to the theme of this conference—to the very vital question you ask here—"Is mobility the fifth freedom?" How vital is the ability to move freely from point "A" to point "B"—for people and for their goods?

The catch-point of all this is that without the fifth freedom of mobility, the first four—freedom of speech, freedom of worship, freedom from want, freedom from fear—don't exist either. Ours is a distribution society, a widespread, far-flung society, a highway-oriented society, and nothing is close to home anymore. Yet nothing is so far away we can't get to it one way or another.

Most transportation builders and planners now agree that balanced transportation is the key to urban mobility. Those same planners, however, have shown us how difficult it is to agree on the mix of modes that should comprise that balance. We have had no lack of technology, no limited supply of ideas and proposals, no shortage of reports, studies or summaries. What we have needed is action. We have needed the no-nonsense attitude of people like my good friend Mayor Jean Drapeau of Montreal who has told us that the best way to build a mass transit system is to "stop talking and start digging."

So we are doing that—in Pittsburgh, Chi-

cago, New York, Boston, San Francisco, Washington, Philadelphia, and Cleveland, and soon in Baltimore, Atlanta, Seattle, Kansas City, Los Angeles, and many other places I could mention as I stand here with my fingers crossed.

But we have a tremendous catch-up job to do. Our emphasis on public transportation—in high gear only since 1969—had lagged far behind other world cities. Since the end of the Second World War, new rapid transit systems have been opened in Stockholm, Oslo, Frankfurt, Cologne, Milan, Rotterdam, Lisbon and Rome.

And the systems in those cities have been built with the full recognition that transit does more than just move people. Rather, it plays a major role in re-structuring our cities to improve the quality of urban life.

We must use this approach here in the United States. Indeed, we have solid indications that this can be the case.

Since announcement of the BART System in San Francisco, the value of new commercial construction started in the downtown area has exceeded one billion dollars. And all of the big new buildings will be within five minutes of a transit station. I might add that in the five to six year period prior to passage of the BART Bond Issue in 1962, new high rise office construction in San Francisco averaged \$10 million a year. Since 1962, the total dollar outlay has been averaging \$50 million a year. It's clear that the BART System will change the living and working patterns of the entire city. This is a very great responsibility for urban transportation planners. It is also our most exciting challenge. And that's the attitude we've taken at the Department of Transportation and in the Urban Mass Transportation Administration.

The largest annual Federal investment in urban mass transportation prior to Fiscal Year 1970 was \$175 million. Now we have \$3.1 billion authorized for the five year period ending in Fiscal Year 1975, with a total promise of \$10 billion for expenditure by 1982, thanks to the solid co-operation between the Administration and the Congress.

And thanks, of course, to the concerned and dedicated individuals and groups of the transit industry—many of you who are here in this room today—who did so much to assure passage of the landmark Public Transportation Act of 1970.

Passage of that legislation has brought us to the point where we will have obligated more money—during the 18 months beginning last January 1—than was obligated for public transportation in all of the previous 6 years. That's what I call action. That's the kind of progress we like to see.

We are making a solid beginning, and none is more promising than the new mass transit undertaking right here in Pittsburgh. Pittsburgh, of course, is one of those urban areas in America where fixed-facility rapid transit is both technically and economically feasible. But this Administration, and the Department of Transportation, are not locked into the position that the only kind of transit is rail—or exclusive, fixed right-of-way—transit systems.

Our policy, of course, is that the decision as to what type of public transportation to utilize is a local decision. We make available technical studies money. We seek a close planning relationship. But in the final analysis, it is up to the local community to decide what sort of public transportation will work best.

And I don't need to tell this group that in the vast majority of cases, the best solution—based on local decisions—has been to optimize existing bus systems all over the country. We are tremendously delighted with the phenomenal success (and "phenomenal" is a conservative word) of exclusive reversible bus lanes in Washington on Shirley High-

way, in Boston on the Southeast Expressway, in New Jersey on the Lincoln Tunnel approaches, and in San Juan, Puerto Rico. These innovations save time for commuters, save money for taxpayers, and save trouble for the cities. Utilizing the newest generation of buses available, such projects provide the commuter with air-conditioning, comfortable seats, carpeting, low-pollution engines, flexible routings and courteous service. Not only do fleets of buses in exclusive lanes cut trip times by as much as one-half, they cut into the total number of vehicles on the highway thereby lessening congestion on overcrowded freeways.

And even in smaller cities—where exclusive busways are not yet needed or practical—a simple upgrading of rolling stock has made urban bus travel more attractive and better utilized.

We are especially proud of the 6,500 new buses we have helped purchase in recent years, and the 45 bus systems that have been revitalized with Federal funds. In Pittsburgh, for instance, Urban Mass Transit Administration funds have already helped buy 380 new buses, with 200 more on the way. In a typical smaller city—Erie, Pennsylvania—a fleet of 50 new buses was purchased with Federal assistance. Since then, passenger totals have increased 8½ percent, reversing a 20-year pattern of decline and resulting in the first addition of a new route in 15 years. In Cleveland we provided study funds in order to scientifically plan an entire new bus routing system. The bus routes were based on trolley car routes from decades before, and hadn't been altered to take into account shifting population and land use patterns. Now the buses go where the people are, and they go where the people want to go.

This is the sort of intelligent imaginative and aggressive traffic management that takes advantage of existing knowledge and technology. And it paves the way for further expansion and sophistication as our cities grow and become worthy candidates for efficient, economically sensible fixed right-of-way systems. And—as the Pittsburgh grant today points out—when a city is ready for that sort of system, we are ready to help.

Pittsburgh's approach is both evolutionary and revolutionary—as ambitious as it is promising. It is perhaps not surprising that the progress that has been made thus far has come hard, and not without disagreement and debate. Few of man's great achievements have come without honest doubt; the exploring of new frontiers has often led to dead ends before discovery—detours before destinations. Our freedoms were honed on the edge of adversity. Establishing the fifth freedom of mobility will require sizeable quantities of that pioneering spirit: in selling new ideas, in solving jurisdictional problems, and in developing new technology. We are trying to make a start in each of these areas at the Federal level.

Next summer, at Transpo 72—the International Transportation Exposition to be held at Dulles Airport—we are going to put some of these ideas and systems on display. And I invite every city and nation represented here today to join with us in exhibiting the promises and potentials of transportation.

I am personally making every effort to insure that Transpo 72 will provide the kind of exciting showcase for progress that the world's transportation industry deserves. Just today we are announcing the appointment of one of the top organizers in the country—Bill Bird, Vice President of Kaiser Industries—to be my Special Assistant for Transpo's development. I am confident that Bill's special expertise together with Managing Director Chet Spurgeon's dedication will insure the success of Transpo 72. And I am looking forward to seeing a great many of you—the transportation leaders of the world—at Transpo in 1972.

The United States—and the world—is developing a new awareness for the importance of transportation.

The four freedoms as we know them may have been enunciated by an American president—but they are basic to all citizens of the world. This conference—and every nation—can set no higher goal than to erase that question mark—to help establish the fifth freedom. The freedom of mobility. The greatness to accomplish this task is before us this morning. It's time to get on with the job.

POP WARNER LITTLE SCHOLARS,
INC.

HON. WILMER MIZELL

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 14, 1971

Mr. MIZELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise at this time to join several of my colleagues, notably the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. HORTON) in sponsoring legislation to incorporate the nationwide Pop Warner Junior League football program under the name "Pop Warner Little Scholars, Inc."

"Little Scholars" may seem a strange name for active, rough-and-tumble young boys who enjoy nothing better than a vigorous game of football. But in my own professional athletic career, and in my work as a Little League baseball coach, I have long recognized that the athletic field, as much as the classroom, is a good place to learn some of life's most important lessons.

But even in the more traditional sense of scholarship, the Pop Warner Junior League has been a guiding force among America's youth. In the 40 years since it was founded in Philadelphia, Pop Warner football has emphasized not only physical fitness and team play—two natural qualities of an athlete—but citizenship and scholarship as well.

Certainly this program has had a welcomed influence on many young lives in the fifth district of North Carolina with leagues in Clemmons, Elkin, Jonesville, Kernersville, Lewisville, State Road, Walkertown, and Winston-Salem.

Now with more than 700,000 boys playing Pop Warner football in more than 40 States, the Pop Warner Junior League has become a major nationwide influence in shaping America's young men for civic responsibility and leadership, scholastic achievement and athletic excellence.

The activities of this organization have expanded to such an extent that a Federal charter is necessary to recognize the organization's broad scope and to protect the Pop Warner name and insignia, those participating in the program, and those who give their dedicated service to it.

A congressional charter will help to insure the continuation and expansion of the unique combination of citizenship, scholarship, safety, and sportsmanship which make up this program, and I urge my colleagues to join me in seeking swift passage of this legislation.

POW-MIA FAMILIES FOR
IMMEDIATE RELEASE

HON. ROBERT L. LEGGETT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 14, 1971

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, Members of Congress and prisoner-of-war families are unanimously concerned that the prisoners and missing be promptly identified and released.

Only the foolish hold out hope that the men will somehow miraculously be returned before the Vietnam war ends.

One organization of prisoner and missing families has a firm hold on reality. The organization, "POW-MIA Families for Immediate Release," states the self-evident facts:

If the President will set a date to end the war, they will then know when their loved ones will come home.

I now insert their most recent statement. Let us hope our President is listening:

AUGUST 31, 1971.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN LEGGETT: You recently received a letter, dated August 11 and signed by a former prisoner of war and five POW/MIA family members. This letter, which urges a campaign to obtain international inspection of all prison camps in Southeast Asia, states that "every MIA-POW group in the country that we were able to contact has endorsed this program and will be distributing and obtaining signatures on this letter."

We are writing to inform you that this statement is a misrepresentation, and apparently it is a deliberate one. POW/MIA Families for Immediate Release was contacted by the signers of the letter, and we declined to endorse the program or to participate in it. We do not know whether there are other groups which have also declined.

We certainly would like to see international inspection of the prison camps. But we have been trying to obtain inspection for years, with no success. This new program offers no plan or approach significantly different from those which have failed in the past, and we see no reason to expect any good to come of it. On the contrary, we feel it will work against the interests of the prisoners by distracting public attention from the only thing which can help our men: the setting of a date for final withdrawal before the end of the year.

North Vietnam and the National Liberation Front have offered to release all prisoners if we will set a date for complete withdrawal in 1971, and we see no reason to doubt that the Pathet Lao would make a similar offer if our government asked it to do so. We feel this offer should be intensively explored with a view to accepting it *within a matter of days*, assuming the safety of our troops and the return of all American POWs and unaccounted for who are in fact imprisoned concurrent with the withdrawal of all American troops, can be agreed upon. It is a source of great anguish to us that our government has failed to do so.

You can imagine our feelings as it becomes increasingly apparent that President Nixon and many members of Congress, despite all their protestations of concern for the POWs, care more for General Thieu than they do for our loved ones.

We fear that if the other side's offer is not accepted and a 1971 date set, the offer may not be renewed until after our November election. Some of our men cannot

survive an additional year in captivity. Moreover, the present Administration's plan to continue air support and a residual force in Vietnam indefinitely leaves little hope that the prisoners will ever be returned.

If our present opportunity is allowed to slip away, we shall spend 1972 working against the re-election of President Nixon and of all members of Congress, regardless of party, who by their votes prevented our men from being returned to us in 1971.

Sincerely,

Mrs. WILLIAM MULLEN,
Mrs. PHILIP CULBERTSON,
Miss SHEILA CRONIN,
Mrs. MICHAEL CRONIN.

OUR DEBT TO OUR NATION'S VETERANS

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 14, 1971

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I would like at this time to explain the reasons for my strong support of the House's recently passed increases in the budget of the Veterans' Administration. I believe that the cardinal consideration here is whether or not we're going to choose responding to human needs or balancing our budget as our first priority.

Specifically, the administration's budget recommendation for the Department of Medicine and Surgery indicated a dreadful callousness toward infirm veterans. This year the average daily patient load in VA hospitals was about 84,500. The funds recommended by the administration for next year would have been sufficient for only 79,000 patients per day. When viewed in light of the steadily swelling demand for hospital admission this cut is insensitive at the least and more aptly described as cruel and brutal. The influx of Vietnam veterans has pushed the total of men and women served by the VA to a record of 28 million. Adding to the picture the fact that the 1½ million World War I veterans now have an average age of over 76, thus requiring more intense and prolonged care; it becomes obvious that the hospitals have to be straining under their load. Therefore, the additional \$120 million that this body approved for medical care hardly evidences a wasteful or slobberingly maudlin posture toward veterans as the President's rejection of our efforts would seemingly imply.

In the area of drug abuse treatment, I believe that this body acted appropriately by increasing the proposed outlay by \$14 million. Our Nation and our Government must shoulder the heavy burden of helping the misled young men in this group to help themselves. We must recognize that the presence of these men in Southeast Asia is not of their own volition but is directly due to the will of our Government officials.

The conditions that must be coped with there—a drug laden land combined with little legitimate recreation and lots of inactive hours—are again not the choice of these men. Hence, to practically abandon these soldiers by providing only very

limited facilities is not the mark of a Government sensitive to the needs of the governed. Also, the money that will be channeled into research on this problem through this increase is an integral part of realistically and thoroughly facing this dilemma.

Handling their volume of paperwork has become an enormous Veterans' Administration task, as the claims increase proportionally to the number of veterans. Particularly in meeting the requests of the many returning veterans from Vietnam, the time lag between application and enactment is agonizingly long. Workloads in the 57 regional offices have increased 25 percent in the last 3 years. The number of personnel in these offices has increased by only 3½ percent in that period. These staffs have to reply to applications for education and training under the GI bill which have soared upward by 36 percent in those 3 years. The VA regional offices' operations are indeed in need of increased funding, instead of seeing this, the Office of Budget and Management reacts by slashing \$14 million from the previous fiscal allotment. The \$7 million which was restored by this body is only a stopgap remedy to this severe problem. With the winding down of the Vietnam war we will have to anticipate an even greater demand on the administrative and clerical services of the Veterans' Administration. Unmistakably, to reduce rather than increase support in this area is a grave error; one we had better not repeat.

The repercussions and significance of this trend toward cutting the VA budget are worth noting. We are all proud of the quality of life our Nation enjoys. We are sufficiently proud to arm ourselves for its protection. We say to our young men that our traditions and life style are worth fighting for, and they go and fight—truly showing courage of the first magnitude. But, when these men are wounded or become aged or return from war addicted to drugs we say that we cannot afford to help them—the budget would not allow it. What a let down these men must feel. Their pride in their country has to diminish as they are passed over and neglected. We cannot expect to transmit much pride in this Nation to subsequent generations if we do not demonstrate a willingness to spend our money in support of a full-term quality life for those who are called to sacrifice most in support of this magnificent Nation.

CELEBRATION OF 25TH ANNIVERSARY OF CANONIZATION OF MOTHER CABRINI

HON. SIDNEY R. YATES

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 14, 1971

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, on November 13, the Roman Catholic Church celebrates the 25th anniversary feast day of St. Frances Xavier Cabrini, canonized by Pope Pius XII in 1946 as the first American saint.

I take pride in representing the district in which Mother Cabrini lived and in which she performed the many good works which live after her. The nuns belonging to the Institute of the Missionary Sisters of the Sacred Heart, founded by Mother Cabrini in 1880, are the daughters faithfully carrying on Mother Cabrini's tasks.

Mother Cabrini was born in a small Italian village in 1850. She lost her parents at a very early age and was thrown upon her own resources. Even during her youth and young womanhood she exhibited her devotion to God and humanity in undertaking the many great and good acts that were to mark her life. Naturalized an American citizen in 1909, Mother Cabrini established many schools, orphanages, and hospitals serving this Nation's peoples of all races and religions.

In my district two hospitals operated by the Mid-West Province of the Missionary Sisters of the Sacred Heart are representative of the caring spirit of the ever-working Mother Cabrini. The Ninth District's Columbus Hospital and Frank Cuneo Memorial Hospital were recently merged with St. Frances Xavier Cabrini Hospital on the near West Side into an expanding health service complex, the Columbus-Cuneo-Cabrini Medical Center.

Mother Cabrini died at Columbus Hospital in 1917 at the age of 67, ending the earthly work of the Patroness of Immigrants. Her legacy of enduring good, bringing health and happiness to many will continue to mark her as a saint of our times, an American saint.

"SPEED" ADDICTION CAN BE STOPPED

HON. GILBERT GUDE

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 14, 1971

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, we are all cognizant of the tragic drug problem which plagues our country, and the urgent need to alleviate it. AMA Update, a newsletter put out by the American Medical Association had an interesting article on how Japan came to grip with "Speed" addiction.

I commend it to my colleagues for their study:

"SPEED" ADDICTION CAN BE STOPPED—HERE IS HOW ONE NATION DID IT

Can a nation solve a drug addiction problem of epidemic proportions?

Yes, says a former Japanese police official. But it isn't easy. His solution, like a well-known headache remedy, involves "a combination of active ingredients."

"Unlike other Asian countries, Japan was relatively free of drug addiction until about 25 years ago," Isamu Nitta told us. Now first secretary of the Japanese Embassy in Washington, he was formerly a senior official of his nation's National Police Agency. "In China, for example, opium has been a major problem for centuries. Opium has never been much of a problem with us.

"But shortly after World War II, we discovered that large numbers of our people

were 'hooked' on 'speed'—methamphetamines. We call them 'wide awake' drugs. The problem was partly of our own making. During the war we issued wide awake drugs to our troops to keep them alert, and to factory workers, to step up production.

"It's not pleasant to have lost a war, as we did in '45. A deep gloom pervaded the land. We were ripe for addiction. By then, manufacturers had built up stockpiles of methamphetamines, which wound up on the open market.

"A measure of the seriousness of the problem was the crime rate—which soared. Most often arrested for drug-related offenses were artists, musicians and other creative types, waitresses, watchmen and others who worked night hours, returning veterans and young people in general.

"It took a full decade, and it wasn't easy, but we licked the problem. Of course, there are definite medical needs for stimulants, and doctors are capable of assuring their proper prescription. Our concern was with their improper use. Our approach was threefold . . .

"First, and most important, was an appeal to public opinion. This educational effort was aimed mainly at young people, and their sense of personal and national pride. But we also stressed the dire consequences of drug taking.

"Second, we enacted stringent new laws. Manufacture of wide awake drugs in tablet or powder form was banned in 1949; our addicts were then accustomed to taking the pills orally. But they quickly discovered that they could get 'higher,' faster by injecting liquid speed into their bloodstream. So we banned the liquid form, too.

"Other laws provided stiffer penalties for addicts and pushers, and compulsory hospitalization for addicts.

"Third was vigorous law enforcement. Our narcotics agents pretended to be addicts, looking for a 'fix.' I've forgotten how many pushers we rounded up that way.

"What's important is, that it worked. In 1954—the peak year—some 55,000 persons were arrested on drug-related charges. Now, only a few hundred arrests a year involve wide awake drugs.

"Narcotics are becoming a problem, though, especially heroin. However, we're using similar techniques. And we think we have the narcotics problem under control, too."

ALASKA'S POPULATION GROWING

HON. NICK BEGICH

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 14, 1971

Mr. BEGICH. Mr. Speaker, in recent years, the population in the State of Alaska has more than doubled. People from all over the United States are learning of the wonders of our glorious State.

To meet this unusually, and I might add, welcomed growth, the State of Alaska must grow with its people. The cities of Anchorage and Fairbanks, as well as other cities, are experiencing rapid population growth, which is increasing the demand for needed municipal services.

One of the services most needed and most affected by the rapid growth of our cities is that of municipal water system improvement and expansion.

Because the financial burden to build a water supply system is so great and because the water supply is mandatory

to the health of the people of the community, the city councils of Anchorage and Fairbanks urge the approval of Federal grants to finance the needs of these communities.

On July 23, 1971, an Anchorage-Fairbanks joint resolution was passed, and I am inserting a copy into the RECORD for examination by the Members of Congress.

A RESOLUTION URGING THE APPROPRIATION OF STATE AND FEDERAL FUNDS TO ASSIST IN THE IMPROVEMENT AND EXTENSION OF MUNICIPALLY OWNED WATER SYSTEMS

Whereas, the cities of Anchorage and Fairbanks, as well as other cities in the State of Alaska, are experiencing an unprecedented growth and resultant demand for municipal water system improvement and expansion, and

Whereas, the cost to meet such demand is a financial burden greater than can be absorbed by municipal water system funds, and Whereas, the public supply of water is mandatory to the health and safety of the cities of the State.

Now, therefore, be it resolved that the councils of Anchorage and Fairbanks, in joint session, urge the passage and approval of legislation by the State and Federal governments appropriating sufficient funds to meet the grant needs of municipally-owned water systems in the State of Alaska.

Be it further resolved that the Alaska Municipal League be requested to obtain and tabulate the fund requirements for municipal water systems in the State of Alaska for the next 10 years and disseminate this information to appropriate government agencies.

THE ADVENT OF A NATIONAL HEALTH CARE SYSTEM

HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 14, 1971

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, the advent of a National Health Care System for the United States is seen as an inevitable necessity by many health care experts. Dr. David Stark Murray, a leader in the establishment of the British National Health Service, is presently touring the United States explaining the benefits of a national health care delivery system. He has observed that health care now consumes less of the gross national product in Britain than in the United States, yet everyone is covered under the British system.

Mr. Speaker, I submit for the RECORD an article from the Detroit Free Press of September 8, by Mr. Frank Angelo, editor, who quoted extensively from an interview with Dr. Murray. Dr. Murray's point is clear: Efficiency means economy, and efficiency in health care can be achieved only through a national health care program.

The article follows:

BRITISH EXPERT SEES IT COMING: PREPAID U.S. HEALTH SERVICES NEAR

(By Frank Angelo)

An editor meets such interesting people. For example:

Dr. David Stark Murray, a delightful visitor from London who gently insists that Americans are much closer than they think to a

free-to-all, tax-supported national health service.

Dr. Murray happens to be one of those fellows who believe that if you need a doctor you should have one without having to worry about paying the bill—at least not directly. The idea, of course, is not a particularly new one—but that a visitor should think that the United States verges on being a hot bed of socialized medicine has a certain novelty. Particularly when the thought is expressed by a recognized authority.

Dr. Murray was a leader in the establishment of what is the best known of such plans—the British National Health Service. He has written and talked extensively about more efficient delivery of health services around the world, and he becomes almost lyrical when he discusses the functioning of Britain's blood bank. More than a million volunteer donors provide blood to make possible free transfusions for anyone in need at anytime.

So much for Dr. Murray's credentials. The fact that he was invited to discuss what some will consider heretical views in a seminar at Wayne State University's Medical School suggests that, indeed, changes are in the air. Added item: The Wayne seminar was sponsored by the school's Department of Community and Family Medicine which is one year old and which is in contact with each student before graduation.

Dr. Murray's appearance at Wayne was one of almost a score he'll be making in the United States at the invitation of friends, and after a few minutes with him it becomes obvious that he dearly loves what he's doing—and is trying hard to be as gentle as possible in his critique of America's health-care approach.

Said Dr. Murray with a touch of bemusement:

"Really, I don't understand why you don't go all the way. After all, about 70 million people in the United States are getting some form of government-paid health care now."

Can this be true? Well, yes, when you consider the Merchant Marine plan that's part of the U.S. Public Health Service and was established late in the 18th Century! And the Veterans Administration, and Medicare, and Medicaid, and the Armed Services, and health-care efforts through the poverty program, etc., etc.

Dr. Murray's point was that if we put all these things—and a little more—together into one National Health Service, period, we'd all be better cared for and it wouldn't cost so much.

Well . . . that may be, and there'll be more than a little debate on the matter in the weeks ahead in and out of Congress. But while you're available, doctor, tell me, how does the British system really work? Who does it cover? What does it cost and who pays for it?

"Everyone is covered, even you if you happened to come to England for a vacation," he said. "It costs nothing directly. Payments to doctors and hospitals come from the general tax funds and some social-security contributions by those who are employed. Cost for each person a year averages \$90 and 98 percent of all people in Britain have signed with a general practitioner."

Assuming you lived in Britain, the doctor explained, you simply would pick the general practitioner you wanted to handle you and/or your family and sign up with him. He in turn would be paid a fixed yearly fee by the health service whether he treated you once or a hundred times. If you wanted special, private care, you would pay extra for that.

There was much more detail, but finally Dr. Murray was emphasizing the efficiency of the system, how health care was taking less of the total national product in Britain than it is in America. And there was a bit

of twinge when, with a twinkle in his eyes, he said:

"You know, the economic problems you're having may be just the thing to force you to think of more efficiency, including delivery of health services."

THE BIG BOYS AGAINST PRINK HILL

HON. HAMILTON FISH, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 14, 1971

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, in the 28th Congressional District of New York, which I have the honor of representing, a fight is presently raging over the proposed location of high tension lines to carry current from a pump storage facility being built by the New York State Power Authority, located in the Schoharie Valley, Schoharie County, across an unspoiled portion of the Catskill Mountains in Greene County for final delivery to Con Edison in New York City.

The background and impact of this proposal is far better explained by a resident of the affected area, Mr. Brooks Atkinson, former drama critic of the New York Times, in an editorial which recently appeared in the Sunday Times, than by any words of mine. For that reason, I insert the full text of this editorial:

THE BIG BOYS AGAINST PRINK HILL

(By Brooks Atkinson)

PRINK HILL.—When he was working on our porch two springs ago, Ralph Teter, buldler and neighbor, spoke the unbelievable words. He said the New York State Power Authority had completed plans to build a massive power transmission line through our community. Originating over the mountain at a pumped storage plant in Blenheim and Gilboa, it will cross a ridge of Pisgah Mountain, which is the western wall of our town, and go down through the Durham and Catskill valleys to Leeds near the Hudson River.

I couldn't believe it. Things as hideous as that don't happen in our truly rural area. About ten thousand years ago a glacier crept over our mountains, leaving vivid scratches that can still be read, like tea leaves. In 1801 the Susquehanna Turnpike was opened to families, wagons and cattle on their way from the Hudson to the Susquehanna, and then on to the West. Apart from the glacier and the turnpike, nothing has happened to alter the quiet beauty and the natural composure of our neighborhood. It is dominated by nature.

But what Mr. Teter said turned out to be true. Not long after he was working here, strangers with surveying equipment began to slip discreetly through the community. In one private woodlot they chopped down a tree that stood in the way of a clear view by the surveyors. The owner of the woodlot had never felt the physical impact of government aggression before. There was no doubt that we were being invaded by a baleful organization—part Mafia, part Big Brother—that proposed to destroy the beauty and integrity of our town and brutally intrude on one of the scenic glories of the Catskill Mountains.

At first it seemed to be impossible to find out who was the enemy. He was hiding behind a bush of polite secretiveness. But we are fortunate enough to have in our community a public-spirited attorney, Barry Garkinkel, who knows his way through the

mazes of bureaucratic intrigue and (doubtless it is just as well) does not expect to be paid. He organized our side (Marshall Bell, the village storekeeper, is the chairman), urged the town to pass an ordinance (which says the transmission line "would forever drastically destroy the environmental values of the Durham Valley area") and filed an interveners' brief with the Federal Power Commission, which will ultimately decide where the line will go.

Nor are we without other friends. The Greene County Planning Board, Representative Hamilton Fish Jr. and Joseph C. Swidler, chairman of the New York State Public Service Commission, have all protested basically because of the irreparable damage to an "uncluttered and uniquely beautiful area." In the beginning I was not certain that an abstract value like "beauty" would carry much public weight. But the bleak prospect of a gross impairment of "beauty" alarmed and enraged the people at the town meeting last year more than the threat to land values.

The inequality of the power authority's resources and ours is frightening—a very harsh fact of life in the corporate socialism that governs our country. Although we have threatened no one and have taken no hostile action, we are expected to defend ourselves against a huge political and technological organization that can pay the salaries of executives, engineers, attorneys and public relations specialists, pay their expenses to meetings, pay experts and witnesses, pay for surveys, promotion and publications. It is a fully staffed state within a state. When its representatives appear at hearings they are not interested in our problems. I hope the genuineness of our concern for an unimpaired environment will compensate for the meagerness of our resources.

For the Power Authority is trapped in a public relations maneuver that substitutes cant for reality and is morally contemptible. It pretends that a 34-mile, high-power transmission line on towers 80 to 140 feet tall through a right-of-way that will be 150 feet wide (more likely 400 feet wide) will be an asset to our environment. "Planning and Design for Preservation and Enhancement of Environment" is the title of the Power Authority's first brochure, published in 1969. Among other things it declares that it has found the way to build and operate hydroelectric projects and simultaneously preserve and enhance environmental values. The Environmental Report published last March is less sanctimonious but it does declare that the line "will not have any significant adverse impact on the environment." It is as full of wish-fulfillment as the Pentagon papers.

I hope the Power Authority does not believe its own propaganda. Its transmission line will introduce into a natural environment a totally alien element of technological design and manufacture. It can only be a calamity.

(NOTE.—Brooks Atkinson is the former New York Times drama critic. His "Prink Hill" is in Durham, N.Y.)

You will note Mr. Speaker, that Mr. Atkinson mentions my name as being directly involved in this matter. That is true. My involvement is an effort to see that the residents and local governments and planning boards of my district affected by the proposed development, receive full consideration, and fair and impartial hearings in this matter which so intimately affect their lives. For this reason I have formally intervened in the proceedings presently before the Federal Power Commission, on the Gilboa-Leeds Transmission Line—project No. 2685.

I have done this as with the passage of time, it has become increasingly my

conviction that the underlying attitude of the Commission is that any objector to the proposed transmission line is an uninformed nuisance, to be placated by a show of bureaucratic legal procedure, while the council and staff of the power authority are the only ones clothed in respectability, and whose words and wishes are the only ones worth listening to. This is true even though the intervenor be Brooks Atkinson, the town of Durham, or the county of Greene, through its county planning board.

The inequality of resources between the power authority and the resources of a small local town or county, mentioned by Mr. Atkinson, tend to tip the scales of justice in favor of the authority and against the interveners, even if the interveners are given every possible consideration by the Power Commission and its examiners. All hope of equity goes out the window when it appears the Commission and its examiner can only hear the voice of the powerful applicant, and is deaf to the poor municipality and helpless individual resident.

Mr. Speaker, an example of this apparent desire to please the voice of power while ignoring the pleas of the relatively impoverished interveners is shown by the selection of the city of Albany as the site of the hearings in this case. Albany is miles removed from the affected area, with the trip there a hardship on the people wishing to attend.

One might forgive the hearing examiner in this case, who chose the Federal Court Building in Albany as the nearest available courtroom on the grounds he likes to hold hearings in a courtroom atmosphere. It is abundantly clear, however, from every motion and statement made since the prehearing on June 22, that only the power authority wanted the hearings in that city.

Given the referee's preference for a courtroom setting, one might even believe this selection of Albany was an unavoidable necessity, were this necessity not the result of the Commission granting the power authority an additional 30 days to prepare its case. Greene County through which this line will pass has a courthouse, and if the hearing date had remained as originally set for October 5, their courtrooms would have been available. But by pushing off the hearing date to November, the power authority, with the assistance of the Commission insured that those courtrooms would be occupied by the fall term of county court. Seven months a year the Greene County courtrooms would be available.

One might even have believed the speedy granting of the authority's motion for a delay in the hearing date simply marked efficiency on the part of the Commission, were it not the only motion granted by the Commission to date, while the 10 or 12 motions made by the attorneys for the Greene County Planning Board and the town of Durham have gone unanswered and unacknowledged.

One might still believe all this were the result of traditional bureaucratic accident, if the representatives of the power authority at the prehearing had not complained at length of the difficulty

of having their paid witnesses travel to Greene County, the unsuitability of restaurant and hotel facilities in the area for such highly placed people, and the general inconvenience a Greene County hearing location would lay on the authority's tax paid staff.

So we find that people whose very lives are directly affected by the proposed lines, must journey at their own expense to the city of Albany, and plead their case in unfamiliar and foreign surroundings, while the Commissioner's examiner and staff will find themselves cloistered in a Federal court building far removed from the transmission line site, and the needs and hopes of the people its construction will affect.

Mr. Speaker, if this case, the only one in which I have been personally involved with the workings of the Federal Power Commission, is representative of the concern shown by that agency of the Government charged with a responsibility toward the governed, then, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest rules, regulations and personnel of the Commission need a thorough overhaul.

MAN VERSUS MACHINE: INDIVIDUAL PRIVACY IN A COMPUTERIZED SOCIETY

HON. ABNER J. MIKVA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 14, 1971

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, in February a Senate subcommittee held extensive hearings on the question of individual privacy and the threats posed by increasingly efficient gathering, storage, and retrieval of information about all of our private lives. Those hearings alerted us to the dangers we face; now we must address ourselves to legislative measures which provide some protection for individual privacy in a society which is rapidly making a prophet of George Orwell.

Perhaps the most thoughtful effort in this direction is contained in H.R. 854, introduced in January by my distinguished colleague from New York (Mr. KOCH). It attempts to place some controls over what sorts of personal information finds its way into the hungry storage banks of the Nation's computers, how long it can stay there, who can get their hands on it, and how the individual citizen can act to insure that false or misleading information about him is not circulated.

I would like to insert in the RECORD a useful analysis of H.R. 854 and of the general subject of controlling the impact of the information explosion on personal privacy, prepared by a constituent of mine. The author, Albert Foer, attends the University of Chicago Law School, where he serves as an editor of the Law Review.

Mr. Foer warns that legislation in this field must take full account of the relevant computer technology, and should not be drafted with file drawers and pa-

per dossiers in mind. He warns that to control what comes out of a computerized information system, you must control what goes in. In addition, he recommends consideration of built-in devices which control access to and improper retrieval of computer data.

The text of the paper follows:

ACCESS TO YOUR OWN RECORDS: THE KOCH BILL

(By Albert A. Foer)

I. THE PROBLEM

"As we pass through life we leave a trail of records, widely dispersed and generally inaccessible—except with a great deal of effort and diligence."¹ The first part of this statement is true. The second part is losing its truth rapidly. Today we are becoming conscious of the fact that a trail of records which is no longer widely dispersed and generally inaccessible leads quietly and almost imperceptibly to a prison of magnetic tape.

The nature of our government and of our economy make it imperative that we give out information about ourselves. Therefore we have tax records; social security records; selective service records; census records; police records; hospital records; school records; test records; marriage records; credit records; records, even, of what books we borrow and what magazines we subscribe to. In the past, these records were kept in the decentralized filing cabinets of the government's various agencies, the corporations and other institutions.

But a new technology has entered the scene, making a much more efficient system of record-keeping possible. Since about 1954, the computer has made it possible to assemble large amounts of personal information in data banks. Due to the perfection of time-sharing and remote access terminals, this information can be made available anywhere in an incredibly short time. The computerization of credit reporting, for example, has made it possible for The Credit Data Corporation to provide subscribing companies with checks on individuals within ninety seconds of a request for data.² The Retail Credit Company, which rates persons for a wide variety of purposes including industrial security, has 7,000 investigators and maintains dossiers on more than forty-two million Americans.³ And the credit reporting industry is only beginning to create the national network which computers make possible.

The computerization of government files has also been proceeding at a rapid pace. The New York State Identification and Intelligence System consists of a central unit designed to store information for state and local law-enforcement agencies and permit them to retrieve data through their own terminals.⁴ On the national level, we have the FBI's National Crime Information Center, the Passport Office's Lookout File on "subversives," the Secret Service's file on potential assassins, and the Army's surveillance file on dissidents, to give but a few examples of the government's computerized records on individuals.

The following problems have emerged as the most significant byproducts of the computerization of records:

(1) Information which was previously hard to obtain is increasingly located in a central data bank. Therefore, more information is more easily available on a given individual.

(2) The new information technology has made it possible to obtain, manipulate, and retrieve much larger quantities of information than ever before. Laser technology makes it feasible to store a twenty-page dossier on every American on a piece of tape that is less than 5,000 feet long.⁵ Wiretapping has progressed to the stage where it is almost

impossible to detect. Bugging is no longer needed: parabolic microphones and other new techniques make it possible to listen in on a conversation from a considerable distance.⁶ The possibilities for obtaining more data and for handling that data have led to the demand by researchers, investigators, and administrators that the new technology be fully utilized. The hunger for facts has more than kept pace with technology, resulting in the continued narrowing of the realm of individual privacy.

(3) Information is shared by different collectors, so that a single national data center—an idea which aroused great anxiety in the late 1960's—has already been outmoded. When computers "talk to each other," and remote access terminals are available, the centralization has already taken place. Moreover, information-sharing has been taking on new and frightening forms. American Airlines opens its flight reservation computers to federal, state, local, and other investigators so that they can learn where you went, and with whom you traveled.⁷ Senator Mathias has recently proposed legislation to keep income tax consulting services from disseminating (for a fee) private tax information.

(4) Computerized information has an aura of accuracy which is often at variance with reality. We don't know what "They" know about us, and consequently we are not able to correct misleading or inaccurate information, even though it might be used to deny us a job, an education, credit, a passport. A record which tells of an arrest, but fails to mention a finding of innocence; or mentions that you served a term in the penitentiary, but fails to add that you had refused induction into the military on moral grounds, may petrify your past so that it can never be escaped.

A complex society needs information. An individual needs a sense of autonomy. Some tradeoff between these conflicting values has always been required. However, with the advent of the computer, the balance has taken a marked shift against the individual.⁸ One is no longer in control over the dissemination of data about himself.⁹ And the shift is still in an early gear. At present, over 50,000 computer systems are installed in the U.S. By 1975 this number is expected to pass the 150,000 mark.¹⁰ There are estimated to be over 70,000 terminals now. By 1973 the number is expected to reach 400,000.¹¹

The fear aroused by these facts has led civil libertarians to cry havoc and call forth the dogs of Orwell. They believe, with Justice William O. Douglas, that "a person should have the freedom to select for himself the time and circumstances when he will share his thoughts and attitudes with others and to determine the extent to which that sharing will go."¹² They fear, like Senator Sam Ervin, that the efforts of well-meaning organizations like the Secret Service, "threaten a mass surveillance system unprecedented in American history."¹³ They conclude, like Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare Elliot Richardson, that the nation "must develop the means of controlling the potential for harm inherent" in the government's computerized data banks of information on citizens.¹⁴

II. THE KOCH BILL

Various proposals have been put forth with the objective of countering the threat of a record prison. These have ranged from broad attempts to regulate computerized data banks (along the lines of a British bill),¹⁵ to undiluted attacks on the right of certain organizations to collect certain types of data (such as Congressman Mikva's bill to eliminate completely any Army surveillance of civilians), to fairly narrow controls over specific trouble spots (such as the Mathias bill on tax consultants). The most sophisticated bill to date has been H.R. 854, introduced by Mr. Koch of New York in January

Footnotes at end of article.

1971. Although the Koch bill is given slight chance of passing Congress, a study of its provisions is useful in depicting some of the difficulties in legislating for the protection of privacy against the record-keepers.

The Koch bill is fashioned as an amendment to the Freedom of Information Act.¹⁶ It declares, in essence, that any agency of the federal government which keeps a record on an individual citizen—the information in which record was not provided by the citizen—must inform the citizen that it maintains such a record. The citizen is allowed to inspect his record and to supplement it. The agency must keep a record of who uses the information and must refrain from disclosing the information outside of the agency. Exceptions to these general principles will appear in our analysis below.

a. Coverage of the legislation

Section 552a (a) of the Koch bill says:

"Each agency that shall maintain records concerning any individual which may be retrieved by reference to, or indexed under, the individual's name and which contain any information obtained from any source other than such individual shall, with respect to such records—"

Other general courses are possible. The bill could have been directed at all record-keepers, private as well as public. It could have aimed at operators of data banks, rather than at federal agencies. It could have left the matter in private hands, perhaps giving the individual a right of action (or a class action) against the abuses of a record-keeper.

The last course would be the least satisfactory. The individual is in no position to initiate action. Frequently he doesn't even know he is subject of a record, much less that the record is the cause of harm to him. When he suspects the existence of a record, against whom would he bring suit? The burden belongs on the record-keeper, who is the active party, rather than on the passive individual. Forcing the individual to bear the burden of protecting privacy—a national value, after all—ignores the realities: it is generally not considered prudent to challenge the government, and the "right" would likely suffer from a severe case of the chills.

While the Koch bill only applies to federal agencies, we have seen that the record-keepers are equally industrious, whatever the source of their income. Admittedly, it would be possible to legislate for individual industries as problems in the private sphere arise; we do have the Fair Credit Reporting Act to cope with consumer reporting. But the computer "is the keystone of a new communications medium,"¹⁷ and its benefits and harms flow across the line between public and private, presenting nearly identical problems in both areas. As computers and communications facilities become increasingly interdependent, the record-keeping phenomenon will become more clearly a matter for national control, like the communications field itself.¹⁸ Broader coverage, therefore, would be preferable. Sufficient constitutional basis probably exists for such legislation in the fact that information is a commodity that enters interstate commerce; that computers and communications facilities are becoming so intermarried; and that the legislation could be directed toward the positive protection of the First Amendment's various guarantees.

The Koch bill identifies "agencies" as the target. This shall be discussed below in relation to the problem of disclosure. It should be noted, meanwhile, that the agency seems a rather artificial target in the computer age; that the individual data bank is more appropriate. This assumes, of course, that the Koch bill is intended to cope with com-

puters. The bill speaks of records, but does not unequivocally refer to computerized records. In 1967, at least 45 agencies had some automatic data processing equipment, and over 2600 computers were being used by the federal government.¹⁹ If there is any possibility that the Koch bill will not be understood to refer to computers as well as manual files, it would be pointlessly anachronistic to pass the bill. Let the words "including computerized records" be inserted after the word "records."

Other problems of wording arise. The records under consideration must belong to "any individual." Would this include foreigners and aliens? One exception to the provisions of the Koch bill is for national security data, so the extension of this law to foreigners would not open up CIA-type dossiers. But there are other types of data which may not bear the national security classification—such as information held by the Commerce Department's intelligence section—which we might want to shield from foreigners.

The bill speaks of records "which may be retrieved by reference to, or are indexed under, the individual's name." This ignores the fact that a dossier system could easily operate without benefit of individual names for retrieval purposes. For instance, records could be retrieved by reference to social security numbers, addresses, or phone numbers. Moreover, a computerized system could retrieve a small sample, for example of "all physicians in Peoria with incomes over \$75,000," in which the identity of individuals would be quite simple to ascertain. This loophole can be patched by eliminating the qualifying words "which may be retrieved by reference to, or indexed under, the individual's name." What would remain would be "records concerning any individual." The purpose of the deleted phrase was, it seems, to insure that the records would be identifiable with the individual or to provide a loophole. The loophole would contradict the purpose of the bill; a record which cannot be identified with an individual is no threat. The phrase can be deleted without loss.

The Koch bill focuses on information obtained from any source other than the individual. This would apparently imply that agencies should divide their individual records into (a) information provided by the individual and (b) other information. In reality, however, an agency would probably not make such a breakdown, which would be rather useless, but would instead program the computer to withdraw any record that contains class (b) information, regardless of whether it also contains class (a) information. In other words, a practical approach would be for the bill to provide generally that the individual will be informed of all records about him, except in the case where all the records have been provided to the agency by the individual.

b. Notification

Section 552a(a)(1) requires that the identified agencies

"Notify the individual by mail at his last known address that the agency maintains or is about to maintain a record concerning said individual."

One possible alternative would be to require the agency to notify the individual of more than the existence of the record: to give him an outline of the record's contents or even to send him a copy or printout of the record. As a compromise to economy, the mere notification of the report's existence is probably sufficient. This is a threshold approach, saying to the individual, "You might be interested to know that we've got a record on you." Any further action comes at the individual's initiative, but the initial burden is, appropriately, on the record-keeper.

Let us examine two alternatives. It would be possible to phrase the legislation so that

the record, or even more affirmation of the record's existence, would be sent out only at the individual's request. We've seen, however, that the individual may not know what to request or from whom; may not be aware that he should be taking action until it is too late to satisfactorily protect himself; and may be subject to pressures making it imprudent to assert himself. The second alternative would be to have the agency report to the individual only when it is taking adverse action against him on the basis of its records. This approach is taken in the Fair Credit Reporting Act,²⁰ in which the user of a consumer report must advise the consumer against whom adverse action has been taken that the action was based on a consumer report, and must supply the name and address of the consumer reporting agency making the report. This has the drawback of leaving it to the agency to determine what constitutes adverse action. Since it could be anticipated that the agency would operate on the principle of "what you don't know won't hurt you," this would not be a satisfactory protection for the individual.

This leaves the approach of the Koch bill, to place the burden on the record-keeper. Koch uses the mail as the medium of communication, which is probably the most efficient, although one could imagine the telephone or the legal newspaper notice as less expensive media. Without knowing how many records are involved, one can only roughly estimate the expense of this notification process. At minimum, every agency which maintains records on individuals would have to search its records to determine which ones are involved; obtain addresses; produce a publication (perhaps a post card) to explain that a record is kept and to advise an individual of his rights under the law; address the publication; and pay the costs of mailing.

If in fact our records do exist in many different agencies, this activity could result in mailings numbering in multiples of our population. It would require a large expenditure of time and of money. Computerization, on the other hand, makes such a process quicker and easier. To minimize expense, agencies could do two things: destroy unnecessary records and centralize what is left over. Since it is unlikely that an agency with multiple record containers would take the effort to collate files so that only one notification would be sent out to a person whose information appeared in more than one record, the agency would soon discover that it is economical to keep all personal records in one file or computer. Perhaps different agencies with similar purposes would agree to work out of a central data bank. The destruction of unnecessary records would be beneficial, except to the extent that an agency may not know what records it will need in the future. Centralization controlled by the types of protections found in the Koch bill would not necessarily be bad; indeed, it seems to be a fact of life even without this extra inducement.

What happens after the agency has already written a letter to an individual and the agency decides to add new data to the existing file? Must a new letter be written? Does a new, and perhaps damaging bit of data count as a new record? If not, the individual is back where he started from, in ignorance. If it does, the expense is increased. What seems to be needed is a requirement of periodic reporting. Perhaps each agency could inform a central agency of what notifications are needed, and that agency could mail out a summary of record loci each year, along with income tax forms.

What is meant by "or is about to maintain a record"? Suppose an agency knows that it will be collecting information over a three-year period on the amount of attention given by physicians in Peoria to their medicare patients. At what stage and how often would the doctors have to be informed of this un-

Footnotes at end of article.

dertaking? It should be noted that the matter of an agency's intent to keep a record strays from the essential aim of the Koch bill—to promote the accuracy of existing records. A warning that a record will be maintained, giving no details of the nature of the record, provides the individual with no real protection and may even promote paranoia.²¹ Nothing would be lost by dropping this phrase from the bill.

c. Disclosure

Section 552a (a) (2) states that the identified agencies must

"Refrain from disclosing the record or any information contained therein to any other agency or to any person not employed by the agency maintaining such record, except with permission of the individual concerned or, in the event said individual cannot be located or communicated with after reasonable effort, with permission from members of the individual's immediate family or guardian, or, only in the event that such individual, members of the individual's immediate family and guardian cannot be located or communicated with after reasonable effort, upon good cause for such disclosure: Provided, however, That if disclosure of said record is required under section 552 of this chapter or by any other provision of law, the individual concerned shall be notified by mail at his last known address of any such required disclosure."

The clear intent of this section is to control the habit of information sharing within the federal government. Although some laws and regulations exist for this purpose, they are not taken very seriously²² and do not provide any real assurance to the individual that what he tells one agency in confidence will not be handed over (or inter-faced) to another agency and used for a different purpose.

But what is an agency? Wooster defines it as "an administrative division." Does this mean that the records of the Office of Education should be available to the Bureau of Veterinary Medicine, since both are part of H.E.W.? If a cabinet-level department is an "agency," what would become of the disclosure provision if Mr. Nixon succeeds in reorganizing the government into a small number of large departments? It is important, therefore, to be more precise about the meaning of "agency." Upon that definition will depend the number of people who are given access to an individual's records. As the Koch bill reads, anyone employed by the agency could have access; this should be modified so that only those with a "need to know" for the carrying out of their jobs have access. The wording of the legislation should be directed at limiting the number of people with access and limiting the uses of information to those for which the information was originally provided.

Personal information can be disseminated with permission of the individual concerned. Must this permission be in writing? How much information must be presented to the individual before he will be capable of wisely determining whether to grant permission? How is the agency to be kept from using leverage in obtaining permission?²³ If the individual is not found, permission may be given by "members of the immediate family." Which ones are these, and since the plural is used, what happens when various members disagree as to granting permission?

Although section 552a(b) states that the Koch bill may be enforced in accordance with the enforcement provisions of the Freedom of Information Act, there are no real teeth in the non-disclosure policy. No penalty is presented for disclosure without proper authority. More importantly, perhaps, is the failure of the bill to provide for an

affirmative duty to protect data from unauthorized disclosure. Procedures are needed for limiting the number of persons who have access to the data—for controlling entrance into the space where the data is kept (increasingly, into the computer or terminal room), and for controlling entry into the actual records. (In the case of computers, a password system would be a minimal protection.) A standard of care is needed for the disposal of records. Notice should also be taken, in the case of computers, of the possibility of a maintenance man or programmer altering the computer so that sensitive data becomes available. Again in the case of computers, there should be a provision insuring protection against wiretappers: even with security safeguards for computerized transmissions, there is strong enticement for blackmailers.

Non-disclosure provisions are not self-executing. There is a strong need for an enforcement body outside of the record-keeping agency, which will ascertain that personal information is being sufficiently protected.

d. An "audit trail"

Section 552a(a) (3) requires that identified agencies

"Maintain an accurate record of the names and positions of all persons inspecting such records and the purposes for which such inspections were made."

This idea of an "audit trail" has been mentioned by most writers who have dealt with computer privacy.²⁴ It is an idea peculiarly adaptable to the computer, though it should be mentioned that computer space taken up by record-keeping of this nature is lost to other purposes, and therefore cannot be ignored as a cost factor.

The idea, despite its cost, is an important protection against abuse, but curiously the Koch bill stops short of tying in the audit trail with the individual it is meant to protect. Shouldn't the individual have a right to know this information?

Finally, there is no provision for monitoring the agency's audit procedures. Don't we need a specified agency, without vested interest in secrecy or efficiency, to enforce this limitation on record-keeping?

e. Inspection

The identified agencies, according to section 552a(a) (4) must

"Permit any individual to inspect his own record and have copies thereof made at his expense."

The bill does not say where this would be done. Could it only take place at the location where the record is kept? This would not be fair to the Hawaiian whose records are in Washington. On the other hand, either the taxpayers or the individual would have to bear an additional expense if records are to be transmitted across country. It is quite probable that this problem will be mitigated by the growing number of remote access terminals; an individual would be able to inspect his record (assuming it is computerized) at a terminal in his region.

When would the individual have this right of inspection? "Any time" might be administratively unmanageable. Without some standard, however, the agency might set up procedures that make inspection a practical impossibility.

How would the individual know whether he is being shown his entire record? Must the individual be personally present for the inspection of his record, or could he give a power of attorney?

f. Supplementation

Section 552a(a) (5) requires the identified agencies to

"Permit any individual to supplement the information contained in his record by the addition of any document or writing containing information such individual deems pertinent to his record."

No limit is established for the length of such supplementation. Suppose the FHA holds information on how neighbors evaluate the individual as a future homeowner. Can the individual insert fifty lengthy letters from other neighbors offering a contradictory character appraisal? Needless to say, this could be quite expensive for the agency. The Fair Credit Reporting Act sets a limit on supplemental information, and is a useful model in this respect.²⁵

g. Procedures and enforcement

Section 552a (c) of the Koch bill states:

"Each agency may establish published rules stating the time, place, fees to the extent authorized, and procedure to be followed with respect to making records promptly available to an individual, and otherwise to implement the provisions of this section."

This leaves to the individual agency, which has a vested interest in making it as difficult as possible for the individual to get into its records, the ultimate power of enforcement. It would be far wiser to have a central, independent regulatory agency, with a driving mission of protecting privacy rather than promoting efficiency, to set and enforce fair standards and procedures. This new agency should serve as an "information ombudsman"²⁶, with national responsibility for watchdogging the gamut of data surveillance problems.

h. Exceptions

Having set out the above protections and procedures, the Koch bill proceeds to whittle them down with a series of important exceptions.

Section 552a (d) states:

"This section shall not apply to records that are—(1) specifically required by Executive order to be kept secret in the interest of national security;

(2) investigatory files compiled for law enforcement purposes, except to the extent that such records have been maintained for a longer period than reasonably necessary to commence prosecution or other action or to the extent available by law to a party other than an agency; and

(3) interagency or intraagency memorandums or letters which would not be available by law to a party other than an agency in litigation with the agency."

The third exclusion is intended to except loose kinds of information which have not yet been put into record form. Without such an exemption, the agency would probably be forced to keep copies of all materials, even working papers, in record form. This might justly be considered too great an administrative burden. It must be considered, however, that this exemption might encourage the maintenance of sensitive information in memorandum form, allowing more freedom of circulation than the bill intends. A solution would be for the privacy protecting agency, mentioned in the last section, to randomly monitor the record-keeping agency's procedures.

A much more difficult problem is presented by the first and second exclusions: the records of the CIA, DIA, NSA, FBI, and police bodies are all unaffected by the Koch bill. In other words, the bill would not even touch the prime keepers of individual dossiers. How should these internal security and national security organizations be treated?

From the perspective of individual privacy, the records of these agencies present a threat mainly in terms of making people afraid to speak their mind or to join an association, for fear that these actions will be recorded and will be damaging at a later date. With the exception of the situation of the man who needs a security clearance for a job he desires, these records do not generally have an economic impact on individuals, and in this way may be distinguished from many

Footnotes at end of article.

of the records made available by the Koch bill. Perhaps, therefore, something like the Koch bill could have value, even with its exclusions. However, privacy is the issue, and if access of an individual to his record would be fatal to the mission of the security agencies, then some other fettering is in order.

The problem can be seen as involving more than access to records. It also involves input. Records are at their most dangerous when they contain substantial amounts of "soft" data—hearsay, opinions, evaluations by employers or neighbors, results of psychological tests. A right of access (called "habeas data" by Alan F. Westin) and of supplementation can provide for the neutralization of some "soft" data. But where the right of access has to be limited, controls must exist at the in-input stage and at the disclosure stage. Disclosure is not a particular problem at the national security level because of stringent laws and procedures, though it does present a problem sometimes at the local or state police levels. This leaves the in-input stage as the most appropriate for controlling the security agencies. The trick would be to draw a "fine line between getting information a government needs in order to govern wisely, and getting it for Big Brother."²⁷ It is time for Congress to specify exactly what kind of data may be gathered by each security agency. A privacy protecting independent agency should then be established to monitor the security agencies.²⁸

In subsection (2), a distinction seems to be made between investigatory files and records. Like memorandums, perhaps, those files are to be considered "raw," not yet ready for perpetuation, and it again seems appropriate to exclude them from the right of access. This same provision speaks of a "longer period than reasonably necessary." Such a phrase is meaningless, since the individual concerned cannot know about such records, and therefore cannot seek access to them on the ground that they are obsolete. (It might be possible, however, for a monitoring agency to obtain this information.) Mr. Koch is correct in noting that obsolete information deserves special treatment, but this treatment would be better placed in a separate section creating a statute of limitations on various kinds of data.²⁹

i. Informers

Section 552a(e) excludes the disclosure of the identity of any person who has furnished information contained in a record. This is in accord with the traditional privilege of the government not to disclose the identity of informers.³⁰ It serves to protect the information-giver (who also has a right of privacy), and to promote further cooperation of informers with the government. On the other hand, the policy promotes the institution of informing, which is associated with the police state. The use of informers, perhaps, should be considered as an in-input problem (what kinds of information will we allow to be collected, by whom, with what means?) rather than an access problem, since it makes little sense, once we have decided to encourage informers, to make their identity known.

How will the record-keepers divide up a record, so that the source of information is unavailable to the individual concerned? Must they eliminate all sources from their records? And, if so, how is information to be evaluated? The simple answer to that is to employ a code system: thus, 2A might be an employer of high reliability, 3C a neighbor of average reliability.

What if the identity of an informer is disclosed? Would the informer be given a right of action against the disclosing agency?

III. CONCLUDING COMMENTS

A detailed analysis of the Koch bill has pinpointed some of the key problem areas in legislating for the protection of privacy. These are:

1. Privacy legislation must work from the premise that records will be computerized. In-input, transmission, and access are three stages which require special safeguards.

2. The line between public and private is not necessarily an appropriate border when it comes to the threat of a "record prison." Data banks, regardless of who controls them, are the appropriate target for control.

3. An approach which is limited to providing access to records will promote accuracy and will help redress the imbalance in the privacy vs. efficiency tradeoff, but it is not likely to affect greatly the problem of dossiers, the most potentially damaging of which are kept by agencies whose very purpose would be contradicted by a right of access. Nothing short of a re-evaluation of in-input policies will bring these dossiers under control.

4. Safeguarding privacy will be expensive, in terms of building safeguards into computer hardware, in terms of reducing the capacity of computers for substantive work, and in terms of effectuating such policies as the mailing out of notifications.

5. Procedures and standards should be set by an independent agency. This agency should also enforce the appropriate legislation.

The task of legislating for the protection of privacy in an age of computers is extremely complex, and this analysis has only touched on a few of the elements involved. While it is clear that the Koch bill is on the right track, it is also obvious that a more wide-ranging, penetrating, and computer-oriented proposal is needed.

FOOTNOTES

¹ Statement of Paul Baran, a computer expert, in *The Computer and the Invasion of Privacy*, Hearings Before a Subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations, House of Representatives, 89th Cong., 2d Sess., p. 123.

² Alan F. Westin, *Privacy and Freedom* (1967) 309.

³ Id., 159.

⁴ See *The Computer and the Invasion of Privacy*, note 1 above, 146-182 for a description of this system. A description of 15 computer data banks presently in use may be found in Jerome Lobel, *Privacy, Security and the Data Bank*, Government Data Systems (Nov. 1970) 38.

⁵ Arthur R. Miller, *The Assault on Privacy: Computers, Data Banks, and Dossiers* (1971) 12.

⁶ Edward V. Long, *The Intruders* (1967) describes many of the new techniques of gathering information. One can visit a store called The Spy Shop in downtown Washington for firsthand observation.

⁷ Miller, op. cit. 42.

⁸ See Westin, op. cit., chapter 14, titled "Restoring the Balance of Privacy in America."

⁹ "Of late . . . lawyers and social scientists have been reaching the conclusion that the basic attribute of an effective right of privacy is the individual's ability to control the circulation of information relating to him—a power that often is essential to maintaining social relationships and personal freedom. Correlatively, when an individual is deprived of control over the spigot that governs the flow of information pertaining to him, in some measure he becomes subservient to those people and institutions that are able to manipulate it." Miller, op. cit. 25.

¹⁰ R. Turn & H. E. Peterson, *Security of Computerized Information Systems* (1970) 2.

¹¹ Id.

¹² Forward, *Computerization of Government Files*, 15 UCLA L. REV. 1374 (1968).

¹³ *Congressional Record*, vol. 115, pt. 29, p. 39115.

¹⁴ *Washington Star*, March 16, 1971. Richardson testified before the Senate Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights (the Ervin subcommittee). It should be mentioned that

an earlier Administration witness, Assistant Attorney General William Rehnquist, stated that the Administration "will vigorously oppose any legislation which, whether by opening the door to unnecessary and unmanageable judicial supervision . . . or otherwise, would effectively impair this extraordinarily important function of the federal government "to collect information on the activities of Americans." *Washington Post*, March 10, 1971.

¹⁵ Both the British bill and a Canadian one of similar intent are in the *Cong. Rec.*, vol. 115, pt. 29, p. 39116.

¹⁶ 5 U.S.C. 552 (Supp. III, 1965-67). The Freedom of Information Act is examined in Miller, op. cit. 152-161, where it is concluded, "Revision of the Information Act seems to be a necessary part of any scheme that attempts to harmonize the policy cross-currents set in motion by the new technologies, individual privacy, and the right of a free people to watch over their appointed and elected servants."

¹⁷ Miller, op. cit. 8.

¹⁸ In 1966 the Federal Communications Commission initiated an inquiry "In the matter of regulatory and policy problems presented by the interdependence of computer and communication services and facilities." (Docket No. 16979.) This is available in *Computer Privacy*, Hearings Before the Subcommittee on Administrative Practice and Procedure of the Committee on the Judiciary, U.S. Senate, 90th Cong., 1st Sess. at 87. Consider the following from H. Goldhamer, *The Social Effects of Communication Technology* (1970): "The computer services—information storage, retrieval, and processing—are not now regulated. Indeed, the extraordinary development of the computer field may be due to the absence of government regulation and the stimulus of a very vigorous competition. The provision of transmission services by companies that provide computer services will raise regulatory problems in the computer field. The lack of adequate data transmission facilities may soon become a serious bottleneck in national data processing. Since the needs of data processors, who now use telephone lines, are significantly different from those of the average telephone user, present regulatory policy is already proving inadequate. This will become increasingly the case as firms whose data needs are small operate through an inexpensive access terminal and simply lease computation from a large computer facility center." p. 22.

¹⁹ 15 UCLA L. REV. 1374, 1388.

²⁰ Public Law 91-508, Oct. 26, 1970. Title VI, Sec. 615(a): "Whenever credit or insurance for personal, family, or household purposes, or employment involving a consumer is denied or the charge for such credit or insurance is increased either wholly or partly because of information contained in a consumer report from a consumer reporting agency, the user of the consumer report shall so advise the consumer against whom such adverse action has been taken and supply the name and address of the consumer reporting agency making the report."

²¹ Compare the FBI's reported efforts to convince dissidents that "there is an FBI Agent behind every mailbox." *New Republic*, April 10, 1971.

²² With the exception of the Census Bureau. See Miller, op. cit., 141ff.

²³ A related point is made by Miller, op. cit., 226: "The Koch bill's right-of-access provision could be a valuable mechanism for enabling an individual to detect and secure correction of potentially damaging errors in his files. On the other hand, it might also subject an individual to coercive pressures by those who want access to the governmental dossiers maintained on him and are in a position to insist upon his procuring copies for their use. It would be perverse indeed if enactment of the Koch proposal enabled

lending institutions and employers to make the disclosure of governmental files a condition of granting the data subject a loan or a job."

²⁴ E. G. Miller, op. cit. 245; J. J. Hellmann, *Privacy and Information Systems: An Argument and an Implementation* (1970); 15 UCLA L. REV 1374, 1446. See, generally, *The Problem of Privacy in the Computer Age: An Annotated Bibliography*, Vol. 2, a Rand publication by Annette Harrison (1969).

²⁵ Note 20 above, sec. 611(b): "... The consumer may file a brief statement setting forth the nature of the dispute. The consumer reporting agency may limit such statements to not more than one hundred words if it provides the consumer with assistance in writing a clear summary of the dispute." (c): "Whenever a statement of a dispute is filed, unless there is reasonable grounds to believe that it is frivolous or irrelevant, the consumer reporting agency shall, in any subsequent consumer report containing the information in question, clearly note that it is disputed by the consumer and provide either the consumer's statement or a clear and accurate codification or summary thereof."

²⁶ Miller, op. cit. 237.

²⁷ *The New Republic*, April 10, 1971.

²⁸ The obvious name for such an agency would be "Bigger Brother."

²⁹ Section 605 of the Fair Credit Reporting Act deals with obsolete information, generally forbidding consumer reports to include information that is more than seven years old. Although there are several important exceptions to this, it is interesting to ponder the significance of wiping out (for credit and employment purposes) a record of a crime whose date of "disposition, release, or parole" was more than 7 years ago.

³⁰ Prosser, *Handbook on Torts*, 309.

MR. ENRIQUE SOLER-CLOQUELL

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 14, 1971

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

SPEECH DELIVERED SEPTEMBER 10, 1971, BY MR. ENRIQUE SOLER-CLOQUELL, CHAIRMAN, PUERTO RICO PLANNING BOARD AT THE FIFTH INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON URBAN TRANSPORTATION, SPONSORED BY THE PITTSBURGH URBAN TRANSIT COUNCIL, THE U.S. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION, AND THE TRANSPORTATION RESEARCH INSTITUTE OF CARNEGIE-MELLON UNIVERSITY, PITTSBURGH, PA.

Ladies and Gentlemen: It is a deep honor to bring the greetings and good wishes of The Honorable Luis A. Ferre, Governor of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, to this brilliant galaxy of engineers, architects, economists, planners, technicians and public servants.

It is a deep privilege, as Governor Ferre's personal representative at these dialogues, to present the status of transportation planning and implementation in Puerto Rico.

Puerto Rico as you may know, is a small place with a large population and with limited natural resources. Perhaps that is why we turned to planning as the only way to create a better life for our people.

By stimulating a unique partnership between the Public and Private Sectors, our efforts transformed a rural-agrarian society into a modern industrial one—in just a generation and a half.

Stemming from primarily "linear" planning and development concepts, our phenomenal successes in industrialization gave rise to an entire host of "second generation" problems.

It also created a hard-won awareness among our decisionmakers that planning itself must be transformed into a sophisticated "nuclear" process.

Planning, in short, must become total in its approach; any other effort will simply be an exercise in *how to make more problems, not how to solve them.*

When Governor Ferre took office in 1969, one of his first actions was to appoint a special Subcommittee on Transportation to the Governor's Advisory Council.

In June 1970, the Council issued a broad policy statement on transportation that stressed these points:

1. Transportation is one of the key elements of social, economic and environmental well-being; indeed, it is the vital thread required to rationalize any society's overall planning efforts in this last third of the 20th Century;

2. Puerto Rico, a sharply-defined tropical ecosystem, requires an Island-wide Transportation Plan and Land-Use Policy;

3. Totally dependent upon a random route highway network and the motor vehicle for all transportation within the Island, Puerto Rico must create an alternative, supplementary public transportation system circling the Island;

4. Puerto Rico must also accelerate development of Metropolitan Area rapid transit systems as an integral part of the proposed Island-wide system; and

5. The Commonwealth must commit itself to intensive, higher-density land occupation patterns, that is, regional growth poles integrated with the Island-wide transportation system, to avoid the disastrous proliferation of urban sprawl.

In response to these recommendations, the Puerto Rico Planning Board initiated in September 1970 a special project to prepare an action plan coordinating the elements of transportation and urban development.

To present you with the highlight findings of this special project, we thought it would be appropriate to take you with sound and light . . . to Puerto Rico . . . by means of a little home-made slide show that we have put together.

AUDIO VISUAL PRESENTATION

(1-12) Puerto Rico . . .

(13) . . . the most popular tourist spot in the Caribbean, (14) a year-round climate, and sunshine that (15) makes you want to lounge on a beach . . . (16) and with 6800 miles of coast line . . . Puerto Rico has some lovely beaches. (17) The interior of the Island offers a contrasting view of dazzling greenery.

(18-19) . . . It's an island with something for everyone . . . (20-25) . . . just like the posters claim.

(26-27) Puerto Rico also has a great climate for its growing industrial program. (28) Already built factories and developed sites offered to industrial entrepreneurs include the following advantages: (29) no federal tax, up to 17 years of local tax exemption and competitive wages. (30) Today over 110 U.S. blue-chip corporations operate factories on the island, (31) *Fortune* magazine advertised the Caribbean market as an expanding one. Last year Puerto Ricans alone (32) spent 173 million dollars on motor vehicles (33) 84.8 million dollars on electrical appliances and (34) 308.1 million dollars on clothing and accessories.

(35) It is easy to see why Puerto Rico is considered as the show case of Latin America.

(36) But Puerto Rico has another side . . .

(37) It has one of the highest population densities in the world . . . (38) 27% of its families earn less than \$2,000 per year . . .

(39) new urban developments are "eating up" its limited countryside . . . and

(40) traffic jams paralyze its cities.

(41) Roughly three-quarters the size of Connecticut, the Island contains some 2,200,000 acres of land.

(42) 80% of this is mountainous or floodable, unsuitable for development. By 1970 (43) almost half of the "developable" area had been dedicated to urban uses . . . (44) today only 263,000 acres of "developable" land remain. By 1985, if the present trend continues, (45) only 12% of this irreplaceable prime land will remain for agriculture, recreation, and open space. (46) The island's population now numbers 2,700,000 people; in the next 35 years, it will double. (47) In the sixties alone the population grew by 14.5% . . . in spite of steady out-migration . . . (48) One out of every three Puerto Ricans leave the island . . . more than one million are living in the U.S. (49) Despite heavy government subsidy, the traditional agricultural sector continues to decline.

(50) So more farm workers, especially in sugarcane, find themselves without a job . . . (51) even though new jobs are created by the modern factories attracted to the Island. Unemployment (52) is officially recorded at over 10% and (53) one out of every four families earns less than 500 dollars per year . . .

(54) One out of every four dwellings is inadequate.

(55) Thousands of squatter shacks are built every year and (56) slums mushroom as the rural poor flock to the cities.

(57) But there are signs of progress, too: Puerto Rico's growing middle class and the new bedroom communities, called urbanizations . . . (58) A typical dream house costs about 25,000 dollars. (59) . . . Condominium apartments near the beach, start at about \$30,000.

(60) Only one family in five earns enough money to buy a new home with conventional financing. Access to home requires a car. Today (61) that's the only way people in Puerto Rico travel . . . by motor vehicle . . . over an Island network of some 5,000 miles of roads of all kinds. (62) Puerto Rico also has one international airport, a number of lightplane airports, and three commercial and three industrial ocean ports. (63) San Juan International airport operates at near capacity; consequently, additional international airport alternatives are being considered. (64) Looking seawards, two industrial petrochemical port have just been completed, beefing up the Island's capacity to handle ocean cargo. (65) 80 percent of the dry cargo handled in Puerto Rico is containerized. (66) Large scale expansion of these facilities is underway. (67) Overland cargo movement throughout the Island is a problem.

(68) Passenger transportation needs are served by privately-owned cars, taxis, "public" cars, and buses.

(69) The impact of motor vehicles on the island has been staggering . . . (70) The accident rate is 2.2 times higher than the U.S. (71) Over 600,000 vehicles were registered in 1970 . . . one car for every five persons. (72) This is an ownership rate approaching France and England, both nations with considerable land reserves and fully developed public transit.

(73) Only Singapore and Hong Kong exceed Puerto Rico in vehicular density . . .

(74) But . . . in Puerto Rico there is no choice, you must have a car . . . or even two:

(75) The need for automobiles and the absence of rapid transit alternatives insure

(76) massive congestion. (77) in the last fifteen years, the pace of change has been accelerating . . . (78) The Island's North Coast is becoming a mass of homes, factories, drive-in restaurants, slums, gas stations and junk yards. (79) The message is clear to read: We must act to control our progress now. (80) Delay will only foster more delay . . . and

more urban and rural deterioration. So we have begun to plan what we must do for (81) the Island as a whole . . . (82) as a single entity with complex and interrelated natural and man-made sub-systems. (83) We have come to see the need for a comprehensive approach . . . for a more rational transportation network and a more rational, land-conserving urban growth policy. We have realized; hopefully in time, that the land appetite of tourism, of industry, of commerce and of urbanizations is directly related to the transportation dilemma of this small Island.

(84) Puerto Rico could simply continue the present massive highway program, (85) which includes extension of the modern roadways connecting our three largest cities, (86) installation of controlled-access toll roads and improvement of secondary roads.

(87) But even our highway enthusiasts projected the need for a rapid transit system to relieve San Juan Metropolitan Area traffic congestion. (88) by providing service along corridors connect six major activity centers.

(89) By 1985, the road-builders program alone would increase the total miles of highway lanes by 51%; however, by that date, the estimated number of motor vehicles in Puerto Rico will have increased by 1116%.

(90) Because Puerto Rico does not benefit from the Inter-State Highway Program, much of this construction would have to be financed by the Commonwealth, which has other social priorities. (91) But even if Puerto Rico lays out two point five billion dollars for new highways and roads, the transportation crisis will intensify . . . More roads mean more traffic jams, more noise, more pollution and more highway fatalities. What's more, such a program threatens Puerto Rico's limited land supply by (92) hastening the loss of lush agricultural green-space, the spread of concrete urbanizations and the deterioration of our social and physical environment.

(93) To probe for alternatives, Puerto Rico initiated the TUSCA Project in September 1970. TUSCA is a comprehensive project aimed at planning and implementing a balanced transportation system and a land-use and urban settlement system that reinforce each other. To prevent wasteful land-use, (94) a fixed guideway, Islandwide transit system is urgently recommended. Projected ridership and economic feasibility data indicate that the first segment of the Islandwide transit system should be operational by 1976 to serve Puerto Rico's densely populated Northeast Corridor. (95) By 1980, the 260-mile system should circle the Island, linking existing metropolitan centers, recreation areas, airports, seaports and the proposed new communities. The Island-wide system will provide (96) fast, quiet and economical transportation to some three quarters of the Island's population, including the transportation poor, with operating speeds ranging from 80 to 120 miles per hour. (97) The transit system right of way will never become obsolete because it is planned as a people-goods-energy movement corridor. It will be sufficient to accept a fixed guideway by 1980 . . . (98) and a future dual-made automated guideway as technology and demand develop. (99) Meanwhile route alignments will be selected to take advantage of the Island's natural beauty and (100) will minimize ecological damage. (101) The system will promote better use of Puerto Rico's remaining developable lands. (102) Route alignment and transit station locations will stimulate higher density patterns in both the new and in existing communities.

(103) By the year 2000, there will be four million people living in Puerto Rico. (104) Four million people who will need housing, jobs, schools, residential, recreation and service facilities. (105) Yet, today, the metropolitan areas still monopolize (106) the Island's

available job and professional service opportunities. (107) To prevent the continuing out-flow of rural residents (108) new centers must be created. (109) TUSCA recommends the developments of ten to 15 new communities of 50,000 to 100,000 population each to accommodate about half of the population increase anticipated by the turn of the century. (110) The Island-wide transit system will connect these new communities with existing urban centers, (111) with industrial areas, with the seaports and airports and with recreation areas. (112) New communities will also have their own innovative transit and utility system. (113) They will provide more compact housing (114) carefully planned to ensure privacy, and open space. (115)

(116) Land acquisition has already begun for Puerto Rico's prototype new community. Located in a demonstration area to the West of San Juan, the new community and a proposed international airport will be linked by the first segment of the Island-wide transit system. Previously, a 12-lane expressway was considered for the airport linkage.

(117) Called *CIBUCO*, the new community will be developed as a regional growth center. (118) Support for the planning and development of *CIBUCO* has been requested from "HUD". Design assistance is already being provided the project by D-O-T's Urban Mass Transportation Administration. (119) The system will provide for primary loop connection of built-up areas and secondary collection and distribution routes for packages and utilities. (120) Transit availability will reduce the current total reliance on automobiles . . . (121) Communities will be more identifiable, more friendly . . . (122) enriched by social interaction. (123) The 10,000 acre *CIBUCO* site will provide a living and working environment for families of all income levels. (124) It will serve as a laboratory to test social, political, institutional and technological innovations, (125) attracting both public and private resources. (126) TUSCA also recommends the integration of the Island-wide system with transit modes in metro areas. (127) Experimental exclusive bus lane service was recently inaugurated in San Juan, along the (128) most crowded traffic corridor in the metropolitan area. Today buses (129) and publicos are the only means of public transportation. (130) Extension of exclusive bus lanes to relieve daily traffic jams is proposed for the entire metro area, prior to the construction (131) of a fixed guideway facility such as the one now in a preliminary design stage, also supported by UMTA. (132) Island-wide and metro area fixed guideways have been aligned to strengthen intensive-activity urban centers. (133) The most important of these is the proposed New San Juan Center, for which a development corporation already exists. This center will be developed on some 200 acres of open land in the booming Hato Rey financial and business sector of the metro area. (134) All metro centers will be serviced by a transit system utilizing light rubber-tired vehicles. This technology appears best suited for urban integration and tropical conditions. This will be demonstrated in (135) urban renewal projects focusing on transit stations, such as the one proposed for La Puntilla, an area in Old San Juan slated for development. This site borders San Juan Bay (136) where a water transit line operates. (137) The San Juan ferry system in 1970 carried three million passengers. A demonstration line is proposed by TUSCA to the site of New San Juan Center, (138) to be extended across San Jose Lagoon and to La Marina, (139) a demonstration community of 60,000 people more being planned "new town" in town. (140) Other metro areas slated for TUSCA planning include Ponce and Mayaguez. Ponce is the booming commercial and industrial center at the South Coast. (141) An exclusive bus lane plan is proposed to link with

future Islandwide transit. (142) The traffic flow of Mayaguez, a city of 100,000 on the Western edge of the Island, (143) is restricted by mountains preventing expansion. New transit is proposed. (144) All these programs call for major capital allocations. Can Puerto Rico afford it? (145) Can Puerto Rico not afford it? (146)

(147) It is going to cost 684 million dollars for the Islandwide transit system. (148) The San Juan program calls for 104 million dollars, including 54 million for waterways, 105 million for busways and 500 million dollars for the rapid transit system . . . Some 65 million are needed for the Ponce/Mayaguez programs. (149) And millions are required to create the infrastructure of 5 new communities. (150) Total TUSCA capital costs is estimated at 1.8 billion through the year 1990. (151) There is an alternative . . . to urban sprawl . . . to social disintegration . . . (152) and to environmental deterioration. (153) It is an opportunity which must not be lost. (154) It is a chance (155) to test out new communities and advanced movement system . . . (156) By implementing these programs, Puerto Rico and urbanized societies everywhere may have still other chances: to promote healthy urban growth . . . (157) to enhance the quality of life and to safeguard the natural environment . . . (158) when we do this, we will demonstrate for all men that Man is capable of becoming urbanized and remaining civilized.

(159) Credits.

(160) Blank.

We hope the presentation indicates the magnitude of Puerto Rico's transportation and land-use problems. I submit that they are the sort of problems that even transcontinental societies must seriously begin to grapple with *now*, before time and space run out.

Let me tell you about some of the technical characteristics of the transportation systems and the integrated new communities that we want to use as instruments to rationalize the urbanizing process.

The Honorable Carlos Romero-Barcelo, the Mayor of San Juan, our North Coast capital, gave you a rundown Wednesday on the Metropolitan Area transportation program.

A two-year preliminary technical study dealing with the San Juan Metro Area rapid transit system is about to be completed.

This study will examine adoption of an innovative, lightweight, automated technology, which was recommended by the Transportation Policy Committee, an inter-agency Governmental instrument of which I am a member.

We are considering rubber-tired noiseless and non-polluting vehicles capable of high-speed service that will be compatible with our insular tropical environment and with our metro and other urban centers.

We believe the aesthetics of this technology should be on a par with its efficiencies—otherwise we will continue creating systems and machines that meet technological requirements but that do *not* serve in any qualitative way the human needs of human-beings. Of course, in these cost conscious times, we cannot spurn efficiencies. Consequently, we are describing an Island-wide Transportation System that will link with urban transit systems projected for San Juan, Ponce and Mayaguez, our three major metropolitan areas.

The Island-wide System will also link our proposed new communities, which will be designed as regional growth centers aimed at conserving fast-vanishing agricultural lands, with existing urban centers.

The Island-wide System will provide competitive and reliable transportation to some three quarters of the Island's population. It will integrate with expanded bus, waterway and, of course, highway/vehicle modes.

Our studies indicate that it will be self-

liquidating, based on a preliminary fare rate of point zero three five cents (\$.035) per passenger mile.

Incorporating the latest technology advances, the Island-wide System will be designed for eventual upgrading as demand dictates.

The Island-wide and Metro Area public transit systems will be a useful tool in influencing higher-density land use and development. Transit stations, as high activity centers, will become development foci. Their placement can create totally new high density community centers or channel development into higher densities in existing centers. We are projecting some 30 or more stations to serve existing communities, and strategic location of stations to reinforce new community development, as in the case of our CIBUCO prototype community.

In a closed, limited ecosystem such as Puerto Rico, the advantage of public transit systems is immediately obvious. Transit systems will enable us to move large numbers of people with minimal impact on natural and urban environments.

Creation of new communities will provide regional growth centers which we can select in advance, rather than simply allowing our existing metro areas to sprawl and sprawl until our Island is totally urbanized.

CIBUCO, our first proposed growth center, will serve business, industrial, residential, recreational and institutional needs for some twelve thousand families in its first phase of development.

More important, it will serve as a laboratory—a pilot project—that will permit us to test and to demonstrate the use of innovative community design and development, new community organization, and modern people-goods-energy movement systems already in design and experimentation phases.

We believe new communities can pay for themselves. Income derived from land sales will offset initial site acquisition and development costs. We see the new community as a joint enterprise between Government and Private Sector builders, contractors and developers.

The possibilities are enormous. We will be glad to provide you with additional technical details in my suite this afternoon. We have some exhibits that can serve as the basis for further discussions with our technical and information people.

Let me bring my remarks to a close.

We think Puerto Rico can do the job.

The alternative to what I have described is calamity; it is a disaster that will loom more and more largely as a possibility even in transcontinental societies with their huge land reserves.

To achieve the creation of an Island-wide Transportation System integrated with other transit systems and with the projected development of new communities, the Commonwealth Government is fortunate in having a unique institutional organization, particularly in regard to its Planning Board.

Unlike the Federal Government, other National Governments or State organizations, the Planning Board is wholly responsible for all social, economic and physical planning and development in Puerto Rico.

Moreover, the Planning Board, which has the final say on all other Commonwealth agency capital improvement proposals, is also the Clearinghouse entity for all Federally-supported programs in Puerto Rico.

We are on the verge of establishing a Transportation Commission which will centralize responsibility for public transportation policies and programs within our existing Department of Public Works, pending creation of a Department of Transportation, a project that is now in our Legislature.

New Community development will be handled by our Urban Renewal and Housing Corporation and the Land Administration of Puerto Rico.

Financial elements for the TUSCA Island-wide Transportation System have been included in our just completed "National Transportation Needs Study", a D-O-T sponsored research instrument required of all the States, U.S. Territories and possessions and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

Land acquisition has been approved and is already begun for Puerto Rico's prototype new community, CIBUCO.

All these things will be coordinated with other on-going regional and Island-wide planning and development efforts dealing with a re-directed industrial location plan, a tourism development plan for our Northeast Sector, a comprehensive Southwest Sector integrated development plan and a new Island-wide housing effort.

Gentlemen, I am not advocating blue-sky boldness; I am speaking of necessity, and common sense.

We must tackle our problems in an overall, significant way. We see Puerto Rico as one integrated urban complex with vital, life-supporting agricultural greenspace.

We can no longer afford to listen to department voices with compartment wisdom, calling for this or that fragmentary minuscule program or project.

We must create—and re-create—relevant communities for human beings. If we do this, then perhaps our generations will be able to bring forth the kinds of civilizations that Mankind will be proud of.

The job begins now.

LEAD PAINT POISONING THRIVES ON ADMINISTRATION'S NEGLIGENCE

HON. ABNER J. MIKVA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 14, 1971

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, last session Congress passed an important piece of legislation, the Lead Paint Poisoning Prevention Act. With all the problems society suffers, at least this one was readily identifiable and the solution was relatively easy. But the administration has made no effort to obtain the full funds authorized under the bill in order to attack the lead paint poisoning problem. Their neglect borders on being criminal, as thousands of children continue daily to suffer irreparable brain damage from ingesting paint chips infected with lead.

A recent article in the Chicago Daily News reported new findings of lead paint poisoning among children in Aurora, Ill., a suburb of Chicago; 600 children were tested pursuant to a new State program, and 90 were found to be suffering from lead poisoning—five children severely enough to require hospitalization.

It is urgent that the law we passed last session be fully funded, so that more children can be tested and treated before irreparable damage is done.

The text of the Daily News article follows:

[From the Chicago Daily News, Aug. 3, 1971]

90 CHILDREN HIT BY LEAD POISONING

(By Lois Wille)

State public health physicians have uncovered many cases of lead poisoning among children in Aurora.

Of 600 tested last week in a new state program, 90 had high quantities of lead in their blood—probably the result of eating bits of lead-poisoned paint and plaster.

Five children were severely poisoned and sent to Cook County Hospital. One child already has suffered brain damage.

The Aurora results may mean that the brain-crippling disease is prevalent in every town with old housing, according to public health authorities.

"We've got a problem on our hands of a magnitude no one has realized," said Dr. Bruce Flashner, deputy director of the Illinois Department of Public Health.

Aurora, 45 miles west of Chicago, was the first city visited by the state testing team. It moved into Springfield on Tuesday and will cover a number of other Downstate cities.

The tests were ordered by Gov. Richard B. Ogilvie to determine the extent of lead poisoning outside of Chicago, where about 500 cases are uncovered every year in city testing programs.

In 1970, only one case of lead poisoning outside of Chicago was reported in Illinois.

The Aurora test results indicate that lead poisoning "could be one of the most critical childhood diseases," Dr. Flashner says.

"We have no idea how many children are walking around sick, anemic, unable to learn because of lead poisoning."

Aurora authorities are reluctant to accept the state's findings.

Mayor Al McCoy said he had no comment on the tests. Dr. Charles O'Connor, Aurora public health officer, called the findings "hearsay."

"Those reports haven't been re-checked," he said. "Frequently there is a laboratory error. So to make any statement now would be premature. We don't want to alarm anybody."

One reason the state testing team found such a high rate of poisoning, he said, "is the way they pick these cases to test."

The team "went into deteriorating areas" and "picked the ones they thought would be most likely," Dr. O'Connor added.

About a third of Aurora's population of 80,000 lives in aging housing, the most common source of childhood lead poisoning. Lead-based paint has not been used for interior walls for at least 30 years. If the old paint was not removed, but merely covered with non-lead paint, cracks and flakings eventually may expose the poisoned layers.

If a child nibbles lead-soaked paint and plaster chips over a period of several months, the lead is deposited in his bones and brain. Mental retardation—and death—may result.

To prevent brain damage, the poisoned child must be treated in the early stages of the disease with medication that draws the lead from his blood.

But the initial symptoms—vomiting, irritability and sleepiness—often are ignored by parents.

Dr. Flashner and other state health officials are afraid that the Aurora results mean many physicians throughout the state also are not familiar with the symptoms and the disease.

THE PRESIDENT'S ECONOMY PLAN

HON. FRANK HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 14, 1971

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following:

THE PRESIDENT'S ECONOMY PLAN

(Text of Congressman HORTON's remarks at a legislative meeting of the Newark, New York, Chamber of Commerce, August 27, 1971)

First, I want to thank you for inviting me to speak to you on Federal legislative issues of interest to businessmen in general, and

the Newark-Wayne County area in particular. As I have told Frank Russell, I have decided to spend the entire 15 minutes allotted to me to speak only about the economic situation. While there are certainly other pressing concerns before the Congress that are of interest to you, there is much that needs to be said about the economic situation in light of recent Administration policy announcements. If you do have questions or concerns in other areas, and I understand that you do, I hope we can cover those during the question period.

I will start by discussing the background which led to our economic problems, describe the problems, and then discuss in detail the actions which President Nixon has announced.

THE ECONOMY—BACKGROUND

The economic problems which America faces now did not begin at any time recently. They did not begin with the start of the Vietnam war, or with the winding down of that war. They began at the end of World War II, when our nation was thrust into a position of both military and economic leadership of the free world. Facing a growing Communist empire in the Eastern Hemisphere, and facing huge war damage and human and economic loss in the far east and in Europe, the task was left to Uncle Sam to maintain free world defenses and to rebuild the societies and the economies of war-torn nations—including both World War II enemies and allies.

The basic economic assumptions of the late 1940's and early 1950's were that America, the arsenal of democracy, had almost unlimited economic resources, unlimited gold reserves, unlimited and undamaged production capacities, and that we had a great deal to gain from rebuilding strong, free economies abroad.

We undertook the huge and successful Marshall Plan, and other economic aid programs around the world to rebuild Western Germany, Italy, England, France, the Benelux countries, Japan, the Philippines and countless other nations that had caught the brunt of World War II.

As a result, the American economy, despite short and relatively small recessions, boomed throughout the fifties and early sixties. We had a fabulous export-import ratio, and a huge balance of payments surplus. There were many years when you could travel abroad and see only U.S. made automobiles, and machinery, and other products which required a high degree of technology. For a time, we were, indeed, the supplier to the world of products of modern industry.

The post-war era had tremendous economic as well as psychological impact upon America and upon the rest of the world. For our part, we thought ourselves to be the permanent economic masters and saviors of the free world. The dollar was supreme in world transactions, and was sought after by everyone abroad from government banks to street corner vendors. American schools taught our children to think in terms of our economic supremacy as a permanent fact of life—to look upon prosperity as an American invention, as something the world could never achieve without our country's tremendous productive capacity.

These were the assumptions of the post-war era. Unfortunately, many Americans still feel these are realistic assumptions for today's world economy. I believe, and I think you will agree, that these assumptions are far outdated for purposes of realistic economic policies in the 1970's. The reason they are outdated is largely, that our post-war policies of rebuilding Japan and Europe were remarkably successful. Today, my friends, you might say that we have become the victims of our own success.

First of all, it is no longer true that we have the most modern and efficient industrial

plant in the world. While we still have the largest productive capacity, much of that capacity is inefficient and non-competitive with the modern plants we helped to build abroad. In effect, Japan, Germany, France and other nations are benefitting from the fact that their economic and productive capacity was destroyed during the war, and from the fact that they were forced to build new plants with more modern designs available in the post war period. We, on the other hand, still have a large proportion of our industry operating out of prewar, or pre-1950 facilities.

At the same time, the standard of living of the American people has risen at a fabulous rate since World War II. Our executives and our workers expect and receive a much higher real income than their counterparts abroad. While we have also enjoyed productivity growth since the war, the productivity growth abroad has grown far more rapidly than wage rates and living standards abroad, relative to our own growth.

This is a necessarily brief analysis of what led to our present economic predicament, but it is enough to explain the results we are forced to live with in the 1970's. The first result is that American economic and trade policies which have been built upon post war assumptions started to malfunction badly in the late 1960's. Our export surplus grew smaller and smaller, and has now completely evaporated. In this calendar year, America experienced its first trade deficit in nearly 100 years. Our gold reserves began dwindling badly in the early 1960's and have now reached the point where foreign claims on those reserves amount to four times the amount of gold we have left.

Because of the lower cost of producing goods abroad, many American firms have chosen to expand and modernize their productivity by building plants abroad. This trend has been significant enough to greatly reduce the growth rate of manufacturing jobs here at home, and to reduce, as well, the growth rate of local and state tax bases. These developments have not gone unnoticed by the American consumer. Not too many years ago, Americans would sneer at the words "Made in Japan." They were synonymous with poorly made, cheap merchandise. No longer. Today the Japanese are known for the quality of their electronic products, their automobiles and motorcycles and their shipbuilding. Their textiles, together with those of Hong Kong, Taiwan and Korea have taken a tremendous share of American markets. And today, Americans are beginning to look upon some American made goods as shoddy.

Yesterday it was announced that automobile sales in the Greater Rochester area for the first seven months of this year showed an increase in the sales of imported cars and a small decrease in the sales of domestic cars. In California the share of the automotive market for imports is near 40%. This, too, has cost us jobs and tax dollars, has aggravated our unemployment and poverty problems and has slowed the growth rate of American industry. Today, more than a quarter of our industrial capacity is sitting idle.

I said at the outset that the current economic crisis did not begin with the Vietnam war. This does not mean that the Vietnam war has had no impact on our current economic woes. On the contrary, our massive expenditures abroad for the Vietnam war have truly bent our economy out of shape. Vietnam is the first major war in which no attempt was made to control inflation by administration policy or regulation. Even the Korean War, which took a far smaller dollar investment and less human sacrifice than Vietnam brought with it wage and price policies. During the Korean conflict, our trade and gold positions were in very good shape, but still, wage and price controls were

applied. In Vietnam, on the contrary, our world economic position was slipping badly—but still we allowed the domestic economy to float free, as though it was unconnected to the amounts we were spending abroad, and the amounts we were spending on defense—over \$80 billion in 1968 alone.

While our guns and butter policies of the mid and late 1960's were not a total failure, they failed to take account of the degree to which our prosperity depended on continued vast military and space expenditures. Just as the Vietnam war slowly crept up on us—growing from a brushfire conflict in a far off land to a major international tragedy, so, also, did the economic realities of that war creep up on American policymakers and the American people.

The winding down of the Vietnam war has served to uncover basic weaknesses which existed in our economy during the peak years of the war—weaknesses, which because of the tremendous amount of war production, did not cause unemployment or recession until after the war started to cool-down.

Beginning more than 18 months ago, I have been critical of the fact that there was virtually no planning done by the Federal government for economic conversion from wartime to peacetime industry. Thousands of manufacturing jobs have been lost in electronics, aerospace and munitions industries which, if there had been conversion and priorities planning, could have almost immediately have been channeled into domestic needs for high-technology products. There is no reason, for example, that many of the General Dynamics jobs lost locally could not have gone into production of items related to urban mass transit, health, pollution, crime control, and modular housing. But the government priorities and programs needed to make this possible were not there in time, and are not there now. The result is a tremendous unemployment rate among highly skilled, technical and scientific workers.

While conversion planning, timed to coincide with the wind-down of the Vietnam war would have helped ease the current crisis, it could not have changed the overall international facts that I have already referred to. All of you know that I have been crusading for a reordering of Federal priorities since 1965. Some reordering has begun in the past two fiscal years, but not nearly enough to absorb the impact of the reduction of war and space production and expenditures. Only two months ago were the first hearings held on a major industrial conversion bill which I and others have sponsored for the past three years.

The fear of many business, labor and political leaders today is that the American economy is in danger of becoming a service-oriented economy rather than primarily a production and manufacturing economy. This trend has very serious consequences for the long-run future of America, and for the prosperity of the American people.

Since late 1969, the greater Rochester area has lost over 17,000 manufacturing jobs, with the promise of more to come. A great proportion of these displaced workers have been already absorbed into the government sector of the economy, and into the service industries of the private sector. But I'm not sure we should be satisfied with putting more and more people to work in government programs. Nor should we be satisfied to take unemployed scientists, engineers and production workers and put them to work servicing Toyotas, SONY TV sets and other foreign made goods. I think the national consensus would be that we want to fix what is wrong with our economic policies and assure our future as a producing nation.

All of us understand that local economic problems are even more complex than the national economic problems we face. We know that even the most far-sighted Ad-

ministration and Congressional actions cannot completely solve the problems we face in New York State. We realize that our state has a history of being among the most prosperous in the nation, but that it also has far more than its share of costly urban problems. This has put us, for more reasons than one, into a poor competitive position with other states in the race to attract new industry and hold existing industry. Thus, even if we can put our economic house in order in terms of national and international perspectives, there will be a major task ahead for state and local governments, and for businessmen at the local level, to improve the competitive standing of Newark, the Rochester area, and the State of New York as a whole.

NIXON ECONOMIC POLICIES

On August 15, President Nixon shook the nation into a sudden awareness of the economic position we are in, and into an awareness of the fact that post-war economic assumptions about America's role in the world must be changed, and changed quickly, if we are to salvage our economic leadership of the free world and the health of our economy at home.

I think it was a necessity for the President to allow the dollar to float free in world currency markets, and to apply the 10 percent import surcharge to foreign goods. For too long, we have been the only major producing nation to pursue policies of free trade. Almost all of our major trading partners have followed free trade on some items, and have held their protectionist shields high to protect certain segments of their domestic economies. Thus, our automotive products are particularly barred from Japan, our agricultural products are held at bay from the European Common Market by protectionist policies. My position has been that free trade is healthier than protectionism in the long run for the American economy—but that free trade must be a two-way street. We can no longer afford to be the international patsy in the name of free trade. We must help some of our domestic industries which are most drastically affected by imports until equitable and mutual free trade policies can be agreed upon. One need only look at the clothing industry in Rochester, and compare it with its employment levels of 10 years ago to see the problems that these one-sided free trade policies have caused for us.

Many of you have followed in the press the reactions of our trading partners to the 10 percent import surcharge and the release of the dollar from the gold standard. While some of the comments have been understandably harsh, no wave of retaliation has followed the President's announcement.

I think this is because the President instituted wage and price controls at home simultaneously with his international economic moves. If he had tried to float the dollar and apply the surcharge without asking any sacrifice from Americans at home, I doubt very much whether we would achieve anything but angry retaliation from our trading partners abroad, and this retaliation, if it came, could have the effect of cancelling out any economic advantage we gain from devaluation of the dollar and application of the temporary import surcharge.

My own suspicion is that the President sees the import surcharge as a way to accomplish a realistic valuation of the dollar in relation to foreign currencies. If he can achieve a 10 or 12 per cent devaluation, making our goods that much cheaper abroad and foreign goods that much more expensive here at home, a permanent 10% surcharge may not be needed to make our products more

competitive. The surcharge is a signal to other countries, however, that if no devaluation comes, he is willing and able to impose unilateral import controls. Once a revaluation of foreign currencies is accomplished, there will be great foreign pressure to remove the 10% surcharge, and there will also be great political pressure here at home to keep the surcharge permanently.

The wage and price controls have caused a flurry of reaction in different sectors of the economy. The primary concerns that have been expressed are that this sudden announcement fell unfairly on certain sectors of the economy. Teachers, landlords and organized labor have complained the loudest about unfairness. While some compromises are probably in the wind to make the effect of the freeze fall more evenly on all Americans, I think that the overwhelming weight of public opinion is in favor of the freeze.

The President was first given the authority to impose wage and price controls in July 1970, when Congress passed an amendment to the Defense Production Act of 1950. I supported this amendment and the bill itself, but I opposed a motion that was made during the debate that would have mandated a wage-price freeze at levels prevailing on May 25, 1970. That motion was rejected by a vote of 11 yeas to 270 nays, reflecting an overwhelming judgment that the country was not ready to accept controls a year ago.

This year, in March, the wage-price control authority was extended in Public Law 92-15. I supported this extension of Presidential authority which is effective through March 31, 1973.

The wage-price freeze has generated much speculation about what will happen after the 90-days expire. Will the freeze be extended? Will selective controls be kept in effect? Will we go back to strong jawboning policies without controls?

Despite the fact that Commerce Secretary Stans has called for an extension of the freeze, I don't think anyone can honestly predict what will happen on November 12th. Several factors are to be kept in mind, however, that will be used to make the final decision.

First, if the controls are effective in holding our rate of inflation for 1971 to between 4 and 5%, as compared with the 6 or 7% of the past 18 months, this would provide some impetus to lift the freeze at least partially.

Another key factor will be the psychological effect of the President's economic moves on the American public. As you know, the American consumer has been salting away savings at an abnormally high rate—thus keeping a heavy lid on demand for consumer products. If the public gains increased confidence in our economy and begins to spend more for durable goods and housing, I think a large measure of the President's goal in applying the freeze will have been accomplished. We will not know this, however, until sometime in October.

Another factor the President will consider is the reaction of Congress to his requests for changes in tax laws that are part and parcel of his new economic program. I urged that the increase in the personal exemption and standard income tax deduction be accelerated to January 1, 1972 several months before the President's announcement. There is a possibility that Congress will go even further to provide tax relief to low and middle income Americans, to go hand-in-hand with the major tax relief that he is seeking for business.

I predict no real problem with the lifting of the 7% auto excise tax as of August 15th. Stimulus to the auto, steel and allied industries is a central part of the President's effort to revitalize manufacturing in America.

I have also long supported reinstating the investment tax credit. The President has proposed a one year 10% credit, as opposed to the

7% credit that Congress instituted at the request of President Kennedy in the early 1960's. However, I have one very major concern about the investment credit. It should not be available as a write off for capital investments in production facilities outside the United States. There is no sense encouraging more American investment in production facilities abroad at this time, when the need is to modernize the efficiency of our industrial plant at home, and to create more manufacturing jobs.

In addition to the President's tax reform proposals, I favor additional tax adjustments for small businessmen. I spent the first part of this Congressional recess holding Small Business Committee hearings in the Western States. The situation of small businessmen there and here in my own Congressional District gives me great concern that there be more Federal encouragement for the growth of existing small businesses and the creation of new ones. It is significant that many of the General Dynamics employees in the Greater Rochester area have found positions with new smaller businesses in the electronics field. While these new businesses have been helped by Small Business Loans, I think public policies should offer even more incentives for new businesses. I am aware that the SBA District Director was in Newark Wednesday, discussing the impact of the Newark Urban Renewal program on some 97 small businesses in this community. I want to be sure that the end result of this program is beneficial to Newark not only in terms of the appearance of downtown Newark, but also in terms of your economic situation.

There are also other factors that will help to determine the future of Administration economic policies, not the least of which is the shadow of the Presidential elections in 1972. There is certain to be more extended and partisan debate over these tax proposals, particularly in the Senate, where so many in the majority party are running for higher office.

Further, it should be kept in mind that the strong opposition of organized labor to the President's policies will be fought out on the floors of the House and Senate. While I predict that the Democratic Congress, in the end, will cooperate with the President in trying to reshape the economy, and to rewrite post-war economic assumptions, you can be sure that Congressional leaders will take pains to see that what Congress does will not appear to be a rubber stamping of the President's proposals.

Against this background, it is also important to keep in mind that the South Vietnamese election, if you can call it that, will be held during this 90-day period. The President has already indicated that he will make his next withdrawal announcements on Vietnam on November 15th. These factors could also affect the mood in Congress when the economic program is considered.

I am very concerned about the possibility that partisanship could stand in the way of economic progress at this very serious juncture in our history. What is called for here is, very simply, an attitude of sacrifice and selflessness on the part of every American, Republican and Democrat, executive and wage-earner. We are in the process of trying to bring the role of America around, both militarily and economically, to the realities of the 1970's. If we, as a nation, can take a united stand, dedicated to accomplishing this important adjustment, we can succeed. We can all find fault with one aspect of the President's policy or another. As a Congressman, it is my responsibility to analyze, comment on and make judgments on these issues. But this must not be done in a negative or selfish spirit. We will never know if President Nixon's policies will work unless we—all of us—give them a chance to work. To me, and I have been concerned with

these problems for so long, it is significant that an American President has done something to make right the distorted economic picture at home and abroad. We had all better realize that we are in a very, very crucial period of our nation's history, that all is not well with our economy, and that the way to correct the problems we have is to work toward a national improvement, even if that means putting aside some personal goals or gains for a short time. We cannot rewrite 25 years of history in 90 days, but we can make a very significant start if we can achieve full cooperation of every American.

THE PRESIDENT'S NEW ECONOMIC POLICY

HON. DAVID R. OBEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 14, 1971

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, Lane Kirkland, as many Members of this body know, is a progressive and farsighted leader of the American labor movement. Mr. Kirkland is secretary-treasurer of the AFL-CIO and recently spoke to the International Brotherhood of Pulp, Sulphite, and Paper Mill Workers of the United States and Canada.

That union, despite obvious short-term risks to its own interests, has been outspoken in its efforts to support pollution cleanup, recognizing that in the long run all Americans can only benefit from a clean environment.

On September 1, Mr. Kirkland addressed the Pulp, Sulphite, and Paper Mill Workers convention at the Queen Elizabeth Hotel in Montreal. The subject of his address was the President's new economic policy. Mr. Kirkland's speech sums up well some of the objections made to the unbalanced approach taken by the President in several areas of his new program. One need not agree with every point made by Mr. Kirkland to recognize the essential justice of many of his observations. Part of the President's recommendations included a cut-back in spending for several Federal programs. Mr. Kirkland's speech cogently sums up the injustice that would be done to the poor and the underprivileged if in the name of inflation this Government reduces its efforts to provide the schools, the hospitals, the parks, and housing and the waste disposal systems needed while at the same time continuing to lavish funds on less potentially productive areas of the economy.

I insert Mr. Kirkland's speech in the Record at this point:

ADDRESS DELIVERED BY AFL-CIO SECRETARY-TREASURER LANE KIRKLAND

SEPTEMBER 1, 1971.

I am very glad to be with you today and to bring to all of the members of this international union the greetings and fraternal good wishes of the AFL-CIO.

That you are meeting here in Montreal is a testament to the unity of interests and aspirations of all free workers on this Continent, as in the world at large.

The lives and fortunes of workers of both our nations are intertwined, and today America's economic jam is a major problem, not just of the U.S., but of the Western world.

When President Nixon took office in January 1969, he inherited a strong and productive economy. There had been an eight-year period of economic expansion. The unemployment rate was 3.4 percent, the lowest in 15 years.

Mr. Nixon had based the domestic aspects of his campaign for the presidency on one major issue: the dangers of inflation. He argued that the inflation rate of 4.2 percent then existing was too high, and he promised to control inflation and stabilize the economy without unfairly burdening any one group.

He emphasized that he intended to avoid increasing unemployment. He promised, in fact, to take steps that would create five million new jobs.

After moving into the White House, he reiterated that pledge, in a letter to the AFL-CIO Executive Council, saying he would curb inflation "without asking wage earners to pay for stability with their jobs."

Well, there are not five million new jobs. There are five million workers unemployed. 14½ million Americans are on the welfare rolls. 25½ million citizens of the richest nation on earth are living in poverty. Because of Mr. Nixon's economic mismanagement, more than 800 American communities are economic disaster areas. Industrial production is 27 percent below capacity.

At the same time, instead of reducing inflation, Mr. Nixon's policies actually accelerated it. The 4.2 inflation rate rose to 5.4 percent in 1969, Mr. Nixon's first year in office. The second year it climbed to 5.9 percent. And the end is not in sight.

Contrary to Mr. Nixon's pledge, the burden of both inflation and recession has not been equal. It has fallen on the poor, on pensioners, on wage earners and on state and local governments.

There has been no recession for bankers and giant corporations. The rich have had no trouble insulating themselves against inflation, and sheltering themselves from taxation.

For the last 2½ years America's wealth has been steadily concentrated in fewer and fewer hands. The rich are getting richer, while the number of those below the poverty line has grown.

Because Mr. Nixon's tight-money policy drove interest rates to the highest level in a century, bank after bank has reported increases of 15 to 20 percent in its profit rates.

And because the higher cost of doing business was quickly passed along to consumers, corporate earnings reports averaged 10 percent higher during the first half of 1971 than the year before.

Yet Mr. Nixon's new, improved game plan—his solution to the economic mess he has created—is to make those profits larger still.

On August 15 President Nixon suddenly unveiled a New Economic Policy whose net effect, in our opinion, can only intensify and increase the damage already done.

On August 19, after careful analysis of the President's new economic game plan, the AFL-CIO Executive Council declared that labor has no confidence in President Nixon's ability to manage the economy of the United States for the benefit of the majority of America's citizens.

Mr. Nixon was empowered by Congress to take certain actions to control the economy, to allocate credit to channel investment toward constructive enterprises, instead of speculative ones.

But he has been highly selective in his use of those powers. Prices are frozen at the highest levels in history, and there is no effective machinery for preventing them from rising still higher in many cases. Wages are frozen at a real earnings level below that of 1968. And the businessmen who write the

paychecks can be relied upon to see that the wage freeze is applied vigorously.

But there is no freeze at all on interest rates, corporate profits, bank profits or capital gains. There is no freeze on dividends; merely a pious hope that they will not be raised. There is no freeze on land speculation or stock market profiteering.

Many times, starting in 1966, the AFL-CIO has declared that if extraordinary stabilization measures were found necessary, labor would cooperate fully, as long as such measures were applied fairly on all sectors of the economy.

We have said repeatedly that we would make whatever sacrifices were necessary, as long as they were necessary, so long as there was equality of sacrifice. And we never left a moment's doubt that any test of equality would have to apply to interest rates, dividends, profits, and the prices of all goods and services, as well as to wages and salaries. Our pledge still stands. And we are still insisting on even-handedness.

And that is why we told the President that we will not cooperate with his new game plan; that we will not help him to place the American worker in a strait-jacket, for the benefit of corporate enterprise. He exacts too much from too many, and gives too much to too few. Consider his tax giveaway plan:

He has asked Congress to grant tax credits amounting to 10 percent of the cost of all the new equipment industry may buy, in addition to a tax giveaway already granted in the form of rapid depreciation allowances. And this, remember, at a time when industry can find no use for 27 percent of the productive capacity it already has.

To call this scheme a "job-creation tax credit" adds insult to injury. Industry's capital investment is aimed at eliminating jobs through automation, not at creating jobs.

So this is a trickle-down scheme that won't even drip. It is designed to give huge sums in public funds to those who need it the least, at the expense of those who need it the most.

Mr. Nixon plans to cut federal employment by five per cent across the board. He is fighting unemployment by wiping out about 140,000 jobs, and reducing government services to the American people.

Mr. Nixon is backing out of his pledge of federal aid to the states and cities at a time when the need is greatest. For 2½ years high interest rates and high welfare costs have been swallowing up local and state tax revenues. For 2½ years states and local communities have been unable to move on badly needed housing and hospital and school projects. Public services are declining. Teachers are joining the unemployment lines. Police and fire and sanitation departments are undermanned, underequipped and underpaid. At least one city—Hamtramck, Michigan—has been forced to declare itself bankrupt.

But because of his solicitude for corporations, Mr. Nixon has changed his mind about helping the states and cities. He doesn't even show any sign of releasing the \$12 billion Congress has already appropriated for public projects.

Mr. Nixon has also changed his mind about welfare reform. If there ever was a time to bring order to the chaos of America's crazy quilt pattern of welfare programs, it is now. But Mr. Nixon counsels more delay.

Mr. Nixon's 10 per cent border tax does not address itself at all to the real source of America's trade problems: the manipulations of multinational corporations and international banks, mostly based in the United States, that are exporting U.S. money, technology and jobs to the four corners of the world.

Their only goal is to produce where wages

are low and sell where prices are high. They are managing international trade by their own rules, for their own benefit. Their operations do next to nothing to help the Taiwanese or Korean or Mexican worker, whose tiny wages will never allow him to buy the things he makes. But they are destroying the earning power of U.S. workers and steadily eroding the U.S. standard of living. They are doing this with the aid and encouragement of the United States government because of trade policies that have stood still for decades while the conditions of world trade changed completely. But Mr. Nixon shows no sign of wanting to bring them into line with the conditions that actually exist.

We in the AFL-CIO are not isolationists or protectionists. We want more trade, not less. Our goal is to raise the wages and the standard of living of workers all around the world, so that the good things this world offers may be shared and exchanged among men and nations on a fair, equal and mutual basis. We do not favor the concept of exporting our recessions by high tariff barriers which can only reduce the volume of trade, consumption and living standards.

The trade unions of America stand, as they were created to do, in the defense of the rights of working people. We have not surrendered—and we never will surrender—the goal of continual economic and social progress for those who produce the nation's goods, who build its structure and who do its work. We shall not help to make the rope or forge the chains of economic repressions, nor shall we offer anything but resistance to the proposition that labor must be held back, so that profiteers may move ahead.

We will not acquiesce to any scheme designed to enrich the fortunate few at the expense of the many. We will insist, as we always have insisted, that the economy of the United States be made to operate for the benefit of all the people of the United States.

In the face of President Nixon's callous promotion of private profit at the expense of the public interest, we have called upon Congress to take those steps required to meet the real needs of all the people.

The needs of the United States are public needs. There is a backlog of unfinished business that will require the full use of the giant industrial capacity of the United States and the full employment of every worker, as far ahead as anyone can see.

The United States needs schools and hospitals, parks and recreation areas.

She needs a vast expansion of medical facilities and medical personnel.

She needs 25 million new housing units for its citizens who are now forced to live in squalor.

She needs new and efficient low-cost transit systems in every major city.

She needs new waste-disposal systems, new technology and new hardware to extract poisons from the air, the water and the soil.

These needs have been neglected too long. They can and will be met, when the public demands that our idle industrial capacity and unused manpower be marshalled to meet those public needs. Only the government can set the priorities and provide the necessary planning and financing to do that.

So, above all, the United States needs leadership. She needs an Administration that can do more than divert public funds into private pockets. She needs an administration that cares about human beings. And we in labor intend to see that she gets what she needs.

In this last third of the 20th century, the labor movement stands virtually alone as the only major force still united and still fighting for the American dream, still insisting on the rights of individual men and women

to share in the abundance and the opportunity that America promises.

The labor movement is in good shape. It is united as never before on its fundamental aims and goals. And so is labor's political arm, COPE.

Over the next 14 months COPE will be conducting the greatest political education and voter registration drive ever mounted.

The energies and resources of every union and every union member will be needed as never before. Our task will be to see that the United States has, as its elected officials, men and women of vision whose goal is to build their country and who put the interests of all the people above private greed.

I am sure that the members of the Pulp and Sulphite Workers Union in the United States will do their part.

Thank you for inviting me to participate in this Convention. And good luck to every one of you.

THE NORTHERN IRELAND SITUATION: A REPORT, NO. 1

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 14, 1971

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, the situation in Northern Ireland grows increasingly worse. With the use of the Special Powers Act, which permits imprisonment of civilians without charging them with a specific crime, reports of torture and abuse have begun to pour out of the prisons.

My daughter, Jacqueline Biaggi, and one of my New York staff aides, Carol Nolan, agreed to visit Northern Ireland on my behalf during their recent vacation trip to Europe. The reports they have brought back are shocking. Oppression is rampant throughout Northern Ireland. The press of that province devotes scant attention to the real problems of discrimination and abuse that occur under their noses.

In order to bring this problem into sharp focus for my colleagues in Congress, and hopefully to gain action by this body on my resolution calling for a plebiscite of all the Irish people on the question of unification, I am going to begin a series of statements today describing the shameful goings-on in Northern Ireland. I commend these pieces to each of you and hope in reading them you will learn as I have that Northern Ireland must be freed of its bonds and be reunited with the south.

One of the most distressing aspects of the implementation of the Special Powers Act is the abuses that are perpetrated against those citizens gathered up in the British soldiers' dragnet. Their gestapo-like tactics of night raids and arrests and physical torture are an insult to all humanity.

The Association for Legal Justice of Northern Ireland has been keeping records on the arrests and treatment of various citizens. To make manifestly clear the vicious oppression that is rampant in Northern Ireland, I am going to insert three of these affidavits at this point in the Record. I am sure you will agree that such a mockery of human rights must be stopped.

The articles follow:

ASSOCIATION FOR LEGAL JUSTICE, INTERNATIONAL—NORTHERN IRELAND 1971 REPORT ON ARREST, INTERROGATION AND TREATMENT OF: GERARD McERLEAN

Age: 19 years.

Occupation: Apprentice.

On Monday August 9, 1971, at 4:30 a.m. soldiers broke into my home and ran upstairs. They woke me and my brother up and told us to come with them. I dressed quickly in trousers, pullover, shoes (no socks.) They pulled me by the arm downstairs and put me sitting in a lorry. My brother was forced to lie down.

We were taken through a Protestant district to Paulette Avenue Barracks and made to sit on the floor. I was given a blanket. About half an hour later the blanket was taken away and I was taken with five other prisoners and four soldiers on a lorry through Protestant areas. We were subjected to obscenities and threats, e.g. "If the barracks is full we'll have to shoot this lot."

At Girdwood Army Barracks we were lined up outside on wet pavements and had our shoes removed. After about half an hour we got inside and six R.U.C. men took down my personal details and six Military Policemen photographed us. The R.U.C. took my personal belongings, including my belt.

I was taken to a large gym where there was a large number of men sitting on the floor. I also sat there and was not allowed to smoke, talk or move.

About 3/4 of an hour later I was taken with five others to a lawn in a helicopter. I was forced down on all fours and accompanied by two Military Policemen with batons and one R.U.C. man behind I was trailed across a field and a concrete area. They shouted: "crawl like a dog, you bastard; you are a dog." They also batoned me. I got my feet cut and knee bruised. I was put in the helicopter and thrown out almost immediately, and dragged on all fours back to the gym. There I was seated on the floor.

About 1/2 an hour later my name was called by a member of the Special Branch. I was taken to a room and questioned by two Special Branch men. I was then taken upstairs to another hall and made to sit on the floor.

A Padre came in accompanied by an officer in the Military Police. The Officer said: "Anyone who wishes may see the Padre by giving his name to the Sergeant." The Padre said: "I am Fr. Kenny, a Roman Catholic priest, anyone who wants to see me may do so." I was disgusted to see a priest mixed up in this brutality. Later he seemed to laugh at us as we were forced across the obstacle course.

After an hour I was taken downstairs and given a sack with my belongings. I was then forced to run fast in my bare feet across an obstacle course with stumps of trees, sharp stones, broken glass, tacks. I was accompanied by Military Police with dogs barking. As I went through a pile or garbage they said: "Go on, you're only garbage."

I entered Crumlin Prison through a hole in the wall. I was taken to a cell with two others. It had two beds and one mattress. I was given food which I couldn't eat. Later I was taken to a cell with one other man.

On Tuesday, August 10 I was kept in the cell all day and given prison meals. In the evening I was taken downstairs, got my belongings and put on my shoes. I was raced across the field with ten others to Girdwood Barracks accompanied by Military Policemen with dogs.

In Girdwood we were taken to a room with seats and allowed to smoke. An officer in the Military Police gave us a lecture about behaviour. He said: "If we call in your homes after dark and you are not in, you will be in trouble. You can get directions for getting home from the Military Police. It's 'hot' in town tonight. When approaching an army

barrier walk in the middle of the road with hands up."

I was then photographed in a group with about 18 others. A Military Policeman who previously was very brutal said: "Thank you for posing; does anyone need footwear?" We were marched to the gate.

The sentry said: "You blokes aren't going out there! There's a — war on out there." We were forced back by other Military policemen onto Clifton Park Avenue at about 11:30 p.m. The bullets were flying. Seven of us made our way to the Imperial Hotel, Cliftonville Road. We stayed the night and got home by taxi on Wednesday morning, August 11.

As a result of my treatment I have cuts and abrasions on my feet and knees. I am afraid to go out at night. Soldiers and police terrify me. My mother is on sedative since.

I have seen my doctor and I shall be off work for two weeks, lose my wages, and will be unable to contribute to the upkeep of the home.

To the best of my knowledge the information which I have given above is a true and accurate account of what happened.

Signature Gerard McErean.

Witness Rev. Brian J. Brady.

Date August 13, 1971.

ASSOCIATION FOR LEGAL JUSTICE, INTERNMENT—N. IRELAND, 1971, REPORT ON ARREST, INTERROGATION AND TREATMENT OF: JAMES MAGILTON

Age: 60.

Occupation: Mechanical Clerk of Works with Building Design Partnerships.

Health: Diabetic, Hypertension, 2 minor strokes.

On August 13, 1971, at 5 a.m. soldiers hammered at my door. My wife opened it and soldiers met me on the stairs. I was dressed in pants, undershirt, pullover, shoes without socks. The soldiers began to search. They found one old radio receiver from my former days as a ham radio operator. In order to avoid a search which might ransack the house, I told them I had a licensed pistol and a licensed rifle the licenses being at the moment renewed at R.U.C. Barracks, Springfield Rd. The soldiers went almost berserk, and said I had been sniping. They also said "this is all we want, we've got you now." They refused to listen to my explanation that the articles were licensed.

They took me out in a saracen on the Falls Road (almost 400 yards). There I was savagely beaten by soldiers and military police with fists, batons, rifle butts and kicked. On the journey with John Murphy, a neighbour, I was given occasional blows by fists.

When I arrived at Girdwood Barracks I was thrown out of the jeep and made to crawl on all fours into the corridor. I was abused physically while I crawled. My hair was pulled.

I was placed against a wall with finger tips only giving me support. Military police kicked my shins and I fell flat on my face. This action was repeated several times with the variation of punches to the stomach and kicks to the shins. I don't remember how often. They tested me with the "gally sniffer" and the results were negative.

I was taken immediately for interrogation by two Special Branch men. They gave me a cup of tea heavily sugared. As a diabetic I refused it. They sent for an army sergeant who first took me to a doctor and who later promised to get my tablets from the house. I was merely questioned about licenses for my guns and radio got absolutely no abuse from the Special Branch men. The sergeant returned and he said that the tablets were unobtainable. I learned later that they hadn't come to my home, they had contacted my doctor.

After this I was taken to the gym and seated in a chair in the middle of the gym with 14-20 others widely spaced, also seated on chairs. I sat there staring ahead. Talk was not allowed. The Army sergeant came with my tablets and I took two and water. Another military policeman gave me a blanket for my shoulders. The Army sergeant came back and asked to be notified immediately if I felt any diabetic symptoms. He offered me a cigarette which I refused although I am a chain smoker. I did this as I was sickened and disgusted at my own treatment and the treatment of others. I was told that contacts were being made with Police Officers who know me as a competitor in shooting competitions and whose names I gave during interrogation.

I was taken to another room and given the parafin test on my hands and face for evidence of recent use of guns. I hadn't fired a shot for over two months due to the disturbed situation. (Fortwilliam Rifle and Pistol Club.)

I was taken back to the gym. Some time later the sergeant said confirmation of licenses and Gun Club Membership was being confirmed.

I had a second interrogation a little later re name, address and personal details. I was asked to sign the answers. It was read to me as I couldn't read without my glasses and I signed it.

A sergeant gave me back my pocketbook and small change. He told me my guns would be given back later. I was taken in a jeep and left at Beechmount Avenue, about 200 yards from my home. A neighbour—Marie McNeill met me and was horrified at my condition. I was hardly able to walk. My pullover was torn and my pants were dirty. She asked two men to carry me home. I got in about 1 p.m. to my own home.

My wife sent for Dr. Jim Ryan who examined me and took details of my multiple bruises and abrasions. He has been my doctor since 1934 and only yesterday did he realize that I was a Protestant living in a totally Catholic neighborhood. The one and only time I was ever beaten was on August 12, 1971, and that was by the British Army. Today I am confined to bed unable to walk and I don't know when I shall be able to.

I am a diabetic and suffer from hypertension. About a year ago I had two minor strokes and was confined to bed for a month. I have since been attending clinics of Dr. Boyle in the Royal Victoria Hospital. I am on constant medication for both complaints.

To the best of my knowledge the information which I have given above is a true and accurate account of what happened.

Signature J. Magilton.

Witness Rev. B. J. Brady.

ASSOCIATION FOR LEGAL JUSTICE, INTERNMENT—N. IRELAND, 1971, REPORT ON ARREST, INTERROGATION AND TREATMENT OF JOSEPH HUGHES

Age: 45, father of 10 children—Ages 3-19.

On Monday August 9, 1971 at about 4 a.m. my wife heard shouts and the door being broken down. There were 8 soldiers there. She woke me. She preceded me downstairs and was butted by a rifle in the stomach. My daughter Geraldine (16) was struck on the head with a baton. The officer in charge kept repeating, "Hugh Joseph Hughes" (not my name). Another said, "let's have him." The soldiers were agitated and in a hurry and kept saying, "the women will be out any moment."

I was pulled by the hair on to the street, batoned on the head and kicked on the leg. I was then forced to run 400 yards in my bare feet to a truck.

The children upstairs panicked and screamed as I was rushed off. My wife was butted with a rifle as she protested to the soldiers.

I was transferred to a lorry, made to be face down on the floor, covered with blankets and struck with rifles. There were other detainees in the lorry, some lying on top of each other.

The lorry drove off to collect other detainees. We reached Girdwood Army Barracks about 7 a.m. I was pushed off the lorry and onto the ground. I was put into a room and interrogated, (name, address, politics etc.) During the morning a number of detainees were maltreated by the army in full view of the police.

About 12 noon I was removed to Crumlin Road jail. There were two other detainees in the cell, one was taken away later. I was kept there until Tuesday night 10 August at 11 p.m. I was finally released at 11.45 p.m. I was refused transport home and had to go up Cliftonville Road, while there was a lot of shooting in the vicinity.

My specific complaints are:—

1. *Injuries to myself:*
 - (a) From batoning
 - (b) A severe stomach wound inflicted by a soldier with his gun when on the lorry
 - (c) Blisters on my heels and feet from forcible exercise over the obstacle course
 - (d) An army injury received when I refused to sing "The Queen"
 - (e) Wounds on hands and legs from kicks
2. *Obscene language—e.g.*
 - (a) On the obstacle course "Run and train like soldiers, you bastards."
 - (b) In the lorry, "Your Virgin Mary was the biggest whore in Bethlehem."
 - (c) Also in the lorry, "Sure they are all the Pope's bastards."
3. *Injuries to my family:*

A horrible experience for my children. My wife and daughter Geraldine were physically assaulted and have had nightmares since.

To the best of my knowledge the information which I have given above is a true and accurate account of what happened.

Signature Joseph Hughes.
Witness Rev. Brian J. Brady.
Date August 15, 1971.

CORRECTIONS TO COUGHLIN POLL ON MAJOR ISSUES

HON. R. LAWRENCE COUGHLIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 14, 1971

Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, I inserted the results of a poll of citizens of Pennsylvania's 13th Congressional District in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of September 9, 1971. Because of several mistakes, I am inserting the corrected material today so the results will be accurate in every respect.

The corrections:

Twenty-five percent approve of staged withdrawal contingent upon a stable South Vietnamese Government able to defend itself successfully. Thirteen percent wrote "immediate withdrawal" while another 5 percent want resumption of bombing and increased military pressure on North Vietnam. Five percent wrote in varying responses.

The results are:

1. Which best expresses your position on Vietnam? (one only):

Staged withdrawal of our troops contingent upon a stable South Vietnamese government able to defend itself successfully, 25 percent.

Withdraw within a specified time contingent only upon the release of our prisoners and safe return of our personnel, 52 percent.

Resume bombing and increase military pressure on North Vietnam, 5 percent.

Immediate withdrawal (written in), 13 percent.

None of above (specify), 5 percent.

2. Which best expresses your feelings about our troop commitment to Western Europe? (one only):

Unilaterally reduce number of our troops, 29 percent.

Reduce troops according to negotiations with NATO allies and Soviet Union, 58 percent.

Maintain present levels, 13 percent.

THE OLD: DOES ANYBODY CARE?

HON. WILLIAM L. SPRINGER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 14, 1971

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, one of the largest and more seriously afflicted minority groups in this country is our aged poor.

There are now around 20 million persons 65 years of age and older in the United States.

A large proportion of them—probably as many as 40 percent—have poverty level incomes.

Of aged persons living alone, 55 percent live in poverty. Every fourth household in poverty, according to the latest estimate, is that of an aged person living alone.

What is more, our elderly population is rapidly increasing. The number of persons 65 and older almost doubled between 1940 and 1963, increasing from 9 million to 17.6 million, and continues to rise.

As many of my colleagues know, I have long been concerned by what I consider to be a deplorable lack of knowledge about this very large segment of our population. For instance, very little is known about the aging process itself and the ills that accompany it. For that reason, I introduced last February a bill, H.R. 3336, to create a National Institute of Gerontology to explore all facets of the aging process and to study special health problems and requirements of our senior citizens.

As evidence of the growing public interest and concern about this matter, I include in extension of my remarks the first of a series of eight articles collectively entitled "The Old: Does Anybody Care?" recently published by the Champaign, Ill., News-Gazette beginning August 29, 1971. They were written by Carol Ann Smith, a law student at the University of Illinois. She has treated this important subject with rare perception and warm compassion.

I know these articles will be of great value to us as we consider legislative proposals bearing on the problems of the aged. The other articles in this series will appear in successive issues of the RECORD.

The article follows:

THE OLD: DOES ANYBODY CARE?

(By Carol Ann Smith)

She rises early each day, often at 5 a.m. It takes her awhile, she says, to get everything going.

Most days she wears a cotton wash dress, its geometrics or flowers fading and sometimes patched here and there. But the dress is always starched. There are old shoes—she can't remember when she had new ones—and a comb stuck in her darkly gray hair.

Her home is old—uneven linoleum floors, souvenir teacups, braided rugs, old birthday cards, artificial flowers, family pictures, old lacy curtains. You could, as they say, eat off the floors—the house is so clean.

Petunias grow in front of the house in late summer. In the springtime there are crocuses, lilacs, violets, then iris and peonies and roses, and then a host of flowers and vines known only to gardeners. She knows them all—and all their quirky growth habits and needs.

She fights weeds with a determination bordering on declared warfare. "Those dratted things will run everything out," she mutters as her hands jab and poke at the ground. Out back on the edge of her tiny lot is a garden—lush this year, producing green beans (enough to can 42 quarts), beets, tomatoes, potatoes.

She is after the weeds out there too, bent over for hours until the heat drives her to more sheltered pursuits.

On Saturday afternoon and evening she devotes herself with single-minded concentration on her Bible and Sunday School lesson, because on Sunday she will dress for church. Hat, gloves, jewelry and a good dress. A friend in the neighborhood calls for her faithfully and she will go unless her knees and back refuse to cooperate or if she has a cold, which now will linger for weeks.

She can't remember when she was "downtown" last, but she knows what "that stupid city council" is doing because she reads her newspaper column by column. People, she says, "spend money like they had it" and government is the biggest offender of the lot.

She is virtually fearless, throwing the neighbors into shock when she crawled out a second floor window onto the roof of the front porch to supervise in her stocking feet the work of a painter.

And her advice to a young friend embarking on a new career was simple. "You just go up there and sock it to 'em."

On Feb. 24, 1971, she was 90 years old. She has buried her husband and two of her sons and she has taken to beginning sentences with "If I'm still alive . . ." She discusses her arthritis, a disease which stoops her a little more each year, with the detachment reserved for an enemy which causes pain but which will never go away. Death, even her death, is a fact of life.

Winter is her enemy's ally and depression comes a little more quickly. One has the feeling that determination amounting to raw courage gets her out of bed on a wet cold morning.

And she is lonely. Lonely in her isolation from the world, a world bordered by her yard, church on Sunday and visits (often infrequent) from her surviving children. Lonely facing her death and the judgment she is certain awaits her when death comes.

And she is poor. Poor to the point that her garden is not recreation, it is her source of food in the winter months. Poor to the point that postage stamps are a major purchase . . . poor to the point that she does not know how to direct distance dial because she makes no long distance telephone calls . . . poor to the point that if her neighbor cannot take her to church she will not go because a taxi costs money. Money she doesn't have.

She reads from the Bible, Matthew. "Do not be anxious for your life, what you shall eat; nor yet for your body, what you shall put on. Is not the life a greater thing than the food and the body than the clothing? Look at the birds of the air: they do not sow, or reap or gather into barns; yet your heavenly Father feeds them. Are not you of much more value than they?"

It is likely that she lives on less than \$75 a month. No one knows how much she lives on; she will not discuss it in concrete terms.

Some of us, if we are fortunate, know a woman like her. Or a man. An aged person who is alert, active, independent, wise. A person who is 90 years of age and independent is something of a rarity.

But everything about medical technology, the science of nutrition, our knowledge of the growth and development of human beings leads to the inevitable conclusion that longevity will increase, that the aged will always be among us and in greatly increasing numbers.

The number and proportion of persons 65 and older has been rapidly increasing in society, almost doubling between 1940 and 1963, from 9 million to 17.6 million. While the population as a whole increased 98 percent between 1900 and 1950, the aging population increased 297 percent. By 1967 the number of persons 65 or older numbered 19.3 million.

There are now about 10,000 people—a small community—living in the United States who are 100 years or older.

From 30 to 43 percent of the aged were included in the 45 million Americans designated as poor or near poor. Of the aged persons living alone, 55 percent live in poverty.

Every fourth household in poverty in the United States was that of an aged person living alone.

There are about 15,000 aged persons living in Champaign County. About 5,000 of them are over the age of 72.

Many of them are poor, very poor. Most of them, considering national statistics, have some kind of chronic disease. They are dispersed, are considered to be unattractive because they are not young and by their very presence remind us of our own impending aging and death.

They have been identified by Congressional and Presidential study commissions as the truly ignored segment of the population, a portion of the populace whose problems are reaching the "crisis" level.

The problems are poverty, illness, housing, isolation, desolation, neglect, victimization and a need to be treated as a worthwhile human being.

The White House Conference on Aging, convening in November, acknowledges some of the problems, hoping to focus attention on them. The basis for the conference is that nothing is being done about the aged now and very little more seems forthcoming in the future.

Social services are next to non-existent in the country. They are also next to non-existent in Champaign County.

A social worker here, an expert in the field, mused one late summer afternoon.

"I wish to God sometimes," she said, "that I had become involved with the problems of blacks or Mexican-Americans or just about anybody else because nobody, nobody gives a damn about old people."

THE ATTICA TRAGEDY

HON. BELLA S. ABZUG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 14, 1971

Mrs. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, national outrage inspired by the horrifying events at Attica State Prison over the past 5 days is great. So it should be, for once again we find staring us in the face a domestic problem in dire need of our attention.

One must wonder if any semblance of justice can emerge from the tangle of

complex and contradictory events which have been reported surrounding this incident. Is it not tragic that events such as this one must occur to awaken the consciousness of our country and its officials to the needs of the people? What was its cause, and why did the resolution of the situation take the form that it did?

When people have ineffective means, or no means at all to redress their grievances, they feel compelled to resort to illegitimate tactics to resolve them. It is evident that the vast majority of the prisoners' demands were valid ones—28 out of 30 were accepted without hesitation. One of the two remaining—that of amnesty for the prisoners—would never have been necessary had prior attention been given to the urgent matter of prison reform.

The grand finale of this crisis also demands our close attention. The storming of the prison by National Guardsmen, State police, and prison officials added 38 to the death toll which had been only two. First reports of the incident scorned the murder of eight hostages as the act of barbarous social degenerates; later reports suggest that it is improbable that the rebels were responsible.

We must address ourselves to all of the issues raised by this chilling incident.

I insert in the RECORD at this point an article from last night's Evening Star. I commend it to your attention:

ATTICA HOSTAGES SHOT TO DEATH, NOT KNIFED, AUTOPSIES REVEAL; NO MUTILATION FOUND, MEDICAL EXAMINER SAYS

ATTICA, N.Y.—The Monroe County medical examiner said today that all nine hostages killed at Attica State Prison during the four-day uprising died of gunshot wounds.

Dr. John F. Edland said, "There were no cut throats or any kind of mutilation."

The bodies of two more prisoners were found today, unofficial sources said, bringing the total dead to 40—30 prisoners and 10 hostages, including one thrown from a window Saturday.

There was no immediate explanation of the origin of the gunshots that killed the hostages—how they were fired, from where, or by whom.

According to all official reports yesterday, the only guns rebel prisoners were carrying were gas projectile guns. Most of the prisoners were armed with clubs, fire bombs and makeshift knives, officials said.

CONTRADICTS REPORT

Jerry Houlihan, a spokesman for the prison, said yesterday several of the hostages had their throats slashed.

Prison authorities would not immediately comment on the report that two more bodies had been found. It came from a police official who asked that he not be identified.

Nor was there any comment on where the gunfire that killed the hostage guards had come from, whether from law officers storming the prison or from guns which may somehow have been in possession of the inmates.

A spokesman for the Department of Correctional Services said he had not heard the results of the autopsies. He said he was "shocked" and "bewildered" by the report.

Prosecutors, meanwhile, were reported seeking evidence to try to obtain the death penalty for the ringleaders of the revolt.

WILL SEEK INDICTMENTS

The Chicago Daily News reported that Wyoming County Dist. Atty. Louis R. James was expected to convene a county grand jury soon and ask for murder indictments against some rebel convicts.

He planned to question 30 surviving guards and civilian employes who had been held hostage during the four-day rebellion.

Early today, U.S. District Court Judge John Curtin of Buffalo ordered prison officials to allow attorneys to enter the maximum security facility to interview and counsel inmates. He also ordered the admission of doctors and nurses.

A group of lawyers, doctors, nurses and legal assistants was turned away at a prison gate at 3 a.m. when they attempted to present the federal court order. State corrections officials in Albany said they would answer the order at a hearing today in Buffalo.

William E. Hellerstein of New York City, told reporters the group turned away felt it was necessary to "get the court into this now" to head off possible reprisals against the subdued rebels.

An assistant attorney general for the state, Joseph J. Ricotta, contended that it would be dangerous for outsiders to enter the prison today. He said eight prisoners are still at large inside the prison.

State Corrections Commissioner Russell G. Oswald, who ordered the assault, had said yesterday that autopsies had shown that two of the hostages had been killed prior to the time state police, guards sheriff's deputies and National Guardsmen moved in to smash the rebellion by some 1,200 prisoners. He would not say how much earlier the two had died.

Oswald said that the convicts, who had armed themselves with bats, home-made knives and tear gas grenade launchers, had been continuing to make other crude weapons.

"To delay the action any longer would not only jeopardize innocent lives but would threaten the security of the entire correctional system of this state," Oswald said.

APPROVED BY ROCKEFELLER

The attack plan had the approval of Gov. Nelson A. Rockefeller, on whose authority the use of National Guard troops rests.

Fifty-five percent of the inmates at the prison are black. Another 10 percent are Puerto Rican and the remainder are white. There are no black guards, though officials have attempted to recruit blacks. There is one Puerto Rican guard.

Two of the convicts found dead after the assault were discovered in cells, stabbed to death, Oswald said. One had been emasculated, Oswald said. Prison officials speculated the two had been slain by fellow prisoners.

"Some of the crimes that took place in there bordered on atrocities," said Oswald.

A guard was fatally injured in the first day's disorder.

More than 100 prisoners were injured or wounded in the fighting yesterday. Three state troopers were hurt and treated in area hospitals.

Richard Smith, a Buffalo school teacher who volunteered medical skills acquired as a medic in Vietnam, predicted after seeing the injured that the death toll would rise.

"It resembled the aftermath of war," Smith said.

"It became apparent to me shortly before the attack that we were dealing with men who were fanatical men, who were revolutionaries," Oswald said.

"If anyone resisted, they were shot," one policeman said. "We had a job to do."

LONG NEGOTIATIONS HELD

After that a helicopter loaded with tear-gas canisters whipped over the rebel-held exercise yard, signalling the attack.

Within hours after the prison was secured, with most of 2,254 prisoners accounted for, correction officials transferred 200 inmates to other institutions, and they planned to move another 1,000. The clash came despite long efforts at negotiations.

Although Oswald agreed to most of the rebels' demands, he rejected one key provision—that total amnesty against any criminal charges be granted the rebels.

Rockefeller said he had no constitutional authority to grant amnesty, and would not even if it were in his power to do so.

Some of the ringleaders of the riot were slain in the police assault. They went by names like "Herbie" and "Champ" and "L.D."

But others remain prisoner and can be sent to the electric chair under provisions written into the state's penal law expressly to discourage killings of policemen and prison guards.

New York State has virtually abolished capital punishment, but the legislature wrote in two exceptions—when a "peace officer," a term which includes prison guards, is killed while performing his duty, or when a life convict commits any killing in prison or in the course of an escape.

An amendment enacted this year extended the deterrent protection to include all employes of jails, penitentiaries or other correctional institutions.

Thus, the killing of such an employe while on duty subjects the killer to the death penalty, regardless of the length of his prison term.

Under the law, a trial jury first decides whether the death penalty should be imposed. If the jury agrees unanimously on death, the judge must impose such a sentence.

If the sentencing jury cannot agree, the judge may either impanel a new jury or impose a prison sentence.

New York has not executed anyone since 1963. But three men are now under death sentence at Green Haven prison, where the electric chair is housed, for killing law enforcement officers in the course of robberies. They are awaiting outcome of appeals.

THE 1ST COMPANY, GOVERNOR'S FOOT GUARD, CELEBRATES ITS 200TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. WILLIAM R. COTTER

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 14, 1971

Mr. COTTER. Mr. Speaker, the 1st Company, Governor's Foot Guard, the oldest military organization in continuous service in the United States, will celebrate the 200th anniversary of its founding September 30-October 2.

First chartered by King George III of England in 1771, the Foot Guard has served as a ceremonial guard with great color and distinction these many years. Its members have fought in all wars in which this Nation has been engaged.

Recently the Hartford Courant chronicled the history of this unit, a history which I feel many of my colleagues would enjoy reading.

It is a privilege to represent in Congress many of the men who make up the 1st Company, Governor's Foot Guard. As a tribute to this fine organization I ask that the story of the Foot Guard's founding and many years of service be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD: GOVERNOR'S FOOT GUARD CELEBRATES 200TH ANNIVERSARY

(By William Barrante)

The First Company, Governor's Foot Guard, the oldest American military unit in continuous existence, will celebrate its 200th anniversary the week of Sept. 26 to Oct. 2.

Chartered by the legislature in October 1771, the Foot Guard to this day has been carrying out its duty "to attend upon and guard the governor and General Assembly."

In any parade or function in which it takes part, the Governor's Foot Guard is immediately distinguished by the parade dress uniform it has worn since its birth two centuries ago: a bearskin cap with red plume, scarlet coat faced in black and trimmed in yellow, buff waistcoat and trousers and black leggings.

The uniform was styled after that of Britain's Grenadier Guards, and was chosen so the Foot Guard would be separate and distinct from the colonial militia.

The occasion for the Foot Guard's inception was the ceremony for the governor's inauguration, which was called "Election Day." In 1768 a militia company from Hartford was organized to escort Gov. William Pitkin at his May inaugural. The company, however, acted disgracefully, and in 1769 and 1770 the governor was escorted by Capt. George Putnam's East Hartford company.

The episode led a group of 65 young men to petition the General Assembly for the establishment of a Hartford guard company. In October 1771 the company was chartered, and called "Governor's Guard."

The first commandant was Capt. Samuel Wyllys of Hartford, who, along with 27 other members, would soon see service in the War of Independence.

The success of the Governor's Guard in Hartford inspired the formation of a similar guard company in New Haven in 1775. This necessitated a change of name, and the Hartford company became the First Company, Governor's Guard. In 1778, when the Governor's Horse Guard was organized, the company received its present designation, First Company, Governor's Foot Guard.

THE REVOLUTION

When the War of Independence broke out in April 1775, the First Company did not join the ranks of Americans going up to Lexington because the Foot Guard's service was limited to Connecticut—its job was to guard the governor and Assembly.

The Second Company in New Haven, however, led by Capt. Benedict Arnold and styling itself the "New Haven Cadets" to "get around" the restriction that it not leave the state without the governor's permission, marched off to Cambridge and stood in the American line at Bunker Hill.

As a result of this action Gen. Washington took note of Benedict Arnold, who soon after received a colonel's commission in the Continental Army.

While the First Company in Hartford stayed in Connecticut, its members fought for the cause in other units.

Before the war broke out, Samuel Wyllys, the first commandant, was made colonel of the 1st Militia Regiment. In May 1775 Wyllys was appointed lieutenant-colonel of Gen. Joseph Spencer's Regiment, and fought with that unit at Bunker Hill.

Col. Wyllys helped plan, in Hartford, the capture of Fort Ticonderoga by Ethan Allen. In 1776 Wyllys commanded the 22nd Continental Regiment at New York against the British invasion. From 1777 to 1781 Col. Wyllys commanded the 3rd Connecticut Regiment.

Wyllys retired from the Continental Army in January 1781 and was named brigadier-general of the Connecticut Militia. He later served as secretary of the state, from 1796 to 1810.

The closest the First Company ever got to see action as a unit in the Revolution was in 1777, when Gen. Burgoyne was leading his British army against Albany, N.Y. Gov. Jonathan Trumbull sent the Foot Guard along with an expedition of Connecticut troops to Saratoga.

The battle at Saratoga, however, had been fought and won before the Foot Guard was able to get there. Under its second commandant, Col. Jonathan Bull, the Foot Guard received news of Burgoyne's defeat while it was encamped at Rhinebeck Flats near the Hudson.

ROCHAMBEAU VISIT

The Foot Guard serves as escort not only to the governor but also to visiting dignitaries. On Sept. 20, 1780, Washington and the French Gen. Rochambeau came to Hartford for a meeting. Also on hand were Gen. Lafayette, Major-General Henry Knox and Lt. Col. Alexander Hamilton, the latter two members of Washington's first cabinet.

The Foot Guard escorted Washington and Rochambeau to Col. Jeremiah Wadsworth's house, where they planned war strategy. Since 1938 the Foot Guard has celebrated Sept. 20 as "Rochambeau Day."

In May 1781 Washington and Rochambeau made final plans for the Yorktown campaign in Wethersfield, and the Foot Guard served as their escort through Hartford.

According to Lloyd W. Fowles, Guard historian, the period from 1802 to 1813 while Nathaniel Terry was commandant "marked a zenith in public display by the Foot Guard."

Terry was the first Foot Guard commandant to hold the rank of major. At this time the Foot Guard wanted equality in all respects to the other militia companies in the state. As the Horse Guard commandants were both majors, Capt. Terry felt the Foot Guard commandant should have equal rank, and was raised to major in 1809.

During the early years of the 19th Century the Foot Guard became a strong center of the Federalist party, the "Standing Order" of Connecticut.

Sentiment in Connecticut was against going to war with Great Britain in 1812. According to legend, the Foot Guard was once attacked in the streets of Hartford by a company recruiting soldiers for the national army. Maj. Terry was said to have ordered his men to charge the recruiting company with fixed bayonets, causing them to disperse.

After Washington replaced the recruiting officer with a more amiable person, good relations were restored between state and federal officials. In February 1817, two years after the war, the Foot Guard escorted Commodore Thomas Macdonough to the elevated steps of the Phoenix Bank, where the victor of Lake Champlain was honored. And in June of that year, the company was escort to President Madison on a visit to Hartford.

While the sectional attitudes of 1812 had diminished, the "Standing Order" of which the Foot Guard was part was threatened by the Republican victory of 1817. The new Constitution of 1818 made New Haven an alternate state capital, and the First Company lost its monopoly over "Election Day" activities.

In 1826 the Foot Guard began its series of expeditions around the state when it went to New London for laying of the cornerstone of the monument commemorating the Revolutionary War battle at Fort Griswold on Groton Heights. This was the company's first expedition outside Hartford since the Saratoga march of 1777.

In 1829, under Major George Putnam, the Company went to Springfield by riverboat. Two years later the Foot Guard went to New York City on the steamboat Victory.

The railroad replaced the riverboat to New Haven in 1839 and the riverboat to Springfield in 1844. Windsor was the last river town visited by the company by steamboat, on July 4, 1843.

During the years before the Civil War the Foot Guard continued its duty as part of the escorts for various officials who made

visits to Hartford, including President Jackson in 1833 and President Polk in 1847.

In 1835 the Foot Guard was called out to quell a civil disturbance. A crowd of whites had assaulted a black congregation and a carpenter's apprentice was shot. A group of angry whites then raided the black neighborhood, and the Foot Guard moved in to prevent a riot.

CIVIL WAR

In the Civil War, as in other wars, the Foot Guard served only on the homefront. In 1862 the company adopted a fatigue uniform to be worn in lieu of the scarlet parade dress. It consisted of a dark blue frock coat and light blue trousers with red stripe.

During the war the Foot Guard served as honor guard for returned bodies of dead soldiers, and also as escort to companies coming home from the battlefield.

In May 1863 the company went to New Haven for the funeral of Adm. Andrew Foote.

SECOND CENTURY

In October 1871 the First Company, Governor's Foot Guard celebrated its 100th birthday. The next hundred years would see the unit expand both in numbers and in activities.

In 1875 the Constitution was amended to provide for biennial election of the governor. Inauguration was moved to January, and the last "Election Day" took place in May 1876. Hartford was once again the sole capital, and the Foot Guard regained its original prestige.

The late 1800s was a time of expositions, which meant trips outside the state for the Foot Guard. While it was not invited to the Centennial Exposition in Philadelphia in 1876, it helped celebrate the 100th anniversary of Saratoga in 1877.

Other events attended by the Foot Guard include the Constitutional Centennial in Philadelphia, 1887; the New York Centennial Celebration, 1889; the Columbian Exposition in Chicago, 1892; the Cotton Exposition in Atlanta, Ga., 1895; dedication of Grant's Tomb in New York City, 1897; Pan American Exposition in Buffalo, N.Y., 1901.

Trips and expeditions, of course, cost money. The Foot Guard receives funds from the state, but also has had to raise funds on its own. In 1885 a board of trustees was created for the First Company to hold property for the unit.

Foot Guard fund-raising activities were helped by obtaining its own armory on High Street in 1887. In January 1889 the Foot Guard put on its first inaugural ball at its new armory, for Gov. Morgan Bulkeley.

In November 1892 John Philip Sousa brought his band to Hartford and began a long series of concerts at the Foot Guard Armory.

In 1897, on the eve of the War with Spain, the First Company had an enrollment of 144, and in October 1898 the company took part in a parade in Philadelphia to celebrate the war's end.

The Foot Guard was disappointed when President Theodore Roosevelt visited Hartford in 1902. The President's escort was not the Foot Guard, but the First Company, Governor's Horse Guard. The reason most often given for this was the fact that TR was an old cavalryman.

In 1904 the Foot Guard established its own band. For the preceding 20 years the company had been using Colt's Band, although that band's first allegiance was to the 1st Connecticut Regiment.

At this time the Foot Guard also entered the field of musical productions, and produced shows—including Gilbert and Sullivan's "The Mikado"—at its armory.

The Foot Guard continued to accompany the governor on trips out of state, including the Louisiana Purchase Exposition in St.

Louis in 1904 and the Jamestown Tercentenary Exposition in Virginia in 1907.

During the early years of the 20th Century the Foot Guard built up a strong friendship with the Richmond Light Infantry Blues, a Virginia militia unit. The two units frequently exchanged visits, and in March 1913 the Richmond Blues presented a silver punch bowl to its Hartford cousin at the Foot Guard Armory.

WORLD WARS

Eighty-two members of the First Company saw service in World War I. Of these two were killed. During the war the Foot Guard lowered its age requirement from 21 to 18 so it could provide some military training for young men subject to the draft.

As during the Civil War, the Foot Guard put aside its scarlet dress uniforms for Army fatigues, except in October 1917 when it served as escort for the 5th Royal Highlanders, the "Black Watch" of Canada, which was on a recruiting mission in Hartford.

With the end of the war, the Foot Guard resumed its ceremonial duties. On Oct. 19, 1921 the company celebrated its 150th anniversary, with a parade of 1,600 to 2,000 soldiers from visiting military units, including the Richmond Blues.

For once, the Foot Guard was not an escort but was escorted—by the 2nd Battalion, 169th Infantry (1st Connecticut Regiment).

On Feb. 27 and 28, 1925, the Foot Guard sponsored its first annual Dog Show—700 dogs were exhibited and 7,000 people attended. In 1939 the Dog Show took place in the State Armory for the first time.

For many years the Foot Guard had been thinking about a trip to Europe. On April 30, 1926, after two years of planning, the First and Second Foot Guard companies, along with the Putnam Phalanx and the Richmond Blues, began a 31-day excursion to Europe.

Because of the general strike in England, the four military units had to land at LeHarve, France, rather than at Plymouth, England, as planned.

The Foot Guard visited Brussels, Paris and the AEF cemetery at Chateau Thierry.

In June 1926 the First Company and the Putnam Phalanx escorted Gov. John Trumbull to the Sesquicentennial Exposition in Philadelphia. The Company—170 men strong—marched in its first presidential inaugural parade on March 4, 1929.

The 1930s was a decade of tercentennaries for Connecticut and several of her towns. The Foot Guard took part in the 300th anniversary celebration of Windsor (1933), Wethersfield (1934) and the state (1935).

The Foot Guard had been officially incorporated into the state militia in 1931. In 1936 towns along the Connecticut River were flooded as a result of the heavy spring thaw. The adjutant-general ordered the National Guard, Naval Militia and state police out to help fight the disaster. On March 19 a detail of the Foot Guard was ordered to report at its armory, as 450 refugees had been quartered there. The whole Foot Guard was then mobilized.

The Foot Guard assumed the duty of guarding all federal property, especially the post office building near its armory on High Street. The company also provided for the safety of post office substations and guarded valuable shipments to the railroad station.

In 1938 the Foot Guard was called out for flood duty a second time.

With a second World War on the horizon, the State Military Department in June 1940 organized the two Foot Guard companies into two provisional battalions of infantry. The First Company was styled "First Provisional Battalion, First Regiment, Connecticut State Guard."

This was done in anticipation that the National Guard and Naval Militia might be ordered into federal service, leaving the orga-

nized militia as the only military force in the state. The Foot Guard thus became the core around which an augmented State Guard was formed.

With the U.S. at war, the Foot Guard suspended much of its ceremonial activity. The last inaugural ball until 1947 was Jan. 8, 1941, for Gov. Robert Hurley. In February the Foot Guard served as escort for the 1st Connecticut Regiment (169th Infantry) when it was inducted into the federal service.

By 1944 there were 50 members of the company serving with the armed forces, two of whom were killed in action.

After the war the Foot Guard resumed all its ceremonial duty. On Jan. 20, 1949 it marched in its first presidential inaugural parade since 1929, and has since marched in Washington at every Inaugural.

In November 1958 the Foot Guard was host to the Band of the Grenadier Guards and the Pipers of the Scots Guards. This was the first time the Foot Guard was host to foreign regiments. The Grenadier Guards will be coming to Hartford again this fall to take part in the Foot Guard's 200th birthday celebration.

As a military unit the First Company, Governor's Foot Guard carries no battle citations on its colors. But during its two centuries of existence, it has won the praise and admiration of officials and people throughout the country and world for its loyal service and military showmanship.

SAVANNAH: A BEAUTIFUL COLONIAL CITY IMPROVES WITH AGE

HON. G. ELLIOTT HAGAN

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 14, 1971

Mr. HAGAN. Mr. Speaker, the fall 1971 edition of *Aloft*, the magazine published for all National Airlines passengers, contains an article entitled "Savannah: A Beautiful Colonial City Improves With Age," by Bill Thomas.

As Representative of this lovely, historic, and proud city, I would like my colleagues to see this extremely interesting article. I feel confident that after reading the writer's descriptions and comments, if anyone has not yet had occasion to visit Savannah, he will want to do so. Further, such a sojourn will make the visitor a lifelong fan and enthusiast of Savannah, for her history and charm will be a source of delight to even the well-traveled sophisticate.

The article follows:

SAVANNAH: A BEAUTIFUL COLONIAL CITY IMPROVES WITH AGE

(By Bill Thomas)

Savannah is the smell of summer borne on salty sea winds; the charm of the Mother World mingled with the atmosphere and pace of the Old South; the brilliance of an ocean of azaleas beckoning to the heavens. Like a vintage wine, the Georgia city has individuality and a unique character that improves with age.

Some of Savannah's beauty is very real; some as abstract as modern art. It counts among its heroes pirates and country gentlemen, generals and nobility, seamen and soldiers. So fitting is yesteryear that one would not be surprised to meet the actors in the drama of world history walking down the cobblestone streets, savoring the waterfront, pausing at a public fountain, perhaps even to admire a statue or plaque musty with age in their own honor.

Built on the laurels of King Cotton, Savannah is old—a secluded spot of exquisite humanness. It manages to grow commercially and industrially, yet somehow maintains an atmosphere that belongs with the 18th century. As a busy shipping port, Savannah plays host to the sailing fleets of the world. And if you want to gain feeling for Savannah's birthright, stroll along the waterfront, along Factors' Walk, which was the Cotton Merchant's trading area.

This oldest city in Georgia is made for walking. To understand it is to see its every detail, to pause to study its finer traits, to feel a kinship to it. You'll meet its people and they'll speak to you, bid you good day as if they meant it. It makes no difference that you are a stranger here; you soon get the feeling you are a respected individual.

Someone once described Savannah as a beautiful lady with a dirty face, a tribute to the mottled look of some of the buildings overgrown with moss, to the walls and monuments encrusted with age. But it is perhaps largely for that reason, that Savannah possesses such charm. For 200 years this old seaport city on the tallwaters of the Savannah River has been more than a trifle contrary. She still may be at times, but if she likes you, Savannah welcomes you with open arms and incomparable hospitality.

This city was the center of a struggle for power during the Revolutionary War, most of which it spent under British occupation. Count Casimir Pulaski, the great Polish patriot, died during an attempt to retake it. Today Pulaski is honored there, along with Sgt. William Jasper, an Irish-American soldier who lost his life in the same battle.

Savannah regained its important role as a center for export to Europe, however, and served as a supply center years later for the Confederacy during the Civil War until the fall of Fort Pulaski in 1862. Fort Pulaski, a monumental engineering feat, guarded the city from the sea from a perch overlooking the Savannah River, while Fort McAllister finally crumbled under the pillage of Sherman on his march to the sea. In evacuating the city in the face of Sherman's advance, Confederate General Hardee spared the city the battering and burning Sherman had given Atlanta . . . had it not been for that, Savannah undoubtedly would not possess the charm it does today.

To visit Savannah is to feel it . . . the richness of its heritage manifested in the cobbled streets: the Regency, Greek Revival, Victorian Gothic and Georgian Colonial houses with their crafted elegance, their calm of authenticity; the twenty parks and squares, each a jewel-box of gentle joy. Turn up your nose here in spring and you'll whiff tulip, poplar and dogwood, crepe myrtle and wild honey-suckle.

This sedate metropolis was given birth by Gen. James Oglethorpe in 1733, and those squares were part of the master plan. In fact, they were originally planned as central areas for water, fortification and protection for the Oglethorpe colonists. Today they are filled with flowering plants, giant shade trees, fountains, monuments and benches where one may rest awhile to watch the flow of passing humanity, read a newspaper or just listen to the sounds. Around these squares stand some of the oldest homes and buildings in America.

Start your tour of Savannah's past with a walk through this area. Visit the Owens-Thomas House, an exquisite example of English Regency architecture (Lafayette stayed here on his famous visit in 1825); Telfair Academy of Arts and Sciences, housing a fine collection of portraits, paintings and antique furniture; Juliette Gordon Low House, where the founder of the Girl Scouts was born, Christ Episcopal Church, whose first ministers were John and Charles Wesley, later founders of the Methodist Church,

Green-Meldrin House, personal headquarters for General Sherman during his occupation of the city.

Bull Street is the very spine of a Savannah tour, for it contains five of the original 14 squares laid out by Oglethorpe, as well as Forsyth Park, resplendent in spring with flowering azaleas, and the site of a fountain resembling that in the Place de la Concorde in Paris. A bronze Confederate soldier stands atop a sandstone marker.

Savannah's waterfront area is unique in its own right, however, and you'll probably spend more time here than at any other spot. Include in your visit a stop at the Pirates' House, a restored inn where legend has it *Treasure Island's* Captain Flint died shouting: "Darby, bring aft the rum!" Rum is still served here, as well as a superb menu of seafood and American dishes. A few blocks away is Factor's Walk, a picturesque row of offices and warehouses today. The Savannah Area Chamber of Commerce occupies the ornate Cotton and Naval Stores Exchange Building here, and will furnish maps and other information or guidance.

A level below Factor's Walk is River Street, paved with cobblestones brought as ballast in early sailing ships. Along that street today are the fascinating Ships of the Sea Museum, the Cruz del Sur, a full-rigged sailing ship you can climb aboard; and the Factor's Walk Military Museum. The first steamship to cross the Atlantic sailed from this port in 1819 and you may see a model of it at City Hall.

During the spring and summer months, extending into autumn, you'll find several open-air markets in Savannah—places small, but unhurried (no one ever hurries in Savannah). Here are great stacks of turnip greens, piles of yams, baskets of shiny red apples, huge stems of brazen yellow bananas. Signs painted on windows offer low-country she crab, jumbo shrimp, mullet roe, oysters, local flounder and a variety of other sea foods. And you'll find men squatting in groups, talking low and laughing, women wearing big skirts and carrying market baskets—open-faced unafraid people who clearly plan to go on living for some time and in a particular style that includes neither harshness and anger nor a killing pace.

But Savannah is not all history, not all old. For instance there's the giant new \$7.5 million Savannah Civic Center, scheduled for completion late this year where Director David A. Fennell is lining up conventions and major indoor events for the auditorium-arena complex.

Economic emphasis has shifted from agricultural to industrial in the metropolitan area. The principal products manufactured range from paper, refined sugar and synthetic nitrogen to trailer-truck bodies and aircraft. In 1970 Savannah's ports, undergoing a \$14 million expansion, tallied net tonnage of 7,296,350, keeping them in the top 10 ports in the country.

Then too, the city's cultural advantages and a mild climate are attracting writers, artists and musicians. An aggressive group organized as the Historic Savannah Foundation, Inc., has salvaged more than 1,000 old buildings and homes, with restoration complete or underway on some 800 of them.

Four miles away on Wilmington Island is an enormous and staidly elegant establishment called the Savannah Inn and Country Club. For people who think in terms of tennis, golf, dancing and pool swimming, it is as one native said, "Jus' perfect."

Just a few miles out of town, the Atlantic confronts you—the velvetlike sand beaches are wide and inviting and normally uncrowded. To the north a few miles is the voodoo country of tidewater South Carolina where one may stop to watch wicker baskets woven at roadside stands by black craftsmen who resettled here from Jamaica. And at Hil-

ton Head Island, one may find an even different and more relaxing atmosphere, in plush luxury with three 18-hole golf courses.

On Savannah's outskirts are attractive modern accommodations common to virtually any city in America, but inwardly, Savannah retains a spirit of yesteryear. It is steeped in tradition . . . in history in the making of a nation. And yet it possesses a rare beauty. Its streets are lined with giant live oaks, bewhiskered with Spanish moss. If you stand under its ancient streetlights during the late hours of the evening and listen carefully, you may hear the voices of sailors from foreign lands, or do they belong to an era before the turn of the century? Who cares, for this is Savannah, city of languid charm. And you wouldn't disturb a moment of its being, just as it is.

OUR LAST FRONTIER

HON. NICK BEGICH

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 14, 1971

Mr. BEGICH. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to include in the RECORD today, an article published recently in the American Bar Association Journal. This article is a well written brief history of Alaska, from its purchase from Russia in 1867, to the present. I take particular pride in presenting this article to you because of the mention of Alaska's court system. Alaska has been able to take advantage of its late statehood by constructing its court system after considering those of other States. Now all Alaskans have the benefits of a fine concept in court systems, of which they can be very proud.

The 49th State claims a system different from that of other States, and that is highly attributable to its constitution which is not yet 15 years old.

I, along with all Alaskans take pride in sharing with you an account of the progress of our State, particularly the court system, constructed to meet the needs of a modern community.

OUR LAST FRONTIER

(By Donald J. Jarosz)

Alaska, from the Aleut word "alaksak", which refers to the part of the mainland now known as the Alaska Peninsula, is physically the largest state in the Union (2,260 miles wide and 1,400 miles long). In 1967 Alaska observed its centennial, marking the one hundredth year since its purchase from Russia. The centennial motto, "North to the Future", reflects the hopes and aspirations of the young and vigorous population.

Alaskans are faced with problems not common to other states—a harsh winter climate, rugged topography, limited capital and distant markets—but there are compensations—pure air and water, breathtaking scenery, room to expand and grow, untouched natural resources and many challenges. In its quest for statehood, Alaska faced and overcame many obstacles.

The organization as a territory in 1912 and the introduction of the first statehood bill in 1916 were only two steps in a long series that led to statehood for Alaska. Senator William McKendree Gwin of California was one of the first men to promote interest in the United States' acquisition of Alaska, but his overtures were interrupted by the Civil War in 1861. After the war ended, fishermen of the Washington Territory pushed for acquisition, but it remained for William H. Seward, when he was Secretary of State, to accomplish the purchase.

For many years it was uncertain why Seward had negotiated the purchase of Alaska. Today, the memoirs of the Russian court, reports from Hudson Bay officials and United States Government papers indicate that the purchase was the fulfillment of a gentleman's agreement.

When the United States was in the midst of the Civil War, the Confederate cruiser *Shenandoah* reached Alaska and did considerable damage to American whaling ships. Facing the distinct possibility that France and England might recognize the Confederacy, the Union found in Russia a friend willing to send her fleets to American harbors as a friendly gesture if properly compensated. Seward made a gentleman's agreement with Russia—our government was to pay Russia for this demonstration of seeming friendship.

Czar Alexander fulfilled his part of this top-secret agreement and dispatched his navy to the United States. While part of the Russian fleet was anchored in San Francisco Bay, other vessels visited the Eastern ports of Washington, Boston and Annapolis. When word reached San Francisco that the Confederate navy was nearing the Golden Gate, Russian Admiral Popoff even cleared his decks and made ready for combat.

England and France did not side with the Confederacy, the war ended, Lincoln was assassinated and Andrew Johnson became President. With the war ended, payment to Russia, especially as a war measure, became complicated. The solution seemed to be the purchase of Alaska. Alexander's finances were not as strong as they once had been, the fur trade seemed to be diminishing, and Russia saw the Canadian border as a British menace.

Admittedly, the purchase of Alaska was done in a spirit of venturing into what appeared to be a promising commercial enterprise for the United States. The treaty was signed on March 30, 1867, and the United States paid Russia \$7,200,000 (less than 2¢ an acre). In reality, according to one source, part of the payment—\$1,400,000—was for the purchase of this new territory, and other portion—\$5,800,000—was for the naval display of friendship and cooperation during the Civil War. The formal transfer took place on October 18, 1867, in Sitka at Baranof Castle, for many years the official residence of the representative of the Emperor of Russia, Alexiel Pestchourof announced the confirmation of the transfer: "By authority from his Majesty of all Russia, I transfer to the United States the Territory of Alaska." On behalf of the United States, Brigadier-General Lovell Harrison Rousseau accepted Alaska, a territory that was to be forgotten for some time by its new owner.

A period of close-fisted commercialism soon followed, and although the administration of Alaska was placed under the Department of War, which loosely governed the territory for the ten-year period immediately following the purchase, little thought was given to the administration of justice, law or government organization. The uprising of the Nez Percé Indians in Idaho caused the withdrawal of the Army in 1877, leaving the settlers of Sitka and Wrangell outnumbered by the hostile Indians and totally unprotected.

Seventeen years after the purchase of Alaska there still was, strictly speaking, no administration of justice until Congress passed "An Act Providing a Civil Government for Alaska", which was approved on May 17, 1884. This is commonly referred to as the "Organic Act", and it constituted Alaska a civil and judicial district, placing the seat of government at Sitka.

Through the Organic Act, Alaska was subsequently provided with a district court "with civil and criminal jurisdiction of district courts of the United States, and such other jurisdiction not inconsistent with the act as may be established by law". Under

this act the President of the United States appointed a district judge who was to hold at least two terms of court at Sitka and one at Wrangell each year. In addition, the act made provision for Presidential appointment of a United States attorney, a United States marshal, a clerk of court and four commissioners. "Such commissioners", it provided, "shall exercise all the duties and powers, civil and criminal, now conferred on justices of the peace under the general laws of the state of Oregon, so far as the same may be applicable in said District, and may not be in conflict with this act or the laws of the United States."

With the Organic Act came the first semblance of the administration of justice, although the act was unsurpassed for uncertainty. However, an important factor was lacking: Alaska still had no laws of its own, for by virtue of the Organic Act, the laws of the State of Oregon were declared law in Alaska. No definite improvement was made in the administration of justice or in the organization of the judicial system until 1900, when the Carter Act gave Alaska a criminal code and designated Juneau the capital. It was about this time that notoriety of the vast natural wealth and resources caused Americans to take notice of this territory that had almost been forgotten since its purchase.

Today, Alaska, the last American frontier, is anything but forgotten. It has the smallest population of the fifty states, but one of the highest percentages of population increase in recent decades. The more than thirty-five years of territorial status eventually proved advantageous when fifty-five delegates met for seventy-five days at the University of Alaska at College, near Fairbanks, in November of 1955 and drafted the constitution. The delegates to the constitutional convention, drawing on the lessons and experiences of the other states, were able to give Alaska perhaps the finest and most modern constitution of the Union.

The voters of Alaska approved their new constitution on April 24, 1956, by a better than two-to-one majority. The basic structure of the 12,000-word document embodies concepts of good court administration. It provides a bicameral legislature of sixty members, forty of whom are in the House of Representatives and twenty in the Senate. Unlike other states which today find their constitutions hopelessly outdated, Alaska faces none of these problems. The delegates to the constitutional convention provided for a strong executive branch, a truly representative legislature and many modern constitutional provisions including the nineteen-year-old vote, protection of natural resources, an up-to-date Declaration of Rights and provisions for amendments and constitutional conventions.

One of the most outstanding and unique constitutional provisions was the creation of the "borough" system of government. When the delegates met and drafted the constitution, they were especially aware of the needed revision in the system of local government. At the time of statehood there were no counties or area-wide political subdivisions, and, outside the cities and the special districts, there was no local government. "Borough" was defined as a place organized for local government purposes, as opposed to "county", which is simply a unit for state administrative purposes. The borough provides three mandatory services—planning and zoning, education, and tax collection and assessment—and is designed "to provide for maximum local self-government with a minimum of local government units, and to prevent duplication of tax levying jurisdictions".

Alaska's transition from territory to statehood was a long, slow process. Since statehood, Alaska has grown politically, socially

and economically. The cover of this issue shows the modern State Court Building in Anchorage superimposed on Alaska's state flag. Although Alaska lacks some of the older, historical landmarks and buildings found in other states, it does not lack a long and interesting history.

NIXON CRITICS NOT REALISTIC

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 14, 1971

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, an editorial appearing in the Peoria Journal Star on September 8, 1971, makes some cogent points regarding the activities of certain critics of President Nixon and his policies and I include the text of the editorial in the RECORD at this point.

NIXON CRITICS NOT REALISTIC

(By C. L. Dancey)

What this country badly needs when the present emergency 90-day freeze on wages and prices ends is a functional policy of basic economic controls that will do the job so badly needed.

We need the best possible such program, and the time to work it out for application in November is NOW.

Therefore, it is rather disappointing, indeed, to hear the chief representatives of what used to be known as the "loyal opposition" offering little more than an over-age propaganda pitch appealing to the most rank political prejudice.

Sen. George McGovern (D-S.D.) talks of "Robin Hood in reverse", and both Sen. Edmund S. Muskie (D-Me.) and Sen. Hubert Humphrey, (D-Minn.) are reciting the age-old political magic (and economic nonsense) as if the whole problem is one of the "working man against the rich."

Muskie says flatly, the old song from 1933: "What this country needs is purchasing power!"

What is involved here, of course, is the traditional self-serving political "economics" of the big labor unions.

We have lived through their consistency in every kind of economic situation, whereby the proper "cure" always comes out exactly the same—more and higher wages.

The way to end a depression was through higher wages. The way to meet the need for growth (to add three million new jobs a year and take care of the growing adult population) is also "more purchasing power" through higher wages.

The way to stop a rampaging inflation is, of course, "more purchasing power through higher wages," and the way to combat a dwindling productivity, the problem of poverty, unemployment, or a climate of scarcity—all the same to them—"higher wages."

This is, of course, utter nonsense. The inflationary problem of 1971 is completely the opposite of the great depression problem of 1933.

To the politicians it doesn't matter that the economic situation is the complete opposite.

What matters is that, regardless of economics, there was political magic in the old hoorah-stuff about "higher wages" being in the national interest.

And political manipulation is, apparently, the only thing they give a hoot about.

Doubtless President Nixon is no better (and probably no worse) in that regard. The difference is that he is now President, the only one we've got right now, and whatever

his political desires he doesn't have much choice but to try to present a program that will actually do some good.

His opponents are under no such handicaps.

They can say anything for whatever political advantage—and always pass the buck to him escaping responsibility for whatever really happens.

They've already just managed that maneuver once.

They are gleefully prepared to do it again—regardless of the true needs of the country.

Those basic needs aren't hard to figure out. We need an economy stable enough that the businessman and the housewife alike can make some sense out of their budgets and hang things together for sane planning and operating.

And we also need enough "extra" or "new money" to expand activities so as to provide about 3,000,000 new jobs a year for the youngsters reaching maturity these days.

An artificial stranglehold on interests and profits, for example, would give us an absolutely sterile and static economy, which couldn't possibly perform that kind of expansion.

We need stability without sterility—or we are going to be in very serious trouble.

Above all, perhaps, we need to grow up to the realization that "profit" is not just play money. It is the seed money that goes into growth and job-creation.

Kill it out of burning economic prejudice, willy nilly, in pursuit of the labor mythology, and the real base on which all programs and hopes and plans are actually based functionally goes down the drain.

Money for taxes, for poverty programs, for job expansion programs, for health programs, for anti-pollution programs, and for providing more standard services and products for less unit cost and price—all rest on the ability to generate new money.

The real trick in the post-November economic program will be to both generate this "new money"—and keep some workable measure of stability in the wage-price picture.

Political fakery isn't helping us accomplish that difficult and urgently necessary twin feat.

AKRON METROPOLITAN HOUSING AUTHORITY

HON. JOHN F. SEIBERLING

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 14, 1971

Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker, last week the Akron Metropolitan Housing Authority—AMHA—published, at no expense to the Government, a special report in the Akron Beacon Journal. At a time when public housing throughout the country is not enjoying a uniformly favorable climate of opinion, the achievements of AMHA are truly remarkable. They are so remarkable that I think many other Members of Congress from urban and suburban areas will wish to know more about them. Accordingly, I am asking that the key pages of last week's report by AMHA be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The driving factor behind AMHA's success in the last 4 years has been its executive director, Jack Saferstein. Mr. Saferstein came into AMHA after a successful career as a self-made businessman. By applying business methods and personal dynamism, he has not only

spurred a rapid acceleration in public housing for low-income and senior citizens in the Akron area, but has brought about a more positive attitude toward public housing on the part of tenants and members of the public.

The methods pioneered by Mr. Saferstein can, I am sure, be adopted by many other public housing authorities, and therefore, I believe that many Members of Congress will be interested. The extracts from AMHA's report follow:

THE MAN AT THE HELM

"The houses that Jack built."

That line has appeared countless times in national magazines and in newspapers across the country. By now it is a cliché of the first magnitude.

The houses referred to are the 2,986 living units provided for low-income residents here in the last three and one-half years.

The Jack is Jack Saferstein, executive director of the Akron Metropolitan Housing Authority these last three and one-half years.

Akron has become the model for getting action in building, buying and leasing for senior citizens and families with lower incomes. Saferstein has become the man who knows how to do it.

Every day brings heavy mail from cities across the country asking for details and advice on housing. Saferstein's phone rings often with requests to inspect the local developments.

It is common for Saferstein to spend a good part of a day leading a contingent of government officials, or officials from other cities, on a grand tour of the AMHA's high rise apartments for senior citizens; new townhouse developments for families; purchased or leased new and refurbished single homes.

In brief, if there's a question anywhere about low-income housing, the word is "ask Jack."

But why? How is it that in such a brief period one community and one man can achieve such distinction?

The answer is in Saferstein's philosophy (a word he cares very little for) on public housing for those with lower income.

"My job is to build housing.

"I am sensitive to the needs of the people I service and somewhat insensitive to bureaucratic structure," he says.

In the simplest terms, he's a doer. He despises red tape.

Tall, athletically trim and with hair streaked with white, Saferstein, 46, has a military presence. He is precise. He acts quickly and forcefully.

Yet behind the precision and business-like manner is a hunger to serve people. Nothing rips his insides more than a pathetic plea from someone for an apartment or a home—and knowing that there is a waiting list of 6,000 for housing.

Saferstein's methods of operation explain how he gets things done quickly.

"First, I feel I have a good relationship with City Hall, the mayor, the councilmen. I always try to work intimately with them, especially those representing wards where we plan developments. Council must pass all legislation to provide authority for building a certain number of units on a certain site.

"If I feel there are others in a particular section of the city that need more explaining about a project, I see to it I meet with groups and individuals," he says.

And how does he get such cooperation from the federal government which provides funds for AMHA projects?

"I maintain a good relationship with regional and national agencies. I work personally with HUD (U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development) people in the regional office in Chicago and Washington.

"I always stay in contact on a day-to-day

basis on each project, following it until it's done.

"We depend very little on the mail. We do practically everything by courier and whenever possible wait (in Chicago or Washington) for responses.

"These people are busy. So if we don't lend importance to documents we send they'd get lost in the shuffle like everyone else's."

On his methods, which sometimes have been criticized as "high handed."

"I don't have to run for public office.

"It's been said I don't politically discuss all my moves in order to make sure no one's feelings are hurt. Fortunately, this is not an arena I worry too much about.

"My aim is to provide housing.

"This means I don't attend a great many meetings to which I'm invited by fractionalized and splinter groups which don't have any foundation. It gives me time to meet with what I consider representative groups.

You can't build housing by attending cocktail parties and discussing philosophy and theory," he says.

How serious is the need for AMHA housing?

"Housing is a basic need. It is absolutely the foundation of an individual's or family's existence. All philosophy and theoretician's views can't build a single unit.

"Out of this (the problem of substandard housing) arise most of the other basic problems in the country.

"Put a family in a clean and new home and that mother can start teaching a child cleanliness, how to use sanitary facilities, how to maintain a room. With a good home and compatible neighbors, we have hope a child will grow up in a happy, decent environment.

"Take the family and put it in a substandard house in a substandard neighborhood and no matter how much effort that mother puts into the home, there isn't a chance. All the family sees is substandard. All we do is raise more children in the same circumstances we want to do away with."

Saferstein is more aware than anyone that public housing has its critics. He's tangled with politicians and neighbors over some projects. He sees a coming ballot issue which would give neighborhoods, in effect, a referendum method of vetoing zoning changes as a threat to the expansion of AMHA in Akron. On the matter of opposition, he says:

"Sometimes the attitude of the general public depresses me. With all that's happened in the last five years in social upheaval, we still seem to have this (anti) attitude.

"It would be so easy to sit in this chair and manage what we have now. So easy. I could attend meetings all day, give speeches, pace myself.

"But I don't know how anyone with a conscience living on a minute to hour to daily basis could allow himself to become insensitive to social needs.

"Everything else the public is aroused about—ecology, pollution . . . well, housing is no different. The problem isn't going away.

"Housing must be confronted head-on.

"You can't do it with citizen boards, who, unfortunately, are not able to relate to the problems. It still takes professionals to complete the job.

"Citizen participation is admirable up to a point.

"But we know if everything was left to neighborhoods, there would be very little of anything done in the way of business ventures, schools, apartments.

"It may sound dictatorial and smell of one-man-rule, but by golly, if what I've done to date in this community has alienated a lot of people and hasn't been acceptable to the so-called powers that be, then I'm content to say the end justifies the means."

Those are just some of the views of the steely Jack Saferstein. He has lots of others

(for instance, urban renewal is "urban renewal" and a failure because not enough concern has been shown for people).

What's ahead for AMHA? Growth. Planned is a 211-unit addition to the apartment on Diagonal rd. that bears Saferstein's name. Planned are a lot of other units, too, and replacement of older war-time developments, such as accomplished at Joy Park.

"We need 10,000 more units right now, about 35 pct. of them for senior citizens, the rest for families," he says.

"I guess you could call that the goal. But I don't need goals. Some people use goals for motivation.

"I just hit as hard as I can every day to get all I can out of Washington to help these people."

At the end of 1967, the year Saferstein took the reins of AMHA, there were 590 applications for low-income housing. That figure now is 6,000 and growing constantly.

He praises his staff highly and says members are dedicated to his philosophy. He says he gives them room, flexibility so they can work to their full talents.

He is very proud of the social services—meaning enjoyment, education, health protection—AMHA offers tenants under the direction of Dorothy Jackson.

"Providing new housing is only the beginning. If you don't involve that person or family in social areas, you've defeated the whole purpose. We must have a program of social activity in all degrees for all in the family."

Saferstein knew poverty as a youth. In 1942, after graduation from old West High, he borrowed some money and opened a small grocery. This led in turn to buying, with his brother, Carl, a grocery on Wooster av.

In 1951, he was in on the ground floor in establishing the Sparkle Markets which now blanket the area. The Wooster av. market expanded and expanded—and then was closed by the 1968 racial disturbances. It consequently was leased but closed again when the new operator couldn't make a go of it.

In 1964, Saferstein underwent open heart surgery but one wouldn't have an inkling there was a thing wrong at anytime with this energetic man. It was in 1964, too, that he became a member of the board of AMHA and it was in December, 1967, he succeeded the retiring executive director, Allen Dickson.

INSTANT HOUSING

It's called "instant housing" and it has been a major part of the success story of the Akron Metropolitan Housing Authority's national leadership in building low income homes and apartments.

Through new concepts in building, a townhouse complex can be started from start to finish in 10 days. And a local builder can complete a highrise apartment building in as little as six months.

Stirling Homex Corp. of Avon, N.Y., mass produces the townhouses. The company digs a cellar and lays a footer one day, puts up the basement walls in the next couple days and within a week sets a housing module in place—a unique process which takes from 50 to 70 minutes.

And, presto, another family unit is ready to rent.

It sounds easy but the groundwork that was laid between AMHA executive director Jack Saferstein and Stirling Homex was a long and tedious chore. And variations to the final product continue with each project.

Here's how the instant housing concept originated with the AMHA:

When Saferstein became AMHA director late in 1967, his first task was to reactivate already existing federal programs "and to take immediate advantage of them."

"One was the immediate acquisition program where you could go out and buy on the

open market homes already up or being built," Saferstein said.

AMHA purchased a few single-family homes on scattered sites in Akron and then was successful in getting six builders to construct more.

"I saw rather quickly we could nowhere come close to getting enough units under construction to meet the demand," he said. "So then I looked for industrialized housing."

His search led him to a Roanoke, Va., company, which, after several modifications to meet Akron's building code, began construction for AMHA in mid-1968.

"After about a half dozen houses were built, I again discovered building single houses on scattered lots didn't add volume to the housing market. Not enough lots were available," Saferstein said.

In September, 1968, Saferstein's brother, Carl, saw a newspaper advertisement about Stirling Homex. The ad sat on Saferstein's desk for several days before he finally called David Stirling Jr., president of the firm.

Immediately, the wheels began to turn. "They were just starting to manufacture three-bedroom units with no basements and had put up a development in Rochester," Saferstein recalled.

Saferstein persuaded Akron Building Inspector John Konopka to accompany him to Rochester and view the buildings. He then asked Konopka to critique them for possible use in Akron.

"When I received his list of criticisms, I still felt the product had good potential," Saferstein said. "It needed 50 to 60 changes to meet Akron's building code."

Stirling agreed to the changes and immediately began to tackle them. By December the company had constructed an Akron model at its Avon plant for Saferstein and Konopka to critique further.

More changes were made and in February, 1969, the first 10 units were constructed in Akron. Since then more than 600 have gone up and by the end of the year the number should go over 1,000.

"No city in the nation has come close to this," Saferstein said. "We are the pacesetters."

While Stirling was preparing the final version of the "Akron townhouse," Saferstein stressed one theme—a maintenance-free product.

There actually is no paint in the Stirling units. The walls are vinyl, cupboards and counters are covered with formica, the bathroom is ceramic and the flooring is vinyl asbestos sheet linoleum.

On the exterior, the first floor has brick construction while the second story is finished in tedlar—a fine skin over wood or masonite. Aluminum gutters, thermopane windows and prefinished doors round out the low maintenance theme.

"They are about as maintenance free as technology will allow and we are constantly changing the production line as time will allow," Saferstein said.

Stirling has built all the AMHA townhouses although the projects are bid openly.

"So far there is no other manufacturer able to give us a total product and have the capacity to produce the units we need," Saferstein said.

But townhouses aren't the only structures which seem to sprout up overnight.

Highrise apartments for senior citizens also are being constructed in record-setting time.

Of the eight golden age structures, seven were built by the Thomas J. Dillon & Co. Inc. The eighth—the Paul Belcher Apartments which were the first to be built—was constructed by the John G. Ruhlin Co.

These buildings also are open to bidders but Saferstein said, "in the eyes of the regional office (of the Department of Housing and Urban Development) and the local authority, he (Dillon) has had the best bids."

Saferstein said the best bid may not always be the lowest. Also considered are site, design and the ability of the bidder.

Dillon constructed the Buchtel-Cotter and Brittain Place apartments as private ventures and then sold them to AMHA.

The others were built through the turnkey program. Here the company options property and then determines the price of land and construction to put into its bid to the AMHA. After the building is up, the company sells the property and structure to the housing authority. These are Dickson, Lauer and Saferstein apartments plus the addition to Belcher.

"Using the concrete systems he has developed, Dillon is able to efficiently, economically produce a highrise building that meets or exceeds all standards for good senior living," Saferstein said.

John A. Mogen, development coordinator for the Dillon company, says there are several reasons why the firm wins the AMHA contracts.

"We have good sites for one thing," he said. Also the company does such a volume of work that it can command lower prices on materials from suppliers, he said.

Another important point is the experience the company has gained. Dillon has constructed apartment buildings for more than eight years, and since 1968 when it put up its first senior citizens building, has built at least 15 others in Ohio, Pennsylvania, West Virginia, Indiana and Florida.

"We probably handle more senior citizens housing through the turnkey program than any other builder in the country," Mogen said.

As an example of the company's speed, Dillon built the seven-story Belcher South apartments in six months.

Mogen said one of the main reasons for this efficiency is that Dillon uses pre-cast concrete exteriors.

"We get it enclosed so we can work inside," he said. "It costs a little more but it saves time in being able to get inside quicker."

This also enables them to "maintain the momentum" through the winter months, he said.

Saferstein notes with pride that both Dillon and Stirling Homex are among only 22 builders in the Nation to receive grants through the federally-funded Operation breakthrough program to provide low cost housing.

In both cases, Saferstein said there seems to be a special chemistry that clicks between he and Stirling and he and Dillon.

"Two people at the right time under the right conditions are able to motivate each other," Saferstein said. "It's a combination hard to equal."

BIG BOOST

The boom in low income housing in Akron in recent years has had a tremendous impact on the local economy and has been a bright spot in an otherwise rather drab period for the construction industry.

Jack Saferstein, executive director of the Akron Metropolitan Housing Authority, says \$50 million worth of construction has gone up in the last three and one-half years.

Besides new highrise apartments and townhouse communities, hundreds of individual homes have been obtained by AMHA.

These are a blend of new homes built by contractors for immediate sale to AMHA and older homes. Rehabilitation of the older homes has totaled \$1.5 alone, said Saferstein.

In addition, more than 700 housing units have been leased from owners by the AMHA. A deal might be made to lease a four-bedroom home for, say, \$135 a month. This provides the owner a guaranteed income. In turn, AMHA will rent it to a low income family for no more than \$63 a month and the federal government will subsidize the rest.

Saferstein sees the purchase and leasing

of some older homes as having a snowball effect on the economy, too, as the person leasing or selling often then is in the market for another home or an apartment.

The purchase of single homes currently is at a standstill awaiting further federal funding.

Says Saferstein: "The economic impact in this area because of these programs—the jobs we've created—is unbelievable."

URBAN FAST MASS TRANSPORTATION

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 14, 1971

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

URBAN FAST MASS TRANSPORTATION

(Address by the Vice President of the United States at the International Conference on Urban Transportation, Pittsburgh, Pa., September 8, 1971.)

Two thousand years ago Julius Caesar found it necessary to ban chariots and other wheeled vehicles from the streets of Rome, during the daytime, because of traffic congestion.

Outside the city, the Romans had constructed the greatest system of highways the world had ever known. Parts of these roads are in use today. Yet they did not solve the urban snarl of ancient Rome.

Two thousand years later we too take great pride in our highways. The Interstate system now nearing completion in this country is the world's finest. But we, like the Romans, still haven't solved the traffic problem on our city streets.

We can fly men to the moon and back without a hitch or a delay, but they don't have to pass through any cities.

We can cross this continent by air in 5½ hours, but then we encounter delays of up to half that time getting from the airport to our office or home.

And going from downtown to the suburbs at rush hour on any week day is a nightmare in traffic dodging that a Caesar could not imagine.

But at least we're working on the problem—your presence here is an indication of that—and I believe we're closer to the answer than we would dare hope.

The answer is not to ban automobiles from the streets—like the chariots of Rome—but to come up with attractive alternatives to do-it-yourself commuting—alternatives that will encourage the citizen to leave his car at home or at least at some way station outside of town.

The alternative is efficient, dependable, low cost public transportation. Not only would this lure commuters off the streets, it would provide an essential service to the one-quarter of our population who don't own or can't drive cars. They include many of our older citizens and those unable to afford private transportation.

The lack of good public transportation is as much a part of the urban dilemma today as housing, schools and jobs. It ties in with all of them and, in fact, may be the key that unlocks the overall problem and revitalizes our cities.

So it is time we stop thinking of transportation as an end in itself and approach it as a part of the whole—a most vital part of the overall urban problem.

I shall have more to say about this in a few minutes, but first I want to extend a

word of welcome to those of you who have come from foreign countries to assist in this Fifth International Conference on Urban Transportation. And I would like to congratulate those of you from the transportation and related industries in America who are devoting your time to helping us solve what has become our most visible urban problem. Your know-how is on the drawing boards and available, and it is up to us in government and private industry, in the vernacular, to "put it all together."

I am convinced we are on the threshold of a major breakthrough in the solution of our urban transportation problems in this country. There is a new attitude of determination, a national will, to end this strangulation of our cities that has grown progressively worse for several decades now.

We have seen it reflected in the higher priority assigned to urban transportation problems by the Nixon Administration. Prior to this Administration, Federal funding for public transit never exceeded \$200 million a year. Last year, under the Urban Mass Transportation Assistance Act of 1970, it more than doubled to \$435 million, and this year it will be \$900 million. This funding for capital equipment grants and research and development will continue to grow as we move forward on projects conceived and implemented at the local level. It is the President's purpose to supply long-term, continuing financial aid for urban transportation projects as fully as it can be effectively applied.

This substantially larger funding—\$10 billion authorized over 12 years—serves as assurance to State and local governments and private investors that the Federal government recognizes the importance of the mass transit problem. It will be, hopefully, the catalyst that will bring about long deferred action on transit systems too long delayed.

A good transit system is a solid investment in the community. Properly planned, it will pay rich dividends—in increased business, employment, land values, tax base and general urban renewal. It will generate prosperity where it is most needed—in the hard-pressed cities—and, in doing so, it can be of great assistance in meeting other urban problems.

There will be many completely new transit systems starting up in this country within the next 10 years—in San Francisco next year, in Washington in the mid-70's and perhaps in my native city of Baltimore very soon. Other major metropolitan areas are also planning new mass transit systems now that they know Federal funding will be available for their plans to proceed to construction.

Extensions of present systems are planned in New York, in Philadelphia, in Boston and in Chicago.

Involved in these new systems—and extensions of existing major systems—will be hundreds of new rapid transit stations. Many of them will be located in critical poverty areas. Their potential for revitalizing those communities is enormous. They should be thought of in terms of their potential to renew the whole urban environment not just as transit stations. They can become vital parts of planned community centers if sufficient land is acquired to permit such development.

Let's look, for example, at what Sweden has done with this concept. The Taby Center Station outside of Stockholm incorporates in it 14 separate functions—schools, apartments, a shopping center, a medical center, churches, a gymnasium, sports centers. It has become a community within itself, but not one strictly dependent on the automobile. Located along a main transit route, the residents are only 30 minutes away from downtown Stockholm.

Taby is but one of 18 satellite cities that ring Stockholm, all with a population of 10,000 to 50,000 and all of them planned communities on transit lines with easy access to downtown. Some of them are only 5 to

10 minutes away. Although Sweden has the world's highest per capita ownership of automobiles outside the United States, it is estimated that 90 percent of its people travel into Stockholm by the transit system.

What a wonderful opportunity this exciting concept offers for solving the problems of overcrowding people as well as automobiles in our own American cities! I believe the creation of new towns and satellite cities is our best hope for planned urban expansion and relief of many of the problems we now face in the impacted areas of our central cities. I have consistently advocated such development even before I was Governor of Maryland. The successful Swedish experience in planning these new communities around a transit system reaffirms the validity of the proposal. The Nixon Administration has included new town development as a vital part of its national urban policy, and I believe new towns and satellite cities will play an important role in our future urban growth, especially when coupled with the sound planning of transit systems.

Such multi-purpose use of transit stations as the Taby Center does not have to be extended outside the borders of the city to be effective. There will be many instances when it can be adapted to the central city, with regard to housing, health services, educational facilities, recreation, and other aspects of everyday living—to the great benefit of its citizens.

It has been well established that a good transit system will provide a stimulus to development of a new area or revitalization of an old one. I am convinced that New York's extensive rapid transit system played a major role over a period of many years in the development of Manhattan Island as one of the world's great hubs of commerce.

In Canada, Toronto's old, declining central business district underwent a phenomenal spurt of new growth after the construction of a relatively short 4.5 mile stretch of subway, the city's first. Within a five-year period over five million square feet of new high-rise apartments sprang up in areas that had been formerly occupied by old single-family dwellings. And in the first 10 years of subway operation, the 4.5-mile line attracted over two billion dollars of new construction for every mile of the system. Land values along the right-of-way tripled in two to five years, and went up as much as 10 to 12 times in the vicinity of transit stations.

So we can see the value of a transit system to the economic life of a community, whether the community is new and planned or old and declining. And the location and functions of station areas are of particular importance.

Some station areas will have a high development potential; others will offer little more opportunity than to serve as a transit stop. The important thing is to make the maximum possible use of their potential. And the key to this is good planning. It cannot involve just the local government and the transit officials; it must involve the whole community. At the Federal level it is not just a problem for the Department of Transportation; it also must involve the Department of Housing and Urban Development to explore the potential for housing projects, the Department of Health, Education and Welfare in the planning of schools and health facilities, and the expansion projections of the private sector. The same broad approach should be taken locally, with private enterprise heavily involved to capitalize on the business opportunities in such a center.

If there is one major lesson that I learned as the head of a metropolitan county government some years ago, it is that there is no substitute for sound, comprehensive, long-range planning. And the more divergent views and broader field of expertise you can bring together, the better will be your planning. Instead of being a rival with Baltimore

City, we in Baltimore County should continue to learn to work in partnership with the City and other suburban counties on mutual problems. As plans evolve for the Baltimore area transit system I feel confident that you are going to see a product of local officials working with State and Federal officials to bring about a mutual benefit to their communities. Traffic problems certainly don't stop at the city line. Neither do those of housing and employment. And we have learned that our solutions to these problems must also know no artificial boundaries.

I believe we have now learned in this country that transportation is not a matter of either good highways or a good urban transit system. We need both, one tying in with the other, if it is to be an effective system and really move people. And moving people is what it is all about—mobility, the theme of your conference. We should concentrate on the individual and how to best get him from his home to school or to work or to the store or to the sports stadium or theater—at a price he can afford and without taking all day—whether he drives his own car or rides a bus or train.

For too long we thought in terms of having either rapid transit or automobiles and trucks as the backbone of a city's transportation. We now know, as our friends overseas have accepted all along, that it is a combination of both. We cannot eliminate the motor vehicle. But we can reduce the dependence on it by enhancing the attractiveness of other forms of transportation.

I am sure that many helpful ideas in a conference of this type will come from those of you from other countries which have developed excellent transportation systems. We, who regard our interstate highway system as second to none in the world, acknowledge you have taken many strides ahead of us in the field of urban transportation.

We are aware, for example, that more new rapid transit systems are being built in West Germany than in any other single country in the world. Lines are being built or extended in Berlin, Cologne, Frankfurt and Munich. And Hamburg's integrated subway, commuter, rail, bus and ferry system—all functioning under a single authority—offers an example of good coordination in public transportation.

Japan's Tokaido Line, with its high-speed train service from Tokyo to Osaka, is coordinated with Tokyo's expanding rapid transit system. Seventy miles of subways are in service in Tokyo with an additional seventy miles under construction. In Osaka the bus and subway system serves 2 million 700 thousand passengers daily.

On our own continent, Toronto, Montreal and Mexico City have all developed outstanding subway systems.

So there is much that we can learn in an international conference of this type.

But the most important change that has come about in this country is the need for better public transportation in our cities—a growing awareness that we are no longer a rural nation and that subways and rapid surface transit are as essential to the healthy growth of all our metropolitan areas as they have been to New York and Chicago.

Ten years ago there were only 16 urban areas in America with populations of more than one million. Today there are 25. By the year 2000 we expect to have 50 cities with a million or more residents. Eight of every ten Americans already qualify as city dwellers, living on less than three per cent of the Nation's land, and their numbers multiply daily. So do their motor vehicles.

Last year there were more than 108 million motor vehicles registered in the United States—89.3 million automobiles, 18.7 million trucks and 379,021 buses. Their numbers increase by about 8,000 a day. At 5 p.m. on almost any working day, it seems, you

will find most of them gathered on Main Street, U.S.A. starting, stopping, honking and overheating as they creep homeward through a pall of gasoline fumes.

The automobile is still man's best method of personalized transportation, and it can continue to serve that purpose for many years to come if we lick the pollution problem and if we keep our highways and streets open. But there are better ways of commuting in urban areas and we must establish them. Otherwise we will reach a saturation point, as did the Romans with their chariots.

I wish you good luck in your deliberations at this conference, and I look forward with interest to the reports and thoughts that will come out of it. We have the opportunity to bring a new vitality to our beleaguered, impacted and dependent cities if we in government and you in industry have the imagination and foresight to conceive bold situations to our age-old problems and the courage to put them into effect.

President Nixon put the challenge this way when he signed the Urban Mass Transportation Bill committing the Nation to a larger, sustained effort:

"As we look into the history of this country," he said, "we recall the development of the Western Frontier. It was made possible because of a massive program of transportation which enabled us to develop that new frontier in the West.

"Now we have the challenge of the urban frontier. And it is through this bill and the support that it will provide for new programs in the field of mass urban transportation that we are going to be able to meet the challenge of the urban frontier. Just as the Western Frontier was the challenge of America in the 19th Century, the urban frontier is the challenge of America in the last third of the 20th Century."

POLISH ARMY VETERANS CELEBRATE 50TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. ELLA T. GRASSO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 14, 1971

Mrs. GRASSO. Mr. Speaker, this month the Polish Army Veterans, District IV, Department of Connecticut, celebrate the 50th anniversary of the founding of their organization.

Members of the Polish Army Veterans have willingly fought for the ideals of liberty deeply cherished through the years.

They have acted out of a deep patriotism born in part of the profound religious feeling.

They share a proud heritage of strength and meaningful endeavor.

After 150 years of oppression, Polish men who had been deprived of their nation joined the fighting forces of other nations during World War I. Peace, it was hoped, would bring a reconstituted Polish State. In June 1917, refugees and emigre volunteers formed a Polish Army in France under the direction of Gen. Jozef Haller. This army joined the final Allied drive which defeated the Axis powers and led to the long desired end of the foreign occupation of Poland.

Although victorious in its struggle against foreign tyranny and oppression, the Polish Army soon had to defend Poland's new freedom. Indeed, the Polish Army was the only force standing be-

tween Soviet Russia and a Germany submerged in revolutionary upheaval. After an initial retreat, this valiant force rallied under the gallant leadership and inspiration of Joseph Pilsudski and his lieutenants to shatter the Bolshevik offensive at the Vistula River in August 1920 and halt the advance of communism into central Europe. A proud army—veterans of the battlefield—crushed the Bolshevik attempt to destroy the Versailles settlement and export revolution throughout Europe.

The happenstance of geography placed Poland between two great European powers. The Poles were again called upon to defend the liberty they hold so dear. Yet, the Nazi blitzkrieg was too powerful—even for a will that was fierce. Despite unflinching resistance, Poland fell to the enemy.

Although the land was conquered, the spirit of the people remained strong. Kindled with the fire of patriotism, the defeated Polish Army would not willingly accept defeat. While some compatriots remained in Poland to fight again, parts of the army managed to reach France where a new Polish Army of 85,000 men under Gen. Wladyslaw Sikorski fought in the 1940 battles at Narvik and Champagne, and in Lorraine. Among the 20,000 veteran Polish troops who managed to escape to Britain after the fall of France were desperately needed airmen who fought with the RAF during the Battle of Britain.

Throughout the remainder of the war, the Polish Army was a credit to its homeland and its cause. A brigade of troops originally formed in the Middle East took part in the north African campaign of 1941, including the valiant defense of Tobruk. Later, II Corps, composed of previously Russian-interred troops, braved the mud and steel of the Italian campaign and captured the famous monastery at Monte Cassino. In the drive across France in 1944, Polish armored and parachute forces joined the Allied assault on the Third Reich.

Yes, the history of Polish fighting forces is a proud history. Let us not forget that it is a story of hope in a world where often there is too little.

At the end of World War II, most Poles expected to fulfill their dreams of freedom and security—of independence and a rightful place in the family of nations. But tragedy was to have its way. Poland soon fell under the yoke of yet another tyrant, the Russians. It was the call for thousands of Polish Army veterans to refuse return to a communist Poland.

Mr. Speaker, these men loved liberty above all. And because they gave expression to this abiding love, many came to our Nation which they have enriched in measure untold.

Like their countrymen from earliest times who came to American shores, talents and skills, and enduring hard work have meant progress for our land.

The Polish Army Veterans, District IV, Department of Connecticut, are commemorating the 50th anniversary of their organization on September 19, 1971.

They mark a devotion to freedom and a willingness to defend it that is an inspiration to all.

Let us pray that the freedom for which so many have fought will again return to Poland.

PRICE RURAL DEVELOPMENT

HON. ROBERT PRICE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 14, 1971

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, as a Representative of a rural area I have long been interested in the subject of rural development. It was my pleasure to testify this morning before my colleagues on the House Agriculture Committee. I would like to have printed at this point in the RECORD my testimony before the committee:

TESTIMONY OF CONGRESSMAN BOB PRICE OF TEXAS

Mr. Chairman and my colleagues on the committee, I welcome the opportunity to discuss with you from this side of the table—my views on the subject of rural development. As the representative of a rural area this is a topic that is very close to me.

Rural America begins with farm America. Agriculture was America's first industry, and it remains one of the keystones of our national economy today. It has made Americans the best-fed people in history, and now exports the produce of one-fourth of its acreage to help feed the world. American farmers have led all sectors of the economy in annual increases in productivity for most of the years in this country. This nation's farms are among our most efficient producers, and they are of central importance to a strong future for rural America.

Yet, there is sharp irony in this success. Ever more fruitful, American agriculture has required fewer people every year to produce food and fibers for our people, and to supply the expanding export market for our commodities abroad.

Hence the departure of people from the farms began to swell as farming grew more mechanized, efficient, and large-scale. Americans living on farms numbered more than 30,000,000 in 1940; today that figure is only about 10,000,000. Once the farm people had left their homes—often the homes of generations in their families—the opportunities often did not exist in rural America to keep them close to those roots. While some jobs began to open up in agricultural service, supply, and processing enterprises, usually known as "agri-business," the number of openings was not nearly enough to match the number of people cast adrift by technological progress.

Migration began toward where people thought opportunities existed—the cities. Not only were there more jobs in the cities, but they paid more. For most decades in this century, the gap between median income in the cities and that in non-metropolitan areas has been wide. Even though income gains outside the metropolis have been almost half again as great as those in the cities during the last decade, median family income in non-metropolitan areas is still 22 percent below that in metropolitan areas.

While the people who have been leaving rural America by the millions have often improved their own and their families' situations by leaving, the trend they represent has had several disturbing effects.

First, in rural America itself, the loss in human resources has compounded the problems of diversifying the economy and fostering a vigorous and progressive community life. Those who have chosen to stay have found it harder and harder to pay for and

provide services such as good schools, transportation systems, and other infrastructure attractive enough to keep people in rural America, or to lure jobs and opportunity to rural America. Many of the small towns which dot the countryside have to struggle for existence: they often have difficulty attracting good school teachers or physicians; many fight stagnation while most of the economy is expanding; they cannot give the older, the disadvantaged, the less educated people needed assistance and care.

At the same time the urban effects of migration have been profound. While the explosive growth in the proportion of Americans living in cities has not been fed solely by the influx of people from rural America—immigration from other countries has also been massive—the millions who have moved from the South and the Midwest to the North and the West have been a major factor in making a nation that was 75 percent rural a century ago, 73 percent urban today.

Many of these people pouring into the cities in search of opportunity have experienced difficulties in adapting to urban life and have required supportive services. Some made the transition successfully—but others have remained tax users rather than taxpayers.

Furthermore, the very size and density of many of our largest cities has produced new problems: whereas the most rural areas it is hard to achieve economies of scale in public activities, the most heavily urban areas have grown far past the size range in which a community can function most economically. It often costs far more per capita to provide essential services, such as police protection, sanitation collection, and public transportation in our dense urban areas than in less congested smaller and medium-sized cities. Many of our cities have, in short, become inefficient and less and less governable. At times, this has led to near-paralysis of public services in our largest cities. Current trends indicate that unless there is a marked shift in public and private attitudes, the increase of population in and around our great metropolitan centers will continue, and the problems of urban management will be further aggravated.

In addition, by even conservative estimates, there will be some 75 million additional Americans by the end of the twentieth century. Whether this growth is beneficial or burdensome depends on our foresight in planning and preparing for it—a process that must begin now and must take a broader view than merely feeding the expansion of the megalopolis.

As never before, the Nation is beginning to see that urban America has a vital stake in the well-being and progress of rural America. This is one nation, and for the good of all Americans we need one national policy of balanced growth.

In a very fundamental sense the farmer and the farm economy provide a cornerstone of the American way of life. Just take a look at these general indicators. First, employment: farming employs 4.6 million workers. This is more than the combined employment in the transportation, public utilities, steel, and auto industry. Moreover, three out of every 10 jobs in the private sector are related to agriculture. Of these, 8 million people have jobs storing, processing, and merchandising products of agriculture, and 6 million have jobs providing the supplies the farmers use.

Second, production: The sale of agricultural production assets represents about \$50,000 for every farmworker. This is approximately double that of each manufacturing employee. Labor production of the American farmer increased by 6 percent a year during the last decade, while output per man hour in non-agricultural industry increased by only 3 percent a year during the same period. According to another measure, each farmworker produces food, fiber, and commodities for himself and 44 other individuals.

Third, consumption: The farmer spends over \$38 billion a year for goods and services to produce crops and livestock. He spends another \$12 billion a year for the same things that city people buy—food, clothing, drugs, furniture, appliances, and other products and services.

You ask what does the farmer do for me? Let me tell you, the farmer feeds the American people for what amounts to 16.5 percent of each person's disposable income. Contrast this to 1960 when food took 20 percent of our take-home pay, and to 1940 when it took 22 percent. Farmers also produce a rich and varied diet for our people. Last year, for example, every American consumed on the average: 182 pounds of beef, veal, pork, lamb, and mutton; 48 pounds of chicken and turkey; 188 pounds of fruit—fresh fruit equivalent; 260 pounds of vegetables—fresh vegetable equivalent; 563 pounds of dairy products—whole milk equivalent; 166 pounds of potatoes and 6 pounds of sweet potatoes.

Moreover, when we go to the store we can choose from as many as 6,000 different foods—fresh, canned, frozen, concentrated, dehydrated, ready-mixed, ready-to-serve, or in heat and serve form.

Yet it seems paradoxical that with all the things that farming is doing for us and all the things that rural America contributes to our culture and our way of life, farmers do not share more fully in the abundance of our nation. The following general indices spell out this fact in grim detail:

First, income: Despite the fact that during the last decade the gross national product rose an average of 9 percent a year, farm income rose on an annual basis less than one-half of 1 percent.

Second, rural poverty: In the cities, one person in eight is poor. In the suburbs, one person in 15 is poor. In rural America one out of every four persons is poor.

Third, employment: The rate of unemployment in rural areas is two to three times greater than in urban areas. Jobs in rural America pay less than comparable jobs in urban areas. There also tends to be far more unemployment in rural than in urban areas.

Fourth, housing: According to official figures, one out of every 13 rural houses is classed as unfit to live in. In terms of living conditions, over half the nation's standard housing is located in rural areas.

Fifth, education: Rural education often lags far behind its urban counterparts. Many rural schools lack libraries, laboratories, language facilities, and a wide education curriculum. Not only do rural teachers earn less money than urban ones, public expenditures per pupil tend to be less in rural areas.

Mr. Chairman, I bring these grim facts to the attention of my colleagues not in an effort to merely depress them and not in an effort to merely elicit sympathy for the plight of rural America. Rather, I bring these facts to the attention of my colleagues to focus, if I can, public concern and attention on the crying needs of rural America; needs that must be faced and met if the fullness and richness of this nation is to become a reality for all.

I have been warmed by the interest and concern for the farmer and his well-being which has been displayed in this committee. At the same time, however, I would caution my colleagues not to confuse talking about the problems of farmers and rural America with solving the problems of farmers and rural America. Action is needed and swift action at that. I have discussed farm and rural problems in terms of five broad categories: income, poverty, employment, housing, and education. In an effort to provide a focus for the interest and concern for these problems now being voiced, I would like to briefly set forth what initiatives I have taken and what legislative actions I am pursuing which are calculated to strike at the very roots of these five problem areas.

The state of farm income is deplorable. Mere statistics cannot really describe the dimensions of the problems that are felt by farmers who cannot earn enough money to provide the necessities of life for themselves and their loved ones. While it is true income problems have, in some cases, been created by overproduction of farm products, these have been magnified by the skyrocketing costs of farming and ranching over the last decade. By way of illustration, during the last 7 years capital investment costs for farmers and ranchers climbed 69 percent. Annual outlays for fertilizers increased 64 percent; costs of pesticides and insecticides rose 20 percent; and feed costs increased 33 percent.

To help the farmer better cope with these rising costs I have introduced legislation designed to increase loan limits on the FHA operating loan program from \$35,000 to \$50,000. This will help this vital FHA loan program better fulfill the farm credit needs of more small farm and ranch operators. In addition, I have proposed transferring the funding of the operation loan program from the Federal budget to the private money market. This will help streamline FHA operations and it will have the taxpayer approximately \$275 million a year in Federal expenditures.

Helping to bolster farm income, however, does not go far enough when laws such as our present inheritance laws exist which cannibalize an individual's estate. Why should anyone spend his lifetime striving to engage in productive work and to save and invest the fruits of his labors when he knows that upon his death the Federal Government, as a matter of public policy, will make every effort to dilute his inheritance, dissolve his interests, and redistribute his wealth?

That such state of affairs has been tolerated for the last 30 years is unthinkable. That Congress has not acted to solve this problem is unjustifiable. Thus, with great hopes for reform of our ill-conceived inheritance tax laws, I have introduced legislation to reform these laws as they pertain to estates involving small farming, small ranching and small business interests. I have proposed that the executor of such an estate should be allowed to establish the estate value for inheritance tax purposes either on the basis of the earning power of the estate as evidenced by a taxable income measure or by the fair market value of the estate's assets. If enacted, this law would change present conditions wherein an estate is often incorrectly evaluated on the basis of speculative land values and unrealistic fair market values.

In essence, allowing an estate to be assessed on its earning capacity enables small business, farms, and ranches to be kept within a particular family, if so desired. This would preserve a valued way of life for thousands upon thousands of individuals who under present laws fall prey to the ravages of excessive and unjustifiable tax laws. Moreover, it would give people new incentive to work, to be productive and to save for the future and their posterity.

Regarding rural poverty, as I have stated before, although nonmetropolitan America has one-third of the Nation's population counted, it has one-half of it poverty-stricken. This means that almost 14 million poor people live in rural areas.

As we are all well aware, poverty and unemployment go hand in hand: consequently, in an attempt to alleviate rural poverty and to provide new job and living opportunities for young people as well as older persons interested in bettering themselves, I have introduced the Rural Job Development Act of 1971 and the Human Investment Act of 1971. The Rural Job Act would give tax and other incentives to provide enterprises upon their relocating in rural areas and working with the individuals and groups interested in improving the quality of life in their

communities. The Human Investment Act bill would provide tax credits to offset part of the expenses businesses would incur in establishing, operating and maintaining job training programs for the unemployed, the underemployed, and those interested in career advancement.

In my view giving business the incentive to relocate to rural areas and establish on-going job training programs would have four primary benefits: first, the amount of Government involvement in the private commercial sector would be reduced; second, participating businesses would give individuals better targeted training than is now common among Federal programs, because businesses usually know their job needs better than Government officials do; third, individuals would receive more beneficial assistance because private enterprise would substitute modern management techniques for traditional bureaucratic practices; and finally, with more people on payrolls, general economic activities would be increased, welfare costs would be reduced, and additional tax revenues would be generated.

Rural poverty is also manifested by the State of Rural Housing. For as I mentioned earlier, over half the Nation's substandard housing is located in rural America. The State of Rural Housing affects more than poor people, it affects many middle-income families as well; for many houses of the nonpoor lack the amenities which we commonly associate with the affluent society.

To strike at the varied problems of rural housing, I have introduced the Housing Rights Act of 1971—a proposal which, if enacted, would suspend local building codes and/or union agreements in all federally-financed housing projects. The need for such a measure is caused by the fact that in many rural communities outdated local building codes often frustrate the attempts on the part of contractors to utilize modern technology in home construction. The same condition is also created by many local union contracts. They prohibit contractors from employing such cost saving building techniques as prefabricated housing parts, and modular construction.

It could be argued that these obstacles would be tolerable if there were not really pressing housing needs in rural America, but the facts proclaim reality to be otherwise. If this Nation is to meet its housing needs in the coming decade, 26 million new units need be constructed; and of these, 6 million should be suitable for low- and middle-income families. Based on historical experience in the housing industry, it is unlikely these goals will be met, because in the last decade the average annual rate of housing construction was less than 1.5 million. Contrast this with the more than 2 million new units which need to be erected each year during the 1970's if the 26 million mark is to be attained. Moreover, as regards the 6 million units needed for low- and middle-income families, the impossibility of attaining this goal is evidenced by the fact that only 938,000 publicly assisted dwellings have been built since the beginning of the Federal housing program in 1949.

The housing rights act of 1971 will enable tax dollars to be allocated to fullest advantage in the housing area. By permitting outdated local building codes and restrictive local union agreements to be bypassed on federally assisted housing projects the housing needs of the American people will be well served.

Finally, as regards rural education problems, rural education will be revitalized if more money is effectively channeled into rural school systems and more individuals are provided with greater educational opportunities. Two bills I have introduced would free up individual resources for educational purposes; the first would establish tax credits for higher education and vocational training expenses. The second would establish a federally guaranteed student loan

program designed to help children of low- and middle-income families pursue higher educational and vocational training opportunities.

In addition, Mr. Chairman, I would like to bring to the attention of the committee two other bills I have introduced which will be of assistance to rural residents as well as those in the cities.

In February of this year I proposed an investment tax credit for investments up to \$15,000. It is heartening to see the President now recommend an investment tax credit on all capital expenditures in the interest of economic renewal and expansion.

My most recent major legislative effort has been the Home Owners' Tax Relief Act of 1971. This legislation would give home owners the same tax depreciation deductions given to owners of rental property. In addition, it provides for a tax deduction of up to \$1,000 for home repairs.

Mr. Chairman, in closing, I want to emphasize two things: first, these are but the beginnings of my efforts to help reshape and revitalize the future of rural America. I will be making further proposals in coming months. Second, my proposals taken either singly or together do not constitute the last word on any of these areas. Thus, I welcome any suggestions as to improvements or changes, and I am examining all the other proposals that have been made in this general area with great interest.

Solving the problems of rural America is a nonpolitical and nonpartisan matter. It is a cause that in the years ahead will demand the best each of us has to offer.

MRS. MABEL TENNANT, ONE OF ALAMEDA'S MOST DISTINGUISHED CITIZENS, CELEBRATES 90TH BIRTHDAY

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 14, 1971

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, one of Alameda's most distinguished citizens, a generous and talented lady who has done much to assist our community, recently celebrated her 90th birthday. I insert with these remarks an article which appeared in the Alameda Times Star, telling of her activities and accomplishments:

[From the Alameda (Calif.) Times Star, Aug. 26, 1971]

HAPPY 90TH BIRTHDAY MRS. MABEL TENNANT!

Mabel Tennant, in whose maternity hospital over 4,000 babies were born, will be 90 years old tomorrow.

In honor of the event she was feted at an open house reception given by the Alameda Business and Professional Women's Club, which she joined in 1926.

Mrs. Tennant opened the Tennant Maternity Hospital October 11, 1911, with 10 beds licensed. The first baby was born there on December 2, 1911. Many Alameda residents and civic leaders "got their start" at the Tennant Maternity Hospital and were among the more than 4,000 babies born there until the hospital closed in January, 1944.

Through the years, Mrs. Tennant has been active in many community organizations. She worked for the Camp Fire Girls when they were in the early stages of organization, meeting in the old water company building.

She was a board member of the first Com-parties and other fund raising events to benefit the Camp Fire Girls before the start of the Community Chest and later United

Crusade, which now supports the organization. For her service to the Camp Fire Girls in Alameda she received the Luther Gulick Award, the highest in Camp Fire.

She was a board member of the first Community Chest and was reappointed for a second year, serving under Judge Donald Quayle, who was chairman.

She joined the Alameda Business and Professional Women's Club in 1926—two years after it was formed here. She served as president in 1930 and represented the Alameda Club at the first biennial in Richmond, Virginia, when the international BPWC was organized.

During the depression she went door to door soliciting funds for unemployed, as a representative of the BWC.

She has also been an active member of the First Congregational Church, joining when the Rev. Gail Cleland was pastor, nearly 40 years ago. She also headed the Women's Fellowship of the church for several years.

Now an honorary member of the Alameda Chamber of Commerce, she was twice named woman of the year by the group.

Always interested in the youth of Alameda, Mrs. Tennant has been a sponsoring member of the Alameda Boys' Club since 1950 and also is a sponsoring member of the Alameda Girls' Club. In addition she is a member of NIKE, an organization of past presidents in BPWC in the Bay Valley District.

CRISIS ON THE COASTLINE: WHOSE BEACHES?

HON. RONALD V. DELLUMS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 14, 1971

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, as the demand for—and utilization of—recreational areas dramatically increases across the Nation, concurrently there are some disturbing trends.

One of the most disturbing is the continuing aggrandizement by private interests to deny the public the opportunity to enjoy the disappearing amount of available recreational land.

Perhaps the most visible—and threatening—trend concerns the Nation's coastline and beaches. Beaches are being ruined or cut off from public use almost every day. No general guidelines for utilization of coastline areas exist.

An excellent perspective on the serious threats to California's beaches was provided recently in an article by Elizabeth Campbell for West magazine of the Los Angeles Times. Miss Campbell, a television producer for the National Broadcasting Co., has made a thorough—sometimes frightening—analysis of the many environmental hazards resulting from the current tendencies to utilize beaches for purely private interests.

In her fine article, Miss Campbell mentions various legislative proposals which have been drawn up in an effort to save beach areas. I have introduced two measures which I believe would comprise the important first steps in this process—H.R. 6595, the Open Beaches Act and H.R. 6605, which would establish a National Coastline Conservation Commission with the power to study and develop plans for comprehensive coastal ecological management. It is my hope that appropriate action can be taken on these types of bills as soon as possible.

At this point, I insert Miss Campbell's article into the RECORD, and I urge my colleagues to study it carefully:

[From the West magazine, the Los Angeles Times, Aug. 8, 1971]

WHOSE BEACHES?

(By Elizabeth Campbell)

I turned on my back and floated, looking up at the sky, nothing around but cool clear Pacific, nothing in my eyes but long blue space. It was as close as I ever got to cleanliness and freedom, as far as I ever got from all those people. They had jerry-built the beaches from San Diego to the Golden Gate, bulldozed superhighways through the mountains, cut down a thousand years of redwood growth, and built an urban wilderness in the desert. They couldn't touch the ocean. They poured their sewage in it, but it couldn't be tainted.—*The Drowning Pool*, 1950.

The California coastline is 1,072 miles long, and it isn't going to get any longer. Of its 302 miles of sand beaches, only 160 miles are public. If we continue to dam our rivers for flood control and water projects, the sand which comes down from the hills to replenish the beaches will be coming no longer. And, as the builders of marinas have learned to their dismay, nothing that affects the coastline is isolated—it is all of a piece.

Every day, irreversible decisions are being made about our coastline: wetlands are filled, breakwaters constructed, power plants built and developments approved. But nobody is planning the development of the coast as a whole, because nobody has the authority to do so.

What results from this authority vacuum sometimes verges on the absurd: the King Harbor District, which owns the property on which the Los Angeles County Beach Department headquarters is located, permitted construction of an apartment building which actually blocks the view of the ocean from the main lifeguard station. More often, however, there is little humor to be found in the bits-and-pieces approach to coastline development.

Consider, for instance, Bolsa Lagoon—a remnant of a once-vast swampland that still supports numerous birds and marine animals. The Orange County Harbor District wants to turn Bolsa Lagoon into a marina, which local boat owners say is badly needed. Surfing enthusiasts oppose the plan because they say the proposed construction would destroy a spot they value. The point is not whether birds, boat owners or surfers have first claim to the area—but, rather, that the needs of all should be considered before a decision is made. As things stand, there is no way that can happen.

Who owns the coast? Robert Baker, a coastline planner for the California Parks and Recreation Department, recalls that "after a year of trying to figure out who owned the coastline, I discovered that the state didn't know where mean high tide was. I wondered if anybody ever got arrested for trespassing, so I called the Sheriff's Department in Malibu. They said, sure, we get asked to tell people to leave private beaches. And I told them, if I don't know where mean high tide is, and the State Lands Commission doesn't know, how is some guy in a sheriff's car supposed to know?"

Theoretically, ownership breaks down this way: the federal government owns the land under the ocean from three miles offshore to 12 miles out. The state owns the tidelands (except where it has given or traded them away) up to mean high tide, wherever that is. Above that, development is left to the discretion of the oceanfront property owner, with the consent of the local government involved. And cities and counties, suffering from chronic financial problems,

often, cannot afford to consider all the needs which press upon their coastlines.

In the 26 miles from the Ventura County line to the Los Angeles city limits, only six miles of beach are open to the public. Along the same stretch, the residents of 1,504 houses enjoy essentially private beaches. Mutterings of protest from other area residents are getting louder: beach privileges, the protesters say, should not be awarded only to people affluent enough to afford a six-figure pad at Malibu. At Cabrillo Beach in San Pedro (the beach most heavily used by minority ethnic groups in all of California), plans to turn the inner harbor into a marina were revised after public protest; the new proposal calls for elimination of only the east end of the beach.

The voices demanding beach access and intelligent coastline regulation will not easily be quieted; the issue of shoreline ownership has been challenged for all time. Reading the handwriting on the wall property owners in Palos Verdes are putting up fences. Because all proposed legislation to establish coastal planning exempts projects which have already been approved, developments are being pushed through faster than ever, with little regard for consequences.

Every year—perhaps every day—that no decisive action is taken, California beaches are being irrevocably changed. We are losing areas which we will never be able to restore. Once a lagoon has been turned into a housing development, nobody is going to advocate tearing down the houses even if hindsight proves that the development was a mistake. Although the San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission hopes to save the two-thirds of the original bay that remains, nobody is suggesting that San Francisco lop off the parts of the city that used to be water and start over. Nobody is suggesting that we return Los Angeles Harbor to 5,000 acres of marsh and wetlands.

Probably the public interest is better served by the presence of Los Angeles Harbor than it would be by the long-gone wetlands, and possibly San Francisco would be more prosperous with an extension of the San Francisco Airport instead of the marshes which now surround the facility. However, marine biologists say that two-thirds of the marine life in the ocean depends on the areas where fresh water and salt water meet—the estuaries. (They also point out that we have lost more than half of the estuaries that once existed in California.) We try to keep chemicals out of our oceans because we know that if life in the ocean dies, so will life everywhere else. So it would seem logical, even essential, to save some of our wetlands untouched.

Nobody has computed the number of fish which do not exist today because of the disappearance of breeding grounds, but it may be enormous. And, as everybody knows, we are also losing many species of animals forever—the brown pelican, for example. Aside from the fact that we will miss pelicans, there are some very solid reasons why our species, even considering its own selfish interests, should think twice before it eliminates other residents of this planet. All life on earth constitutes an enormous resource. Today, scientists are using sea hares for brain research, barnacles for muscle research and sea urchins for cancer research. There may be an antileukemia factor in sea squids. In themselves, some of these creatures may be considered of little value, but it is impossible to predict what life in the sea may eventually have to offer mankind. Nature isn't especially efficient this way; we may never find uses for most sea creatures, but any lost species is a lost option.

There is a kind of worm found on the east side of Point Dume which exists nowhere else in the world. Possibly this worm never will perform any function more vital than supplying material for Ph.D. theses. But if a

marina is built at nearby Paradise Cove, as is tentatively planned, nobody will be considering the welfare of the worm. He does not fall under any of the jurisdictions in charge.

Plans for other estuarine areas are more than tentative. All along the coast, every lagoon and salt marsh looks like a quick coastline profit to somebody. And estuaries are not the only parts of the coast in danger. There are thousands of archaeological sites along the coast which may tell us, someday, what life was like for the original inhabitants. At Paradise Cove, a site occupied for 7,000 years, evidence of ancient villages has been obscured by a trailer park.

Educational institutions need unspooled areas in which to study marine life. Hundreds of thousands of fishermen, divers and surfers want an unpolluted ocean to enjoy. Thousands of boat owners need docking space. We need power plants, harbors, airports, highways and sewage treatment plants—and, as if all these needs weren't enough, we need the housing, which so far seems to have enjoyed priority. And there is still another need which doesn't fall into any kind of cost/benefit analysis: we need the ocean to look at, for the enrichment of our spirits.

All these needs are real; many are conflicting; not all can be filled on the same stretch of beach. We have only so many miles of sand, so many mineral deposits, so much oil, so many unique physical specimens along our coast—and there is no broad-based agency to weigh their value against that of more houses or more marinas. The decision making is now being done by local agencies with local needs in mind, but that system doesn't seem to be working very well. Which needs should take priority? Whose beaches are they?

It is unfortunate that prophecy is an imperfectly developed art among human beings. If we could foresee our problems before they became critical, we might avoid some of their more disturbing consequences. But that hasn't happened yet. Whatever the "public interest" is, it seems to get itself defined by being threatened.

When Ross Macdonald wrote *The Drowning Pool*, the ocean itself seemed indestructible. Only in the past few years has it become evident that we have the capacity to destroy our oceans, and that our coastlines represent a limited resource. Because decisions about shoreline land use traditionally were made by individuals, the collective loss that resulted from shortsighted planning was not easily definable. But while the length of our California coastline hasn't changed over the years, the number of people who want to use it has: what was sufficient for 1.5 million people in 1900 is utterly inadequate for 20 million in 1971.

Nobody who has been to the shore recently has to be told that California beaches are crowded. Of the 160 publicly owned miles of sand beach, various branches of the armed services are tenaciously holding 40—which leaves only 120 miles for the millions of inland sun worshippers who flock to the ocean every sunny weekend. Estimates of use are difficult to make, but the City of Los Angeles says that 26 million people use its beaches; Long Beach says its seven miles of sand bring out 14 million every year. These estimates don't include the number of people who might want to go to the coast but aren't willing to face the crowds or the parking problem. Huntington Beach says that 4.6 million people use its city beach, which has 2,100 parking places. Nearby Sunset Beach is just as nice but has a mere 16 parking places. Only 350,000 people a year visit Sunset.

Hundreds of thousands of people use the two miles of sand between the Manhattan Beach and Hermosa Beach piers. This summer, for the first time, that stretch of beach will get rest rooms. For years the public

health has been protected by laws requiring rest rooms in restaurants and hotels, at swimming pools and parks—everywhere the public gathered except beaches. Last year, Assemblyman Paul Priolo was able to push through legislation requiring rest rooms at public beaches, in spite of opposition from local governments.

"From a project selection standpoint," says Governor Reagan, "California beaches represent the single resource most in demand by the recreation-seeking public of the state and, as such, they are given primary consideration." But state officials, historically, never even made statements like that, let alone did anything to back them up. In the 1930s, a group of young men in the shoreline cities became concerned because state park funds were not being spent on beach development. They formed the Shoreline Planning Association and came up with a creative—and, ultimately, successful—idea: the beach cities would turn over the land they owned to the state which would, in turn, spend the assessed valuation of the beach lands for acquiring more beaches. Many existing Los Angeles County beaches resulted from this agreement. However, the kind of people who traditionally have been in control of recreation and parks departments have not been primarily interested in beaches. (The upper echelons of the state parks department are filled with former forest rangers, which may explain why California parks have so many trees.)

Just this year, the Los Angeles City Recreation and Parks Department put its beach operations division on a level with special services; previously, beaches had been administered under cultural affairs. Los Angeles County has had a Beach Department for only two years; before that, county beaches were run by the Parks and Recreation Department, which demonstrated what it thought of them by spending more than \$16 million (since 1945) on parks and golf courses, and not one cent for beaches. It is not coincidental that the county's proposal to purchase its first new beach in 15 years came just after the Beach Department was formed.

When the development of light-weight surfboards and wet suits made all-weather surfing popular about five years ago, year-round lifeguard operations became essential, and lifeguards are now a force to be reckoned with. True professionals, they are able enough to appear at city council meetings and demand salaries equal to those paid to police and firemen, and secure enough to point out that their supervisors might know little about the beaches.

No decision about beach use or development is made without someone complaining. When the Los Angeles County Beach Department decided to open Point Dume State Beach (publicly owned since 1966) to public access by constructing parking lots and rest rooms, "ecology!" became a battle cry for residents all along the coast. Most of the disapproval came from residents of the area who believed that the beach ought to be preserved in its natural state. Many land owners who lived directly behind the beach, however, were delighted. They had had enough of rapes, muggings and drug overdoses in their front yards, and welcomed county supervision.

When the county attempted to open nine easements from Pacific Coast Highway to the ocean in the Malibu area, the furor was even louder. Residents there complained about having their beaches open to the public without adequate sanitary facilities. (These are the same people whose sewage runs, essentially, down their toilets and out into the ocean.) To be fair, problems do result when beach property—or any property—is open to the public without adequate supervision.

Some people find making love on the beach delightful; others like to throw away tin cans. Neither is acceptable public behavior today.

Last year's Gion-Dietz decision by the California Supreme Court was an attempt to resolve this continuing conflict, at least temporarily—though hardly to the satisfaction of the property owners. The court decided that, if public use has been allowed of coastal property, a public easement exists. In other words, the very title to that land includes the public's right to use it forever. The idea is that if a land owner has let people use his beach, he has given "implied consent" for its continued use.

The immediate consequence of the Gion-Dietz decision has been a reduction of beach property available for public use. Fences have gone up in Palos Verdes, on the north side of Coral Beach in Malibu, on Irvine Company land in Orange County. Property owners are afraid that when the county's easements in Malibu are opened, people will walk down the paths to the beach and then spread out, essentially, in the beach dwellers' front yards. Even if land owners put fences across the sand at mean high tide, which they have every right to do, it would be extremely difficult to keep everyone out. And the state court's decision provides that owners who wish to protect their property must not only warn the public to keep off, they must also succeed.

The Gion-Dietz case has been appealed and will, ultimately, be determined by the U.S. Supreme Court. Meanwhile, public agencies are cautiously applying it to the acquisition of land along the coast. Huntington Beach is using its principle in litigation over the Huntington Pacific Property next to the city beach. The Los Angeles County Beach Department is attempting to get permanent recreational rights to a piece of sand on the Torrance-Redondo Beach border. (That property was scheduled to become an apartment house on the sand; the County Beach Department heard about it only when the builder asked if he could cross county sand to haul building materials to his site.)

If the Gion-Dietz decision is upheld by the Supreme Court, legal actions probably will become more numerous. Private individuals can file suit, but this kind of litigation is very expensive. The Sierra Club or other organizations could file "Quiet Title" actions, however, claiming that the public's right to use the sand in front of private property should be part of the actual title. (The name comes from the assumption that a contested title is "making noise" and that a suit establishing who actually owns the land will "quiet it down.") In this way, public access might be established to all the sandy beaches along the coast. But there is a catch: the state legislature will, almost certainly, pass some kind of bill ending "implied dedication" this year. (In other words, if you use somebody's beach after that legislation has been passed, you won't be able to claim that he intended to let you keep on using it.)

Neither the state legislature nor Congress has, at this writing, taken a position on overall coastline control—the very situation which prompted the recently retired Chief Justice of the California Supreme Court, Roger Traynor, to push for some kind of coastal land use decision that would undoubtedly provoke further, more extensive, testing. State Assemblyman Paul Priolo's committee now has been given the responsibility of approving some kind of coastal access bill. All bills currently under consideration include specific restrictions on development, as well as a general coastline plan. Authority is the essential factor: plans in themselves, without adequate provisions for enforcing them, are only pipe dreams. Orange County, for instance, adopted a master plan for shoreline development in 1941

that called for 37 miles of public beach. Today, there are only 18 miles of public beach in Orange County.

The bills proposed to the Priolo committee are based on various definitions of "the coastal zone." Assemblyman Alan Sieroty's proposal defines it as extending inland to the highest elevation of the nearest coastal mountain range; Assemblyman Pete Wilson's bill would limit jurisdiction to 1,000 yards inland. All the bills call for administration by local and central commissions.

The forces opposing coastline legislation are powerful and, for the most part, rich. If enlightened shoreline planning is ever to become a reality, it is up to the public to provide a broad base of financial support to legislative candidates who favor the adoption of coastal measures. Funding is a problem, too, in coastline studies. California's Comprehensive Ocean Area Plan (COAP) was allotted less than \$150,000 in state funds for a complete inventory of our coastal resources. The Ventura-Los Angeles Mountain and Coastal Study Commission has no funding at all. Both these projects are underway now but, since COAP lacks the money to hire enough experts, much of the work is being done by students and volunteers. An adequate plan—one that considers both the resources of the coast and the demands upon it—will cost money, and the Sieroty and Wilson proposals call for such modest appropriations that it seems doubtful they could do the job. (The Sieroty plan stipulates \$600,000 for the first year; the Wilson plan, according to estimates by legislative analysts, would require an outlay of \$1,500,000 for a three-year period.)

Aside from ridiculous underfunding, there is another serious problem with the coastline development bills. The administrative commissions they propose to establish would be appointed in complicated ways; for instance, voters elect a county supervisor, all the supervisors together appoint somebody to the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG). SCAG appoints somebody to the local coastal commission, the local commission appoints somebody to the state commission, and the state commission works out a state plan for the coastline—a process which seems neither immediately responsive nor directly representative.

The question in a democracy, of course, is always, "responsive to whom?" The Redondo Beach City Council may be responsive to the interests of its own constituency when it permits the building of an apartment house on the city's sand, but the council doesn't care about the interests of the people who live in Glendale much less about those who live in Nebraska. But people from Glendale visit that beach, and people from Nebraska contribute to federal beach erosion control. Even a badly conceived regional viewpoint may be better than no regional viewpoint.

The real answer to the coastline dilemma may have to come at the federal level. If our ocean is an international ecological and economic resource, then the California coastline is, surely, a national recreational resource. Washington Senator Henry Jackson's "Open Beaches Act of 1971" would state a national interest in the coastline, but it has little chance of passing this year. What is needed is a national sentiment which can be expressed where it really counts—through the ballot box—that the public won't stand for any more ill-founded coastline exploitation. The developers have the money, and so far local government has had the political pull. The only factor that can change the course of the coastline is widespread public outrage.

There isn't any question that the public interest in our coastline will eventually triumph: the only question is *when*. Because by that time, the question may have changed from "Whose Beaches?" to "What Beaches?"

AMERICAN-CANADIAN TENSION

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 14, 1971

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, though there may be some of us unaware of it, our Canadian neighbors are fast developing anti-American sentiment in regards to U.S. ignorance of Canadian interests.

This point was brought to my attention recently by Dr. Harvey R. Wall, a constituent of mine, who spends his summers in British Columbia. In his knowledgeable letter, he enumerates the reasoning behind the Anglo-Canadian tension and why it is building.

This attitude mainly stems from a proposed Alaska-Washington oil tanker route and the disastrous results that would occur from an oil spillage. An advertisement from the Vancouver Sun details the safety precautions the tankers should adopt and calls upon the U.S. Government to "control the tanker problem before it is too late." And, I might add, our "good neighbor" relations are destroyed by an oily ecological disaster.

Finally, Dr. Wall adds a few comments on the Alaskan nuclear testing and the negative Canadian reaction to it. This feeling coupled with the tanker route add up to the reality that a change in U.S. attitude is definitely in order.

I enter Dr. Wall's letter and advertisement as a means to acquaint the Members with these problems and the growth of an unfortunate Anglo-Canadian division:

CONCORD, CALIF.,
JULY 22, 1971.

HON. JEROME WALDIE,
Cannon House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: While we spend our summers at our summer home near Powell River, B.C., we typically study the Vancouver newspapers for their perception of the world and see some rather significant differences in interpretation and emphasis.

Through the years, it has become increasingly evident that Canadian nationalism is developing at the expense of increased anti-American attacks—both in government and in press behavior.

My reasons for writing you before we return to Concord pertains to two concerns which should be of interest to you because we, as a nation, have taken the Canadians on "good neighbor" rides for years without the discriminate concerns for their attitudes and reactions. The two topical problems relate to:

1. The pending tanker route from Valdez, Alaska, to Cherry Point, Washington—I am enclosing a full page advertisement which is regularly appearing in both major Vancouver papers. Why is the Pacific Coast of Canada alarmed about the proposed route? Our Santa Barbara and Bay spills have been seen as infant concerns in contrast to the inevitable spillage which is predicted from the Alaska shipping route. Specifically any spillage which will inevitably occur in the Washington area will not take its toll upon the US coastal scene because the tidal flows from the Juan de Fuca Straits flows in a northerly direction thus virtually guaranteeing severe pollution for our Canadian "friends" or is it now "suckers" and dependencies as it seemingly always has been?

2. The approaching Alaska (Amchitka)

nuclear testing is again making us look very sad and gluttonous, indeed. Several protest groups have formed throughout the Dominion and this province with the outcome to surely be another "black-eye" diplomacy fiasco I wonder how many more of these blunders we can perpetrate upon those we continually take for granted. Sometimes I fear that we are very slow learners.

We like the stance you have taken on several critical issues recently and hope that your voice will again be heard in relationship to the potentially furthered alienation of a one very good friend.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

DR. HARVEY R. WALL.

OIL: THE CRUDE REALITY

Very shortly, huge oil tankers, more than twice the size of the Toronto Dominion Bank tower will be threading their way through Juan De Fuca Strait to the Cherry Point refinery in Washington.

If it's difficult to imagine an oil tanker that size, it isn't difficult to describe what will happen when one of them is involved in a collision. The resultant oil spill will be the largest in the world. The Santa Barbara Channel and San Francisco Bay spills would be mere puddles in comparison. Sadly enough, the odds overwhelmingly favour a collision. In fact, a U.S. Department of Commerce mathematical analysis related to Puget Sound predicted eight tanker collisions and four groundings within ten years. And, oil company spokesmen themselves admitted that spillage would be inevitable—although they did not say what kind of accidents would cause the spillage. One cause, certainly, will be Juan De Fuca Strait itself.

A DANGEROUS CHANNEL

The B.C. Pilot, the book used by the B.C. Pilotage Authority, calls the Strait a dangerous channel of water. No more than 15 miles wide, it is replete with heavy fogs, changeable winds, strong tides, and swift currents. Fairly heavy freighter traffic, fishing vessels, and thousands of pleasure craft makes navigating these waters in a large ship a delicate and tortuous task.

If this were not enough of a problem for super large tankers, they must at one point pass through Rosario Strait, and here the passage is not much more than a mile wide at any point. In such a narrow channel, a freighter out of position, or a joy-riding speedboat will present a very real collision situation.

THE TANKERS HAVE BUILT-IN PROBLEMS, TOO

Tankers currently planned for operation between Valdez, Alaska and Cherry Point will carry about 940,000 barrels of crude oil. Eventually, tankers carrying over 2 million barrels may dock at Cherry Point. Whatever their size, all the tankers will face certain problems of marine navigation—they require considerable distance and time to come to a dead stop. Once a tanker traveling at an optimum speed of about 17 knots (speed needed for maximum manoeuvrability) reverses its engines, it takes 30 minutes and five miles to stop. Representative Steward Bledsoe, of the Washington State legislature, said of the tankers: "They're okay once they are moving along—they've got momentum. But they often have trouble stopping in a hurry because they are underpowered."

Detecting objects well in advance with radar to avoid collision and grounding is of limited value in an area like Juan De Fuca. Movable and immovable objects are everywhere, even the experts can be fooled. The Andria Doria disaster proved that. So the human error factor will definitely be in operation, plus the fact that in a government study of 570 tanker collisions, 83% of them occurred when the vessels were entering or

leaving harbour. And in 1969 alone, 234 ships carrying oil were involved in accidents somewhere in the world.

So what can we reasonably expect to happen?

SPILL WILL HARM BRITISH COLUMBIA, NOT UNITED STATES

According to W. S. Hugget of the Canadian Hydrographic Service, "if a big spill occurred during the flood tide, the oil would initially float directly up the Strait of Georgia." As yet, no one has discovered an ecologically sound method to clean away on-shore oil blankets other than by hand (using bulldozers along the water's edge removes sea organisms that shore birds feed on). So the sheer physical effort necessary to remove an oil blanket that could be half an inch thick, ten feet wide, and almost 1000 miles long would be staggering. Not to speak of the cost. According to Dr. McDiarmid, Social Credit member for Alberni, such a major spill would cost the B.C. government anywhere from \$13,000,000 to \$15,000,000 to clean up.

But no amount of cleaning could help the marine life involved. When 5000 barrels of oil—about 210,000 gallons of No. 2 diesel was spilled on April 26th of this year, it killed virtually every duck and seabird over a 200 square mile area. Imagine what would happen if even the smallest compartment of one of the supertankers returned—almost 400,000 gallons of crude oil would be released. What sea life did survive would inevitably be polluted with cancer-producing tars.

And once the oil did come ashore, what would happen to the tourist trade? After the first flock of sight-seers, it would simply die. And most fishermen, pleasure craft operators, hoteliers, restaurateurs, barmen, guides, taxi-drivers, waiters, store staff and many others would find their income sharply curtailed. But worst of all, a major oil spill in the Strait of Georgia would not go away. Juan De Fuca and Georgia Strait act as a kind of vast marine bathtub, some water returning to the open sea, but much of it constantly moving back and forth within this area. We might have a new Dead Sea. For years to come.

CAN ANYTHING BE DONE?

Yes. While there is no legal way for Canada to stop the supertankers, we can protest the way in which they operate with all our might. We can, and should, urge our government to insist that the U.S. companies involved in transporting oil, use every reasonable precaution to insure that their ships operate in the safest manner possible. Perhaps in a manner unprecedented in marine history. But the consequences for our coast, should an accident occur, call for such unprecedented measures.

The Special Committee on Environmental Pollution headed by David Anderson, M.P., the Liberal Member for Esquimalt-Saanich, has drawn up a list of conditions that would at least insure a reasonable amount of safety. They are:

That compulsory one-way shipping lanes be established.

That a certification system to insure correct radar functioning be made mandatory for every oil vessel operating in coastal waters.

That each tanker be provided with an escort vessel.

That double skin construction be employed on each tanker.

That split rudders and sea anchors be installed on every vessel to increase manoeuvrability.

The oil companies have insisted that to install such safety precautions might raise the cost of transporting oil as much as 25%. But who could set a figure on the cost of restoring our coast? Whatever amount is necessary to preserve it should be spent now. Once the first accident occurs, no amount of money will bring it back.

Below are some coupons to send to people who can insist the U.S. government control the tanker problem before it is too late. Send them today, or use your own words, if you prefer.

But if we raise no protest, if we fail to speak out clearly against this impending disaster, then; when the first spill occurs, we will have no one to blame but ourselves.

The Right Honourable PIERRE ELLIOT TRUDEAU,
Ottawa, Ontario, Canada:

I implore you to show strong leadership in protecting the B.C. coast from supertanker oil pollution. Please advance Special Committee on Environmental Pollution recommendations to the U.S. government in the strongest possible way.

Signature _____
Address _____

The Honourable JACK DAVIS,
Minister of Environment, Parliament Building,
Ottawa, Ontario, Canada:

I support your strong stand on environmental protection for B.C. coast from supertanker oil pollution. Please continue to press our cause with every resource at your disposal.

Signature _____
Address _____

The Honourable RONALD BASFORD,
Minister, Consumer and Corporate Affairs,
Parliament Building, Ottawa, Ontario,
Canada:

I strongly urge you to use all the powers of your office to help protect B.C. coast from supertanker oil pollution. Your continued concern and assistance is vital.

Signature _____
Address _____

THE SPOILED BRATS OF OUR RICH SOCIETY

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 14, 1971

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, in a very succinct editorial commentary, the Southwest Messenger Press of Cook County, Ill., in my opinion hits the nail on the head commenting on attitudes within our country.

The Messenger Press serves a dozen communities in Southwest suburban Chicagoland, and this particular editorial is typical of its pointed and effective editorial style.

The editorial follows:

THE SPOILED BRATS OF OUR RICH SOCIETY

Work, they say, keeps people out of mischief. Perhaps this is so. The productivity of the American system certainly seems to have given an excessive number of critics the time and the money to demonstrate against nearly everything that has occurred on the North American continent since the landing of the Mayflower.

Statistics are pretty dry things, but a few of them may help explain the extra curricular activities of the flag stompers. For example, one American farmer produces enough to feed himself and 42 others. In France, one farm worker can feed about six. The ratio is about five in Italy, and in China one farm worker produces only enough for himself and one other person. Last year, the U.S. produced as much in goods and services

as all of the U.S.S.R., Japan, West Germany, France and the United Kingdom combined. The population of these countries is 2.5 times that of the United States.

Probably at no time has it taken less effort than in the U.S. today to acquire the essentials of individual survival, and many are showing their appreciation by acting like the spoiled brats of a rich family. Probably they will come to the same end—shiftless and destitute.

WILCOX RESIDENCE BECOMES A NATIONAL HISTORIC SITE

HON. JACK F. KEMP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 14, 1971

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, this sesquicentennial year is a big year for Erie County. On August 23, the Erie County Agricultural Society, the Erie County Historical Federation, and the Buffalo and Erie County Historical Society jointly dedicated the recently completed addition to the Historical Building at the Erie County Fair. This was an Erie County Sesquicentennial project sponsored by the fair board in commemoration of the county's 150th birthday.

I might mention the Erie County Fair and Exposition is now ranked officially by the International Association of Fairs and Expositions as the largest county fair in the Nation. It is interesting to note that the oldest building on the fairgrounds, the health services building, one of the few remaining octagon-shaped buildings in existence, has been completely renovated and improved and moved to a new location. It is now on the Avenue of Flags where the public will be given the opportunity to take advantage of the free diagnostic clinics offered by the various health services in Erie County.

However, Mr. Speaker, the highlight of the year will be the dedication of the Wilcox Mansion as a national historic shrine. Seventy years ago this day, President William McKinley died in Buffalo at the Wilcox residence on Delaware Avenue, the victim of an assassin's bullet. That same day, in the mansion, Theodore Roosevelt took the oath of office as the 26th President of the United States.

Six years later, September 5, 1907, the city dedicated an impressive obelisk in Niagara Square honoring the martyred President. It had been erected through an appropriation of \$100,000 granted by the State Legislature.

Subsequently, Public Law 89-708 made the Wilcox Mansion a national historic shrine. Congressman THAD DULSKI, the author of the law, deserves the thanks of everyone in the community. Compliments should also be extended to the Theodore Roosevelt Foundation, the Junior League and many fine citizens who made a commitment of local support for a successful future for this lovely and historic home.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I include an article from the September 12, 1971, Buffalo Courier-Express concerning the dedication:

WILCOX RESIDENCE BECOMES A NATIONAL HISTORIC SITE IN MEMORY OF MCKINLEY

(By Clare Allen)

On September 14, 1901, in the library of the Ansley Wilcox residence, 641 Delaware Ave., Theodore Roosevelt took the oath of office as the 26th President of the United States. This Wednesday, on the 70th anniversary of that occasion, the "Wilcox House" as it is now known, will be opened to the public as a National Historic Site.

The event will mark the successful completion of a project that was initiated in the 1950s to save the house from demolition, and to have it restored and designated by an act of Congress as a National Historic Site under the jurisdiction of the National Parks Service.

In the intervening years, countless hours of effort by scores of interested persons and approximately \$500,000 have been spent to acquire the property and restore the home exactly as it was at the time Mr. Roosevelt took the oath of office. Funds for the project were provided by the Federal government, the New York State Historic Trust, the Junior League of Buffalo, and by contributions from groups and individuals. The entire plan was coordinated by the Theodore Roosevelt Inaugural Site Foundation, composed of prominent civic and business leaders in the Buffalo area.

The ladies of the Junior League have been especially active in the restoration effort since 1969, at which time they pledged \$50,000 as their contribution, in recognition of the 50th anniversary of their organization. In addition, a committee of ten League members has given thousands of volunteer hours under the direction of Dr. Walter S. Dunn, director of the Buffalo and Erie County Historical Society, researching the history of the house and locating original or duplicate furnishings for it.

Every detail of the restoration has been approved by the National Parks Service, which will now be the caretaker and landlord for the property.

The oath of office ceremony for Theodore Roosevelt in the Wilcox House was the climax of a series of events which began on September 6, 1901, at the Temple of Music on the grounds of the Pan-American Exposition. The site of the building, on what is now Fordham Dr., is marked by a plaque mounted on a boulder.

On the fateful day, President William McKinley, flanked by his host for the Buffalo visit, John G. Milburn, and the President's secretary, George G. Cortelyou, stood on a platform as the President shook hands with well-wishers standing in a long line. Guards and Secret Service men assigned to protect the President were in their customary places.

The handshaking had proceeded for several minutes when a detective noticed that a young man at the front of the line had his left hand extended toward the President while his right hand was covered with a handkerchief. The detective reached for the swathed hand, but too late.

Leon F. Czolgosz, with a pistol concealed by the cloth, fired two shots at the President, who fell into the arms of his friends. The assassin was taken into custody and whisked away from the shocked and angry crowd.

The President was rushed to a small hospital on the exposition grounds and examined by hastily summoned doctors. They found that one of the bullets had been deflected by a button on the President's coat causing only a flesh wound. But the other had penetrated deep.

An operation was performed and Mr. McKinley was taken to the Milburn home at 1168 Delaware Ave. For a week an anxious world waited for bulletins from the sick room, and, for a while they were encouraging.

Then, on September 13, the President fainted in bed. Heart stimulants were administered but to no avail, and at 2:15 a.m.,

September 14, William McKinley, 25th President of the United States, died.

Vice President Theodore Roosevelt, who had left Buffalo when he was assured that Mr. McKinley was out of danger, was immediately summoned from a camp in the Adirondack Mountains where he was vacationing with his family. Following a grueling night ride in a wagon over 40 miles of backwoods roads to the nearest railroad and a waiting train, Mr. Roosevelt arrived in Buffalo nearly 12 hours after the President's death.

The Vice President was met at the station by a guard of soldiers and police who escorted him to the Ansley Wilcox home and then to the Milburn residence, where he paid his respects to the dead chief executive. He then returned to the Wilcox home and at 3:55 p.m., September 14, he took the oath of office as President of the United States.

Czolgosz, an admitted anarchist who had come to Buffalo just a few days prior to the assassination, went on trial in Supreme Court in Buffalo on September 23. He was convicted and sentenced within two days, and paid the death penalty in the electric chair at Auburn Prison on October 29.

Although the Wilcox House attained prominence as the result of a tragedy, its restoration and opening to the public is an important event for Buffalo. It will be the first and only National Historic Site in New York State west of the Hudson Valley. As such, it will be another noteworthy attraction in an area rich in the history of our country.

VEYSEY URGES NATIONAL CEMETERY FOR RIVERSIDE

HON. VICTOR V. VEYSEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 14, 1971

Mr. VEYSEY. Mr. Chairman, I have introduced legislation which directs the Secretary of the Army to establish a national cemetery in Riverside County, Calif.

California has more veterans than any other State in the Nation, and the immediate Riverside-San Bernardino area has the greatest concentration of veterans in California. California, in fact, has 11 percent of all the veterans in the Nation, and yet, there is no available veterans' cemetery space.

Of the Nation's 98 national cemeteries, only 51 are currently active, and six more are scheduled to be declared inactive within the next several years. For California veterans and their families, the closest available national cemetery is located in Portland, Oreg. This poses an intolerable inconvenience for the families of veterans throughout California.

Currently, there is abundant Federal land available in California, and in particular, in Riverside County for the establishment of a new national cemetery.

My legislation would provide the Secretary of the Army authority to establish the cemetery, and would direct that the necessary funds be made available from the Treasury. The inequities caused by the current lack of facilities far outweigh the small cost of establishing this national cemetery in southern California.

AMERICA'S DARK NIGHT OF THE SPIRIT

HON. JOHN G. SCHMITZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 14, 1971

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, our country was born—and grew up to immense power and wealth—in a spirit of triumphant, unquenchable optimism. It seemed there was nothing we could not achieve.

Within a few short years all this has changed. The confident American optimist is now a vanishing breed. We are no longer sure of where we are going, or how to get there. Our foreign foes grow stronger as we become less resolute. We are tortured with divisions and strife between ethnic groups and between generations, the like of which we have never known before in all our history. From a nation of optimists we are well on our way to becoming a nation of pessimists.

Certainly we must face the truth about the evils among us and the danger confronting us—both those which are widely condemned, too often for ulterior motives, and those which are widely condoned. There are still some Americans who will not face the fact about what is wrong with us, and many who refuse to recognize certain particular evils—such as Communism, or sexual immorality, or drug abuse—for what they really are. But the most common reaction among Americans today is not so much to deny the reality and seriousness of the evils and dangers, as to dismiss with weary despair the possibility of doing anything about them.

This is perhaps the essential manifestation of the dark night of the spirit in which America now finds itself. For if evils cannot be eliminated or even effectively fought, then their triumph is inevitable—and with it, the destruction of everything we have ever loved and valued in this land of ours.

I have often quoted the profound remark of the ancient Chinese sage Sun Tzu, when he said that the supreme excellence in warfare is to persuade your enemy to surrender before going to battle. That is exactly the trap into which today's faltering, pessimistic American is most likely to fall. We should fight for the right because it is right, regardless of the cost or the odds. If we do this, then we are in fact much more likely to succeed than before we began to fight. There is too much gloomy calculation of the odds against us these days. We are so busy thinking about how likely we are to lose that we never give ourselves a chance to win.

When this newsletter is published, I will be in Africa as the guest of some of the leading citizens of a country that refused to count the cost or the odds against it when, had they done so, they would surely have seemed overwhelming: Portugal. A small country with very limited resources, Portugal was challenged 10 years ago in one of her African provinces, Angola, by an organized

Communist-inspired campaign of terrorism whose like has been almost uniformly successful in similar areas elsewhere—for example, in Vietnam. By any reasonable calculation of the odds at the time, Portugal had very little chance of defeating this well-planned campaign so far from home.

But surrender was never considered. Portugal's leaders took seriously their obligation to their threatened people, resolving to defend them at all costs. That defense has been substantially successful.

During the long declining decade during which we, the most powerful Nation in the world, slipped from the Bay of Pigs to Henry Kissinger's visit to Peking, Portugal has defied and frustrated those who intended to overrun its African parts, so that the revolutionary terrorists are no closer to taking them over than they were 10 years ago. Little Rhodesia also, stoutly and successfully defying "world opinion," has retained its independence against all odds for the past 5 years. The "inevitable" defeat of both countries, freely predicted by so many, has proved not to be inevitable after all.

If Portugal and Rhodesia—on their own, with virtually no help and occasionally actual hindrance from us—have been able to resist so well today's evil "tide in the affairs of men," then from our position of power in the world we should be all the more able to resist it—so long as we do not convince ourselves in advance that we cannot.

MINNEAPOLIS HEALTH HEARINGS

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 14, 1971

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, at the hearings I recently held in Minneapolis, Dr. John Verby, representing the Department of Family Practice and Community Health at the University of Minnesota Medical School discussed a new way to deal with family medical problems of the various members of a family unit on a preventive basis.

Dr. Verby's paper that follows describes this program in more detail.

Dr. Verby also discussed the very terrible impact the doctor draft has on doctor short areas of our country. Many urban and rural areas are without trained physicians in large measure due to the military service requirement facing doctors. Congress has taken steps to meet this problem by appropriating \$12.5 million for fiscal 1972 to fund the Emergency Health Personnel Act of 1970. It is incumbent upon the administration that this program be promptly implemented by allocating these funds.

The item follows:

STATEMENT OF DR. JOHN VERBY

INTRODUCTION

"The health care system is sick." Review the data base and a list of serious problems emerges—several are potentially lethal:

1. Lack of comprehensiveness.

2. Lack of continuity.
3. High cost.
4. Inadequate evaluation of professional performance.
5. Inadequate maintenance of professional effectiveness.
6. Irregular and unpredictable accessibility.
7. Crisis orientation versus prevention.
8. Shortage and maldistribution of personnel and facilities.

The University of Minnesota Health Sciences and Family Practice Department in Minneapolis, Minnesota, is meeting this challenge in the following ways:

Our Department is working with ALL the undergraduate medical students from day one through their senior year. Each student works with our faculty on tutorialships, usually on a two students-to one faculty member basis; seeing patients, both ambulatory and hospital patients; learning how to relate to them, comfort and care for them as a family physician on a continuous primary comprehensive and preventive basis from womb to tomb. No other specialty in our Health Sciences will claim or attempt to do this for the taxpayers and people of our State and Region.

In the freshman year they learn about how to deal with grief, death, pain, disability and a number of variables including biological, psychological, and social. These variables will be integrated for the benefit of the patient. This we never learned in our training program when I was in school. In the sophomore-junior year, we are working with these students in the community with practicing physicians, showing the student how the majority of their time (75%+), is spent in the offices caring for ambulatory patients, less than 25% of the time being spent with hospital patients in the hospitals.

They develop and learn the appreciation of the episodic crisis maintenance, but that is only part of their work which they are sensitized and made aware of in the early inception of their professional careers. In their senior year we have up to this point captured the imagination of approximately 30 to 40% of the class who want to track in Family Practice over and above the other departments in the Medical School. At this time the student may go out with the practicing physician for six weeks for academic credit, either in the urban or metropolitan areas of the State.

We have over 40 experiences with senior medical students in the past year-and-a-half. All of them have been very, very favorable and are encouraging the student to go into the community with the practicing physicians to care for the taxpaying people of our State and Region. They are also learning and developing a sensitivity and awareness in how to work, relate and cooperate with other health professionals (nurses, physician therapists, pharmacists, dentists, etc.) in a way that will make for more effective economic care for our people.

In order to do this, we must develop a new curriculum, new models, and new plans for attacking our SICK health and disease care system.

One of these models is now functioning at Fairview Hospital. Fairview Hospital has done an outstanding job of investment of funds that run into the six figures in support of our program in Family Practice and Community Health for our residents in training after they graduate from medical school. Bethesda, St. Johns, St. Marys, Methodist, and North Memorial Community Hospitals are planning to do the same.

We are also planning a Physician's Associate Program in which the junior medical student may go out with the practicing physician for one year, receive six months academic credit and six months of payment for services under direct supervision of the

practicing physician. This has been well received by the medical students and the practicing medical community of our State.

Our Department is sending senior medical students to the northwest corner of the State in collaboration with the Minnesota State Public Health Department, working with the migrant workers in this area during the summer months each year.

We think that the maldistribution of health care workers and professionals in wealthy pockets of our metropolitan areas at the detriment of our lower social economic population in urban and rural areas of our State is due in great degree to the Federal government's demands upon our profession for physicians in military service. The doctor draft in the past decades has literally pirated many of these physicians into military service, taking them to all corners of our world, insulating them usually against ever coming into the needy areas of our region. We believe that the military personnel and leaders of our Country should create their own military medical schools and their own physicians with their billions of dollars (as they need them) rather than pirate our civilian physicians and disrupt their families and communities in doing so.

We believe that the U.S. Public Health Service Physicians' Act allowing medical students to go into needy areas of our country in lieu of military service would change the maldistribution of our physicians within a five-year period and easily within the decade. I work closely with the undergraduate and graduate students of our medical school, and they reaffirm this statement so that I know that at least half of each graduating medical school class would do this rather than serve far distant areas of our world to the jeopardy of our own taxpayers.

We believe that the University of Minnesota Medical School and Health Sciences has promulgated and developed a Department of Family Practice and Community Health that is next to none in the world as far as leading and developing family practitioners for our Region.

We are the only medical school who has disproportionately increased the classes as much as we have (from 160 in a class to almost 230 per class).

This means that the 3 to 4 medical doctors on our faculty in the Department of Family Practice work with over 800 undergraduate students on tutorialships on the basis of two students to one physician. Obviously with the other planning projects we have with other health professionals and models, the development of curriculum, leaves us with a gap in inadequate personnel, teachers and faculty to do the job that is necessary in developing family practitioners for our Region.

We believe that one of the reasons the health care system is sick at the present time is because of the inability of health sciences faculties throughout the Country to mount and develop departments and programs for family physicians in our communities. In the past two decades the gap has widened so badly that we are now addressing ourselves to the question of "the health care system and its sickness" which we would not have had to do if we had been developing family practitioners along with the many other specialists and health workers and professionals in the various compartments of our health care delivery system.

We believe that the frontline of health care delivery is being broken also by the serious increase in malpractice suits, and it is essential that the bar association and the medical association come together quickly and make arrangements with regards to the evaluation of our malpractice suits and removal of protection for over 4,000 physicians in our Country to date. If this continues, there will be very few students and physicians that will want to face

the frontline care, and I believe that the contingency fee that the legal profession is utilizing is causing serious disruptions in our health care delivery system. In Canada the bar association frowns upon contingency fees in which 30 to 50% of the monies won in law suits are paid to the involved attorney. In Canada they have very, very little trouble in this regard because of the ethical nature of this point. I would therefore recommend that we look very hard at what is happening in the legal profession in relationship to health care delivery. This year we anticipate over 10,000 malpractice suits involving physicians of our Country.

In the past two decades one of the most neglected areas of funding in health care delivery is for faculty teaching in ambulatory care for the students and residents in various programs. Many of these teachers have been practicing physicians that have taken time away from patient care in their practices to teach in our medical schools and clinics. They receive "tips" usually for their teaching services, sometimes *nothing* other than the satisfaction of the teaching. These physicians will need to be funded at a much greater rate than we have in the past.

I sincerely appreciate the opportunity to share my thoughts with you this evening. Thank you very much.

JOHN VERBY, M.D.,
Associate Professor and Acting Head,
Department of Family Practice and
Community Health, University of Minnesota
Medical School, Minneapolis,
Minn.

NADER: FRIEND OR FOE?

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 14, 1971

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, like many Americans, I have been deeply disturbed by Ralph Nader's continuing attacks on American business. Certainly our economic system is not without severe faults, but the thrust of rampant Naderism seems at times bent on the destruction of our free enterprise system, rather than the reform of suspected abuses as alleged. Dumitru Danielopol, a knowledgeable and respected correspondent for the Copley News Service, has carefully explored the implications of Naderism and I ask unanimous consent to share his commentary with my House colleagues.

The commentary follows:

[From the Aurora (Ill.) Beacon-News,
Aug. 13, 1971]

NADER: FRIEND OR FOE?

(By Dumitru Danielopol)

WASHINGTON.—Ralph Nader looks in the mirror and sees a reformer. Others look at Mr. Nader and see a man who would have us scrap our free enterprise system, then quietly lie down alongside the wreckage and die.

Nader delights in poking at the ills of our system. Cars aren't safe at any speed; the air is unfit to breathe; the waters are polluted; everything we eat might poison us; the banks where we save our money are robbing us blind; stores steal from the buyers, advertising lies; the stock market is unreliable, the profit motive is immoral, the country is a mess, etc., etc.

Only Mr. Nader, apparently, can save us from ourselves.

Riding an emission-free bicycle and armed with a Xerox machine, this Lochinvar is

going to protect us dumb consumers—you and me—from the big business smart guys. I'm a product of European business. I studied law, economics and finance. I'm old fashioned. I admit it. But there is something about Mr. Nader . . .

He didn't discover the fact that there are unscrupulous people in industry, commerce and the public services that try to take advantage of the public. They were there for centuries before Mr. Nader was born. The past predators were found out and punished and usually the penalty of the market place was more devastating than anything governments conjured up.

I will not argue with those who say the American system could stand improvement. It can.

But do we junk 3,000 years of experience and take our chances on the pent-up knowledge of Nader's 30-year-old raiders?

If our system is so bad, how come it has given us the highest standard of living, the highest per capita income, the healthiest, best fed, housed, best clothed population, more leisure time, more labor saving appliances, more information, transportation, housing, education, freedom, responsibility, than any nation in the history of man?

If our industrial system is so corrupt, how did we put men on the moon four times?

If our industries—who foot a major share of the tax bill—are so selfish, how come they allowed us to spend billions upon billions to help other nations rebuild their destroyed economies?

How is it that Americans who live in this "polluted" atmosphere and eat this "poisoned" food are still able to swim better, run faster, jump higher and grow taller?

Sure we can do better. Ask any immigrant why he came to the United States. First, he wanted a better life for himself, but no matter what his personal problems were, he knew his children would have an even better life. That's the American dream.

The consumerist considers business his enemy. He advocates more controls, more bureaucracy, restricted initiative. He doesn't say so but every action points to eventual government take-over.

Mr. Nader and his raiders would deny this objective. But I remember other times in other lands when real and imagined problems were magnified to the point that whole peoples reached out for government controls. Men promised that if they were given the reins they would quickly lead the way to a better world.

Let's see, there was Russia, Germany, Italy, Japan, Mainland China, Cuba, Chile . . .

RON JAMES RECOGNIZED BY DINNER IN SAN JOSE

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 14, 1971

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to pause for a moment to mention that this Friday, in San Jose, Calif., Ron James will be honored with a recognition dinner. Ron, who had been active on the San Jose City Council, was the first directly elected mayor of San Jose in 1967. Although he has now retired from the political arena, he is still active in community activities such as the YMCA and the Better Business Bureau. I am pleased that the community is extending its appreciation to him this Friday and I would like to add my appreciation to that of the entire community of San Jose.

MORAVIAN MUSIC AT THE KENNEDY CENTER

HON. WILMER MIZELL

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 14, 1971

Mr. MIZELL. Mr. Speaker, it was with great pride that Mrs. Mizell and I joined with 2,600 other people who attended an inaugural concert, featuring an outstanding program of Moravian music, at the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts this past Sunday afternoon.

I have the honor of representing one of the Nation's foremost Moravian communities, located within Winston-Salem, N.C., the largest city in my district.

Thus it was with special pride that I witnessed a 2½ hour program of Moravian music in the Kennedy Center's great concert hall. It was a truly moving and inspiring performance, as befits the inaugural of America's first and only national cultural center.

Sponsored by the Moravian Music Foundation and the North Carolina School of the Arts, the concert featured the Piedmont Chamber Orchestra and the Westminster Choir under the masterful direction of conductor Nicholas Harsanyi.

It was a great event, perhaps the crowning point in the long history of the Moravian people in America.

Mr. Jim Shertzer, a reporter for the Winston-Salem Journal who covered the event, has expertly captured the spirit and the majesty of the occasion, and I would like at this time to include the text of Mr. Shertzer's article, which appeared in the September 13, 1971 edition of the Journal, in the RECORD of today.

The article follows:

MORAVIAN CONCERT IS VIVACIOUS

(By Jim Shertzer)

WASHINGTON.—The sound of a brass choir, which has announced important Moravian events for more than two centuries, called Moravians and others yesterday to one of the most auspicious and glittering occasions in the history of Moravian music; an inaugural concert at the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts.

The concert, the fourth held in the mammoth cultural center's Concert Hall, and the only inaugural program honoring American music of the past, paid tribute to the Moravian settlers whose works, composed in America, helped lay the foundations for the nation's native musical heritage.

MORAVIAN CENTERS

About 2,600 people—many from Winston-Salem and Bethlehem, Pa., sites of American Moravian communities—almost filled the plush red-and-ivory hall for the two-hour-and-20-minute program, sponsored by the Moravian Music Foundation and the N.C. School of the Arts. Though the hall was not quite full, the concert was sold out.

What the audience heard brought great honor, not only to some of the country's first composers, but to the performers as well.

Nicholas Harsanyi, making his first appearance as conductor of the arts school's Piedmont Chamber Orchestra, led his musicians with great enthusiasm, yet a sense of disciplined control.

The orchestra, three vocal soloists from the arts school's faculty and the Westminster Choir of Princeton, N.J., responded magnificently to every nuance of his direction

and filled the large hall with a glorious blaze of sound.

PRELUDE TO CHORALES

The opening portion of the concert—the brass ensemble prelude of chorales by German and American Moravians—started about 10 minutes late, at 2:40 p.m., before most concertgoers had taken their seats. The hall filled as the quintet, which performed from the end of the hall's box circle, played such well-chosen pieces as "This Day Is Holy to the Lord" and "We Who Here Together Are Assembled."

Harsanyi opened the concert proper shortly after 3 p.m. with Overture in D by Charles Hommann, a 19th-century composer who, though not himself Moravian, had close ties with Moravian musical groups in Pennsylvania.

The overture, composed about 1840 and regarded as one of the first full-scale orchestral pieces written in America, was an excellent opening selection. Cast in late Classical-early Romantic overture form, it opens with a rather ominous adagio in the minor key and builds to a joyful finale in D major, delivering the piece from gloom to jubilation.

40 MUSICIANS

The orchestra, which was increased from about 25 to about 40 musicians for the concert, sounded magnificent. The acoustics in the hall are remarkable; one could hear each instrumental section—and very nearly every instrumentalist—with unusual clarity.

Two chamber pieces, Johann Friedrich Peter's Quintet No. 2 in A major and David Moritz Michael's Water Music Suite in E flat, followed.

The quintet is one of six quintets Peter composed in Salem around 1789. Michael's Water Music Suite was written in Bethlehem around 1809 for concerts presented from barges on the Lehigh River.

Scholars think Peter's quintets may be the first chamber pieces written in America and regard Michael's work as one of the earliest pieces of occasional music composed in the country. Like the Hommann overture, both are light and friendly works.

Both of those qualities shone especially in the performances, which were models of elegant musicianship. Here again the hall proved its acoustical worth by carrying the sound of the small ensembles as well as it carried the sound of the full orchestra.

The Peter quintet seemed alive with special grace and vivaciousness as performed by Vartan Manogolian and Giorgio Clompi, violin; Jerry Horner and Sidney Crutis, viola; and Marlon Davies, cello.

The performers gave a lively reading of the folk-like themes in the sprightly first and third movements and a haunting interpretation of the quintet's richly expressive second movement.

The four sections performed from Michael's 15-movement Water Music Suite were equally delightful as played by Robert Listokin and Fred Ormand, clarinet; Mark Popkin and Timothy Ward, bassoon; and Frederick Bergstone and Dan Ashe, horn.

Heard were movements No. 1 (March), No. 5 (Adagio), No. 6 (Presto) and No. 10 (Polonese). Particularly impressive were the light-hearted march and the lovely adagio, which featured some highly melodic, slightly forlorn exchanges between the clarinets and bassoons.

Harsanyi and the orchestra closed the first half of the concert with the modern premiere of Sinfonia in B flat major by Johann Christoph Friedrich Bach, the ninth son of the great 18th-century master J. S. Bach.

The sinfonia and five other works by the composer were found in 1956 among the thousands of manuscripts collected by the Moravian Music Foundation. The copies were made by Peter, who brought them to America in 1770. The foundation's copies are thought to be the only ones extant.

The Bach sinfonia was charming but quite

different from the other largely Classical works played. The composer, who was not a Moravian, was much influenced by 18th century Italian music, which maintained much of the flavor of 17th-century Maroque composition.

The *sinfonia*, though, proved quite tuneful, with two lighthearted movements framing a slow and amorous central section. Particularly charming was the orchestra's lively rendition of the closing movement, a minuet, that brings the *sinfonia* to a courtly conclusion.

Like the other works performed, this piece is not great, in the sense that, say, a Mozart or Beethoven symphony is great. But as is the case of much early American Moravian music, it is of such quality that even the most casual listener can be thankful it has been preserved. The historical value of such works is, of course, immeasurable.

The largest known work produced by Moravian composers—Christian Ignatius Latrobe's oratorio, "The Dawn of Glory"—required the entire second half of the concert. The work was highly appropriate for many reasons, one being that Latrobe's brother, Benjamin Henry, helped design the Capitol and the White House.

Latrobe, an English Moravian church administrator who never visited America, composed the work around 1800 as a sequel to his gloomy "Dies Irae" ("Day of Wrath"), a shorter oratorio about the fate of the Damned on Judgment Day. He subtitled his second oratorio "A Hymn of the Bliss of the Redeemed at the Last Day," which well describes the musical and dramatic nature of the work.

The oratorio's 16 sections present a striking depiction of the joys to come to Christians in heaven and contains a number of very fine pieces for orchestra, soloists and choir. Among the best vocal pieces are a tenor air, "How shall a mortal song aspire"; a duet for soprano and bass, "Blessings, might and majesty"; and the chorus, "Thou Holy Lord."

Seth McCoy, tenor, and Janice Harsanyi, soprano—new faculty members at the arts school—sang with great feeling and shining voices. The quality of their work was very nearly matched by William Beck, bass, another arts school faculty member.

The Westminster Choir, in brilliant red robes that accented the hall's color scheme, was in excellent form as well, giving an especially moving performance of "Thou Holy Lord," which is accompanied only by piano.

As the final "Amen! Hallelujah! Amen!" resounded triumphantly through the hall, the audience rose to its feet for a thunderous standing ovation that lasted nearly five minutes. Harsanyi, the soloists and Joseph Flummerfelt, the director of the choir, returned to the stage several times to acknowledge the tribute.

The faces of many leaving the hall seemed to reflect a feeling that the program celebrated not only America's artistic past but also hope for the future for American arts. To many, the Kennedy Center represents a change in the wind, especially as far as federal support for the arts is concerned. As a program, "The Dawn of Glory" certainly seemed to embody that hope.

Marble and mirrors do not of themselves nurture such faith. Music and performances as inspiring as those heard yesterday afternoon, however, do.

Foundation officials announced in June that they had been asked to present one of the opening concerts at the Kennedy Center. They had been invited to do so some months earlier, but the invitation was kept secret because center officials reserved the right to announce the opening programs.

The invitation was secured, in part, by a number of Winston-Salem people who helped bring Moravian music and the work of the foundation to the attention of the center's planners. Among them were R. Philip Hanes, Jr., and Mrs. John de Braganza.

Hanes was appointed to the advisory committee on the center in 1962 by the President, for whom the center was eventually named. In 1965, Hanes was appointed to the National Council on the Arts by President Lyndon Johnson.

In these capacities and others, Hanes met frequently with Roger L. Stevens, the board chairman of the Kennedy Center, and discussed with him the possibility of a concert of Moravian music at the center. Hanes also gave Stevens a first-hand opportunity to learn about the foundation and the music in its archives on visits to Winston-Salem.

Stevens is a trustee of the North Carolina School of the Arts Foundation, Inc., and Julius Rudel, the center's musical director, is vice chairman of the arts school's advisory board.

Mrs. Braganza is the southeastern representative of Friends of the Kennedy Center and on many occasions promoted the idea for the concert with center officials.

Harsanyi and Dr. Ewald V. Nolte, executive director of the foundation, selected the music for the concert from materials prepared from manuscripts in the foundation's vaults in Winston-Salem and Bethlehem.

Other inaugural attractions at the \$70 million center which officially opened Wednesday have included the world premieres of works by Leonard Bernstein and Alberto Ginastera, a ballet choreographed by Alvin Ailey to music by Duk Ellington, recitals by some of the nation's foremost concert artists and shows by popular entertainers, such as the Fifth Dimension, Merle Haggard and Chicago.

HEALTH CARE

HON. NICK BEGICH

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 14, 1971

Mr. BEGICH. Mr. Speaker, during this session of Congress, one of the major responsibilities facing this body is the resolution of the crisis in health care in the United States. By now, the problem is no longer debatable, and we are left to decide only the plan which will best insure a national health care plan. During this session, a number of important bills have been introduced, each reflecting a different approach to the solution.

Alaska has a special stake in this issue for the reason that it feels the current health care crisis in its most extreme form.

Many health care plans that are good for the urban areas of our country are not advantageous for many Alaskans.

The Alaska State Medical Association on September 1, 1971, issued its views on national health insurance and it is my privilege to share this information with all my colleagues by inserting it into the RECORD:

PLANNING FOR NATIONAL HEALTH CARE DELIVERY

The Alaska State Medical Association thanks the members of this meeting for the opportunity to place this statement in the record.

The physicians of Alaska believe that national legislation altering the method of delivery of health care will almost surely be enacted within the next eighteen months by the Congress. We shall not comment in detail on the various bills now proposed or pending, since we believe that final legislation will represent a compromise combining various features of these. The State Medical Association at its annual meeting last June

did endorse the AMA's "Medicredit" plan, as the most desirable of current specific proposals, but the association is continuing to study various schemes with interest. We should like to emphasize the following elements as germane to design of such legislation.

I. Much of the often emotional and at times polemical discussion of this problem has implied that the current health care delivery system is sadly deficient and of little value; the term "crisis in health care" is commonly used. We feel this to be a gross exaggeration. Although there are clearly significant lacks in the availability of care, particularly in rural and ghetto areas, we believe the majority in Alaska and in the Nation are receiving satisfactory care. We should be certain we are improving the system before radical changes are adopted.

II. The present system is a pluralistic system, appropriate to a free society, encompassing as it does individual practitioners, a great variety of forms of group medicine—both fee-for-service and prepaid, and purely socialistic systems in the government hospital program. (Cost-effectiveness studies of these last systems do not, incidentally, engender great optimism for economies were similar institutions to be widely adopted.)

III. Expansion of health care availability must depend upon the expansion of facilities and personnel. Without this, the stimulation of demands for care can only result in a chaotic competition for available services. The complete removal of financial barriers to treatment comprises a strong such stimulus. If the ability to pay seems idealistically an unacceptable method of limiting utilization, some other method must be devised as a practical matter, since available funding and facilities have finite limits. Both pre-paid group plans and government hospitals are currently facing this problem.

IV. In the last two decades, the number of physicians has increased about 50%. Although this substantially exceeds the population growth, the number of physicians in actual general patient care has proportionately decreased, comprising now only about two-thirds of all doctors. Motivational factors for this although partially obscure, can perhaps be altered. Greater use of mechanized systems can improve efficiency at the expense of associated depersonalization, not always satisfying to the sick person. Much greater use may be made of less broadly trained, so-called "paramedical" personnel, and we would strongly encourage this trend, despite some inherent quality loss.

By these and other methods the Doctor supply can be stretched, for it clearly will take some years to significantly expand it. But we must stress that the present system is relatively efficient, particularly for the more common medical problem, in which the Doctor-Patient relationship is not merely a catchword, but the sine-qua-non of rational therapy. As an entrepreneur the doctor applies care in administration of his business; as one who does piece-work he is stimulated to efficiency; and in the fee-for-service arrangement it has a vested interest in the satisfaction of his client—the patient. You will note none of these considerations apply to some of the proposed plans. And although frequent jokes about the night call, and the house call, are popular, those of you who have dealt with salaried physicians well understand how it is when you really have an eight to five doctor.

In accord with the above then, we should advocate the expansion of medical schools (and perhaps revision but not shortening the curriculum); the encouragement of the utilization of non-M.D.'s in health care, by suitable intensive though narrow training programs in special fields, and by enabling legislation to overcome legal obstacles to their activities; the devising of incentives to relocate doctors to areas of special need, and to encourage the return to patient care of those

many now in business, industrial, and research positions. Considerable (50-100%) gain in efficiency will accrue to the credit of he who can eliminate the paperwork involved in medical practice.

V. There is a crisis, if you wish to use the term, in medical care costs, now approaching \$70 billion annually in total expenditure. This is not importantly due to the inefficiency of hospitals, which are in the majority non-profit, and whose labor costs have risen astronomically; it is not importantly due to the avarice of physicians, most of whose hourly wages are not inappropriate to the skills and responsibilities involved, and whose total fees comprise less than one-quarter of total medical costs. Discounting inflation, the two major factors (which must be controlled) are the vastly increased complexity of services, and the loss of control of utilization.

The growth over the last two decades of third party payment for services, together with recent institution of Medicare and Medicaid programs have eliminated natural restraints on expenditure. Deductibles and co-insurance provisions have been of limited effectiveness. Since the physician has traditionally worked primarily for the benefit of his patient (a role we feel proper) he is committed to the provision of all reasonable diagnostic and therapeutic services. The suggestion of some that the expansion of medicare-like programs will result in a solution to the cost problem seems at very least unrealistic. Clearly, if cost to the patient is no longer to serve as a practical limit to services, the limits must be set by administrative officials, medical professionals or otherwise. We feel this is undesirable, but possibly the only solution for those whose medical care must be completely subsidized. Hopefully the size of this group can be minimized.

Another old fashioned tradition in the medical profession is that there is a moral and ethical obligation to use all means at the doctor's disposal in attempt to maintain life or health. But as science has advanced, medical technology has exploded,

and with it cost. Today's office call and today's patient-day are not comparable to those of twenty years ago, nor should their cost be. A reasonable projection of present trends would place total medical expenditures in 1980 near \$200 billion, or about 15 percent of the GNP. It seems dubious that the taxpayer will accept this. If he does not, the physicians' duty will then be to provide such services to the patient as expense will be justified by the probable benefit, including both medical and social considerations, notwithstanding the patient's desires. The doctor will thus be an agent of the state, rather than of the patient, an uncomfortable role for most of us, and we think for our patients.

VI. In summary, the Alaska State Medical Association feels that the present method of medical care delivery is not so bad as it has been painted in many quarters; that violent change in the system may very well produce more problems than we now have and may well result in the babies being flushed with the bath water. Of the two major problems visible at present, lack of personnel and facilities is probably more important, and few of the presently proposed plans make adequate solution for this deficit, the correction of which will in any case take some time. We would expressly caution against adoption of any system that would through financing abruptly increase demands for medical service.

The solution of the rising cost problem is most importantly one of over-utilization and over-sophistication of services; to suggest that real economies can be achieved by the substitution of bureaucracy for our present system is difficult for most of us to accept with the great previous projects of the government everywhere at hand for comparison. Under a monopolistic or government-paid plan, economies can indeed be affected, but at the expense of the patient's loss of any control in his management. We would venture to predict that the patient, in this case the taxpayer, under these circumstances would not have great

gratitude for those who imposed this system upon them. Many of us feel that the sick patient still needs a doctor, and cannot be well satisfied by a mass production of medical industry.

We would further caution that systems that have evolved over considerable time, though rarely immune to improvement, are very likely to have more virtues than may be recognized, and that elegant systems concocted de novo from the heads of bright young planners are very likely to have more defects than are obvious in the planning state.

Finally, a medical care system deals primarily with human beings, as patients, as doctors, as technicians, and as administrators and planners. A shrewd and realistic estimate of the capacity of this cast for self-interest, pettiness, inspiration and ingenuity, may optimize the design.

ROBERT D. WHALEY, M.D.,

Chairman, Subcommittee for National Health Legislation, Legislative Committee, ASMA.

MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN—HOW LONG?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 14, 1971

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

Communist North Vietnam is sadistically practicing spiritual and mental genocide on over 1,600 American prisoners of war and their families.

How long?

SENATE—Wednesday, September 15, 1971

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. ELLENDER).

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

O Lord God Almighty, guide, we pray Thee, all those to whom has been committed the government of this Nation and grant to them special gifts of wisdom and unflinching devotion to righteousness. May their leadership and their legislation be such as will promote the common welfare, succor the poor, relieve the oppressed, redress social wrongs, subdue terror and tyranny, raise our national ideals and goals, and bring in the era of brotherhood.

O Thou Redeemer of Life, we beseech Thee to mend the brokenness of our common life. Mitigate the tensions, fears, and anxieties of the people and bring healing to their wounded spirits. By the power of divine love, expel the hate and bitterness which blights the life of our society and destroys all that is good and beautiful. Correct and reform those who pay the penalty of their misdeeds. Support and strengthen the custodians of the law, the protectors of our safety, and

all keepers of public order. Unify us in common cause for a better Nation and a better world under Thy rulership.

In the Redeemer's name we pray. Amen.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Geisler, one of his secretaries.

REPORT ON FEDERAL-INTERSTATE COMPACT FOR THE HUDSON RIVER BASIN—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with Section 3 of Public Law 89-605 as amended by Public Law 91-242, I am pleased to transmit a report by the Secretary of the Interior on the progress which has been achieved in negotiations on a Federal-Interstate Compact for the Hudson River Basin.

The Secretary of the Interior will continue to work with the States of New Jersey and New York to find a viable method of managing the environmental problems of this significant river basin.

RICHARD NIXON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, September 15, 1971.

REPORT OF NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL ON EXTENSION AND CONTINUING EDUCATION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

To the Congress of the United States:

The Fifth Annual Report of the National Advisory Council on Extension and Continuing Education is submitted herewith.

This Council, authorized by Public Law 89-329, has reviewed the administration and effectiveness of the program authorized by Title I of the Higher Education Act of 1965 and other federally supported extension and continuing education programs.