

Hollings	McIntyre	Scott
Hruska	Metcalf	Smith
Hughes	Mondale	Sparkman
Inouye	Montoya	Spong
Jackson	Nelson	Stennis
Jordan, N.C.	Packwood	Stevenson
Jordan, Idaho	Pearson	Symington
Long	Percy	Talmadge
Mansfield	Proxmire	Thurmond
Mathias	Randolph	Tunney
McClellan	Roth	Weicker
McGee	Schweiker	Williams

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—25

Bayh	Kennedy	Ribicoff
Brooke	Magnuson	Saxbe
Dominick	McGovern	Stafford
Eastland	Miller	Stevens
Goldwater	Moss	Taft
Hartke	Mundt	Tower
Hatfield	Muskie	Young
Humphrey	Pastore	
Javits	Pell	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote the yeas are 75, and the nays are 0. Two-thirds of the Senators present and voting having voted in the affirmative, the resolution of ratification is agreed to.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR PELL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, with the unanimous final ratification of both the International Convention Relating to Intervention on the High Seas in Cases of Oil Pollution Casualties and the Amendments to the International Convention for Prevention of Pollution of the Sea by Oil, the Senate is indebted deeply to the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. PELL). It was mainly through his diligent and persistent efforts in steering these measures through the Committee on Foreign Relations that the Senate accepted them so overwhelmingly. Senator PELL has already established himself as one of the leading experts in this body on the environment. His work as chairman of the Subcommittee on Oceans and International Environment has been outstanding.

Unfortunately Senator PELL was away on the official business of the Senate today and could not be here to witness the completion of his work product. May I say again, however, that we are deeply in his debt and appreciate his efforts immensely.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate return to the consideration of legislative business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXTENSION AND REVISION OF THE DRAFT ACT AND RELATED LAWS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, what is the question pending before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FANNIN). The Chair lays before the Senate the pending business, which the clerk will state.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill

(H.R. 6531) to amend the Military Selective Service Act of 1967; to increase military pay; to authorize active duty strengths for fiscal year 1972; and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, what is the unfinished business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The unfinished business is the Military Procurement Act.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in adjournment until 10 a.m. tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR THE RECOGNITION OF SENATOR MONTOYA TOMORROW

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the remarks of the junior Senator from West Virginia (Mr. BYRD) tomorrow, the distinguished Senator from New Mexico (Mr. MONTOYA) be recognized for not to exceed 15 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I believe that an order has already been entered with respect to the transaction of routine morning business tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. And that such period is not to extend beyond 11 a.m. tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I thank the distinguished Presiding Officer.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum. I assume this will be the final quorum call of the day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, unless the able assistant Republi-

can leader or the distinguished manager of the bill has something to say at the moment, I will proceed with the program for tomorrow.

PROGRAM

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, the program for tomorrow is as follows:

The Senate will convene at 10 a.m. After recognition of the two leaders, the following Senators will be recognized, each for not to exceed 15 minutes, and in the order stated: the junior Senator from West Virginia (Mr. BYRD) and the junior Senator from New Mexico (Mr. MONTOYA).

Following this, there will be a period for the transaction of routine morning business, with statements therein limited to 3 minutes, the period for the transaction of routine morning business not to extend beyond 11 a.m.

Beginning at 11 a.m., there will be 1 hour of controlled time for debate on the motion to invoke cloture on the conference report on the extension and revision of the draft.

At 12 o'clock noon, a mandatory live quorum call will occur in accordance with Standing Rule XXII. When a quorum has been established, an automatic rollcall vote will occur on the motion to invoke cloture. That rollcall vote will occur about 12:15 p.m.

If cloture is not invoked, presumably, another cloture motion will be filed immediately, with a rollcall vote thereon to occur on Thursday next.

If cloture is invoked on tomorrow, under the rule, the adoption of the conference report on H.R. 6531, the extension of the Military Selective Service Act, shall be the unfinished business, to the exclusion of all other business, until disposed of. Thereafter, under the rule, no Senator will be entitled to speak in all more than 1 hour on the question of adoption of the conference report or motions affecting the same.

The distinguished majority leader has indicated to me today that he expects the Senate to continue its deliberations with respect to the conference report until that matter is disposed of. Hence, the Senate will not operate on any dual track system until such disposition occurs.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move, in accordance with the previous order, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 10 a.m. tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 54 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, September 21, 1971, at 10 a.m.

NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Senate September 20, 1971:

TREASURER OF THE UNITED STATES
Romana Acosta Banuelos, of California, to be Treasurer of the United States.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

REPORT TO NINTH DISTRICT
RESIDENTS

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 20, 1971

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following commentary on U.S. adoption of the metric system:

REPORT TO NINTH DISTRICT RESIDENTS

The National Bureau of Standards has completed a three-year study of the metric system versus the inch-pound system of measurement in this country. The study team said the United States has been "going metric" for many years, and would continue to adopt more and more metric standards. It recommended that we begin a planned change to the International Metric System.

Secretary of Commerce Maurice Stans has endorsed the study team's findings and has recommended to the Congress a careful change-over to the metric system in this country over a 10-year span. He recommended that a Congressional-created coordinating committee work out a timetable for the conversion.

It appears inevitable that the United States will be adopting the metric system, sooner or later. This is the only major country which has not committed itself to the metric system, which in the last 20 years has become the dominant system of measurement in the world.

Most Americans are not well versed in the metric system, but statistics show that those who are informed about it tend to favor it. The key question is not one of changing or not changing to the metric system, but whether we will change by plan or no plan.

Admittedly, some measurements and some dimensions probably will never be changed, such as railroad track widths, the length of football fields, and baseball diamond dimensions. Many sectors of our society, both public and private, have changed, or are in the process of changing, to metric measurements—the pharmaceutical industry, the military, and even the space program, among others.

The question of "going metric" has raised many arguments, however. Those favoring the change point out:

Change to the metric system would enhance our position in world trade markets with nations already on the metric system.

Since metric units are related by multiples of ten, problems of calculation would be simplified as compared to the inch-pound calculations. Education in metric terms also would be simplified.

With increased trade potentials brought on by a switch to the metric system, the benefits of conversion would offset the costs of conversion.

Change to the metric system in the U.S. is inevitable, so we might as well do it now and avoid unnecessary expense later.

Those arguing against the change point out:

Conversion would incur additional work, time, and cost to re-educate the public.

There is a natural reluctance to abandon something deeply imbedded in a country's learning system.

There would be an enforced obsolescence of many machines, parts, equipment and appliances. Firms would be forced to keep, or

produce, double inventories of products and parts.

Adoption of the metric system might give foreign metric countries an added edge in exporting products to the United States.

One of the most important reasons for renewed interest in the metric system during the 1960s was the decline in the U.S. share of world trade. With the possibility that the European Common Market may become stronger, the industrialized members of the bloc will offer even more competition to U.S. products in the world's metric markets.

The Bureau of Standards study is now being reviewed by the House Committee on Science and Astronautics and the Senate Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences. To date, there has been no specific legislation proposed for conversion to the metric system.

Before Congress acts on any metrification plan it must make a thorough appraisal of all of the ramifications of conversion to the metric system in commerce, industry, and the daily domestic life styles of all Americans. The overriding question will be what measurement can best serve the future needs of the United States.

THE WAGE-PRICE FREEZE—TO THE
ADVANTAGE OF INDUSTRY AT
THE EXPENSE OF CONSUMER

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 20, 1971

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I was impressed by the Nicholas von Hoffman article entitled "What's Good for Corporate America Isn't Good for the Country," published in the Washington Post of August 25. He points out accurately the several ways the wage-price freeze will work to the advantage of industry at the expense of the consumer. Also, I would like to endorse his recommendations for current reading on the general subject of "Who Owns America."

From Mr. von Hoffman's astute article it is clear that corporate America's conception of the shape of the economy is not good for the rest of the country. But perhaps he has proven a further point. The facts he presents would adequately substantiate an article entitled "What's Good for Corporate America Isn't Really After All."

As he describes, in striving to absorb smaller competitors, effect mergers, and wield influence over the economy and the Government, the large corporations have lost any competition-stimulated creativity that they once may have had. The giants of American industry who extol the virtues of free enterprise have lost the will or desire to compete and consequently the impetus to innovate. They have, by applying their power to deter the development of new devices and techniques that would threaten that vested power, bought short-term security at the expense of long-term progress.

Not only will the consumer suffer from the absence of superior and safer goods, but corporate America will also suffer, having lost its innovative preeminence to other countries.

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

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

WHAT'S GOOD FOR CORPORATE AMERICA ISN'T
GOOD FOR THE COUNTRY

(By Nicholas von Hoffman)

Both the announcement and much of the reaction of the President's espousal of Democratic economics has had an America-is-going-to-war ring about it. Many exhortations to unity in the hour of crisis. Much talk about sacrifice in this moment of peril and very little discussion of the culpability of those who brought us to it.

The raising of questions is made to seem unpatriotic or eccentric. The President talks red, white and blue xenophobia, tells us we must be number one in the National Football League and in the world, and the country accepts a new and sweeping exercise of central power with docility.

The governor of Texas objects and is regarded as some kind of nut, an economic Lester Maddox. The labor leaders protest the abrogation of legally drawn contracts and are viewed as wage and salary profiteers. Ralph Nader suggests that there was advance notice of the price freeze given the automobile manufacturers by John Connally and it is implied that he is being irresponsible.

But this isn't the sort of crisis that people should hush up about. There's no enemy at the gates, and if we're in serious trouble, the fault must lie with those who let it reach this point. In terms of individual freedom, money and public policy, too much is at stake for silence.

Nader is quite right in publicly questioning the administration's good faith. Nor is he alone. The latest issue of U.S. Oil Week also questions the probity of our hypnotically dynamic Secretary of the Treasury:

"One can only wonder whether John Connally (D-Tex.) tipped off the petroleum industry to save refiners and others from the horrors of being frozen into prices prevailing across the nation late in July. Tipped off or not, major refiners put gasoline prices July 28-30 as much as six to eight cents in some depressed areas. By beating the higher price before Aug. 1, the industry can consider the higher prices as legal under the government's definition of price maximums."

Before the new economic decrees were a week old the government permitted a huge price increase in the airline industry. This was accomplished when the Civil Aeronautics Board approved reductions of as much as 38 per cent in the schedules of United, American and Trans World Airlines. Since there was no corresponding cut in the cost of tickets the Department of Transportation estimates that the decision will put as much as \$151 million in these companies' treasuries.

When the decrees were put into effect, Connally told the country no big corporation would dare violate the price freeze. He didn't discuss how easy it is to get around it simply by reducing the quality of the merchandise or the service while charging the same old prices for it.

Still, we can put up with a degree of unfairness and of chiseling and conniving for a few months. What we can't do and come out

of this in good health is take the suggestion that we all play good soldiers for 90 days and wait and see what happens. You know that line about giving the President a chance. He's had a chance, a lot of them; he's completing his third year in office.

These 90 days ought to be used for the most stringent kind of debate about what we want and how we can best get it. Certainly there's no reason to wait and see, because we know what we'll get at the end of this period, more measures designed to buttress the economy and produce prosperity by the use of greater federal power on behalf of our major corporations.

But is what's good for corporate America good for the real America? All of us have been schooled to answer yes. We're taught to chant it with almost the same thoroughness that Russian children say it about the Soviets. The corporation is the cheapest and best method of production; the corporation has the money, the resources and the incentives to produce the best products at the lowest prices.

The rational part of us knows this is fallacious or we wouldn't be in the fix we're in; we wouldn't be excluding the less expensive, superior products of Japan and Germany. But, in addition, over the years a large body of literature and documentation has been built up which demonstrates that the megacorporation isn't particularly innovative, that it is wasteful, dangerous and retards the prosperity and progress it claims to foster.

"I know of no original product invention, not even electric shavers or heating pads, made by any of the giant laboratories or corporations with the possible exception of the household grinder," wrote former GE vice president, T. K. Quinn, in a much quoted passage from his book "Giant Business: Threat to Democracy." "The record of the giants is one of moving in, buying out and absorbing the smaller creators."

And then it turns out that even the household grinder was perfected by a small, Racine, Wisconsin, company. For more about that as well as a shattering analysis of the whole corporate mess, you might want to read "Monopoly Capital," a modern, American Marxist classic, by Paul A. Baran and Paul M. Sweezy (Monthly Review Press, New York, paperback, \$3.95).

If the idea of reading a Marxist work bothers you, the story is well told by non-Marxists, too, most recently by Morton Mintz and Jerry S. Cohen in their superbly done book, "America, Inc.—Who Owns and Operates the United States," (Dial Press, New York, 1971, \$10). In it you will learn that the Chrysler Corporation has been sitting on a perfected gas turbine engine which, in general use, would vastly diminish our air pollution problem. You will also find out that the American steel industry, which is being allowed by the government to raise its prices during the freeze, made no research or development contribution to the new technologies that gave the Japanese and Germans such a huge jump on the great sluggards in Pittsburgh.

There was more to learn at the Aug. 7 Conference on Inventors and Non-Technical Barriers to Innovation, sponsored by Ralph Nader's Public Interest Research Group.

From this meeting it emerged the Dvorak Simplified Typewriter Keyboard would not only come close to doubling typing speed but make it possible for millions of people to learn to type who can't spare the time to master the present archaic system invented in 1878 and unchanged since.

We can also learn from the proceedings of that meeting that something in the order of 180,000 persons a year are killed and injured by rotary power lawn mowers; that there is a far safer mower which cuts grass better that isn't on the market and isn't likely to be put on the market.

The list of better, safer products you can't buy is very long. Frozen food packages could be made with a little marker which would

tell you if its contents had been thawed and then refrozen; there are several extremely inexpensive devices for making harmless aerosol cans that won't explode if kids throw them on a fire; there are safety caps that could be used on pop bottles so they don't accidentally blow up and maim and blind people.

The modern megacorporation has no incentive to introduce any of these improvements. It lacks both the threat of competition or government compulsion. Moreover, a number of these products would offend the \$12 billion a-year accident injury industry, as Ralph Nader calls the insurance companies, repair and medical services who make their livings off this unnecessary mayhem. (See "How to Think About the American Economy" by Ralph Nader in the Sept. 2 issue of *The New York Review of Books*.)

If we come out of these 90 days resolved to bolster and strengthen this set of economic arrangements we're simply suicidal, and even though we will be dying of botulism in the soup, lead in the air, oil in the water and glass in the eyes, it will actually be by our own hand.

LANE KIRKLAND, SECRETARY-TREASURER AFL-CIO SCORES NIXON ADMINISTRATION'S POLICIES

HON. JOSEPH E. KARTH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 20, 1971

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, September 14, during the recent Minnesota AFL-CIO Convention in Minneapolis, Lane Kirkland, secretary-treasurer of the AFL-CIO, delivered a hard-hitting speech against the shortcomings of the Nixon administration's new economic plan. Since the talk deserves a wider audience, I take the opportunity to make it available in the RECORD:

TEXT OF ADDRESS DELIVERED BY AFL-CIO SECRETARY-TREASURER LANE KIRKLAND

In recent weeks, we have been subjected to a new style of government, unusual and dangerous in a democracy: government by surprise, in the dark of the night.

Sudden shifts of the party line, so extreme that they would embarrass the Kremlin, are conceived in secrecy by a handful of men whose loyalties do not extend beyond the confines of inherited or hustled wealth. The conclusion arises that if socialism ever does come to this country, it will come at the hands of right-wing Republicans, under a Madison Avenue label, for the welfare and benefit of corporate America.

One thing can be said for those who now control the executive branch of the government—they have no shame whatever about taking care of their own and they do it brazenly and generously, confident of the protection of the press. I only wish that the so-called friends of the working-man were half so loyal to the interests of those who support them for office.

We are reminded again that labor has more than one role to play in a democratic society. The trade union, of course, exists to defend and advance the interests of workers in their places of employment. But an equally fundamental role of free trade union movement is to defend the rights of free working men against the excessive and oppressive acts of the state. We do not propose to forget or neglect that responsibility, regardless of its effects on our popularity among those caught up in the exuberance of new slogans and new rhetoric.

We will not lie down and roll over. We will not blindly follow Nixon's midnight shifts in the party line. We will resist any effort to reduce the American worker to a tool or instrument of an autocratic national policy.

Mr. Nixon called on August 15 for the adoption of a new kind of socialism for the rich at the expense of the public interest. On September 5—on Labor Day—he prescribed sterner competitive free enterprise and harder work for workers. He expressed no sympathy and offered no hope to the poor, the unemployed, the aged or the young. He didn't explain to them how they can improve themselves through fiercer competition, or how the work ethic can brighten the lives of those who can find no work to do.

Let me recall briefly what Mr. Nixon's policies have meant to America so far.

When he took office in January of 1969, he promised to bring down inflation and stabilize the value of the dollar without damaging the economy, without injuring the good and welfare of workers or any other sector of the economy.

He promised especially to avoid increasing unemployment. He promised to pursue policies that would create five million new jobs. After moving into the White House, in a letter to the AFL-CIO Executive Council, he underlined his pledge to curb inflation "without asking wage earners to pay for stability with their jobs."

His solution was to cut government spending, withdraw and reduce government services and tighten the money supply. That was Game Plan Number One. It was an unmitigated disaster.

There are not five million new jobs. Instead, five million workers are unemployed; 14½ million Americans are on the welfare rolls, not because they are fakery and chiselers, as the President implies, but because they are in need, unable to work or unable to find work. 25½ million citizens of the richest nation on earth are living in poverty.

Industrial production stands at 73 percent of capacity. More than 800 American communities are economic disaster areas.

Instead of reducing inflation, the Nixon Game Plan actually accelerated it. The 4.2 percent inflation rate of 1968 jumped to 5.4 percent in 1969, Mr. Nixon's first year in office. It climbed to 5.9 percent in 1970, and inflation is still with us.

There has been no recession for bankers and giant corporations. For 2½ years, thanks to Mr. Nixon and his Game Plan, the rich have been getting richer. America's wealth has been steadily concentrated in fewer and fewer hands.

Bank after bank has reported profit booms that raised their annual profit rates by 15 or 20 percent or more.

And because price increases kept pace with soaring interest rates, corporate earnings reports averaged 10 percent higher during the first half of 1971 than last year.

Workers and consumers paid for that. Contrary to Mr. Nixon's pledge, workers have paid not only with their jobs, but with their savings, with the welfare of their families and with their goals and hopes for the future.

Game Plan Number One did not create stability. It undermined the stability of American society precisely as labor predicted it would.

Now, after 2½ years of destructive experimentation with discredited economic theories, Mr. Nixon's new game plan, his solution to the economic mess he has created, is only to heap new burdens on wage earners, to starve the public interest still further, and to make the rich still richer.

On August 19, four days after President Nixon unveiled his Game Plan Number Two, the AFL-CIO Executive Council declared that labor has no confidence in Mr. Nixon's ability to manage the economy of the United States for the benefit of the majority of America's citizens.

Most of the discussion since then has revolved around Labor's objections to the wage-price freeze. The Council said that the President's formula was unequitable, unjust, unfair and unworkable. It is all of those things. It demands sacrifices from wage earners only, and it does nothing whatever to control speculators, profiteers and interest-gouging moneylenders, who are the greatest source of inflation.

But an even worse aspect of the President's program has had too little attention. That is his proposal to transfer even more of the public treasury—billions of dollars that belong to the taxpayers and the people—into the hands of big business.

He is asking Congress to grant a 10 percent tax credit this year and five percent in future years on any amount of money business may feel inclined to invest in new plant and equipment.

He is asking Congress to defer federal taxes on the profits of foreign export subsidiaries of U.S. corporation. He is asking for these two giveaways on top of the rapid-depreciation gimmick he gave business earlier this year.

These three programs would relieve business of \$70 billion in federal tax obligations over the next 10 years. And that is \$70 billion out of the pockets of ordinary taxpayers. That is \$70 billion in public funds that this nation desperately needs for public purposes. And yet the President calls this trickle-down scheme a "job development tax program."

Just how badly does America need new machinery for private industry when businessmen can find no use for 27 percent of the productive capacity that already exists?

How many new jobs will be created by the sophisticated automated equipment that industry does buy?

What good will it do to increase federal subsidies for the runaway corporations that are already looting the American economy and exporting the jobs and earning power of American workers to the four corners of the earth?

What this program adds up to is a job-elimination scheme. Nothing about it is designed to increase the purchasing power or improve the well being of a single American family. Just the opposite. American families are expected to pay the cost. Look closely at how the President proposes to fund his \$70 billion relief program for business:

First, he wants to take money from the poor, by delaying welfare reforms he has repeatedly urged—reforms that are long overdue and desperately needed.

Second, he wants to take money out of the pockets of federal employees by delaying wage increases they have already earned until next July.

Third, he wants to cut back federal employment by five percent and further reduce government services.

Finally, he wants to delay the federal aid that is needed to restore and maintain many of the functions of America's states and cities, and that he has promised so many times.

President Nixon has reversed America's most urgent priorities.

America's problems cannot be solved and her needs cannot be met by richer banks and fatter corporate earnings.

America's needs are public needs, and the \$70 billion the President proposes to give away should be used for public purposes.

It should be used for schools, hospitals and waste-disposal systems. It should be used for low-cost housing and low-cost transit systems. It should be used for cleaning all the air and the water. It should be used for training the unemployed, and for retraining and upgrading skills to meet the nation's needs.

It should be used to promote public safety—to man and equip police, fire and public service departments. It should be used to

provide day-care centers and to enlarge medical schools.

These are just a few of the things that President Nixon proposes to short-change in order to enrich corporate America.

They have been short-changed too long already. Instead of cutting back investment in these areas, America should vastly increase it. America should convert her unused industrial capacity and marshal her unemployed manpower to meet the real needs—the public needs—of the American people.

Public investment also is what America needs to strengthen the private economy.

Business needs markets more than additional machinery.

Americans need incomes and purchasing power to enable them to buy the things industry makes.

What America needs most is jobs—jobs for the five million now unemployed and for the millions more who are underemployed, jobs for hundreds of thousands of returning GIs and displaced defense workers; jobs in the public service.

Money spent in the public sector would create jobs, pay wages, buy materials, increase purchasing power and strengthen the private economy. At the same time it would make America a better, safer, healthier place for all Americans.

So that is why the AFL-CIO has called on the Congress to reject President Nixon's tax giveaway scheme.

We have a fight on our hands, and we intend to win it. The first step is to see that our fellow citizens really understand what is at stake, and that they remind their representatives what America's needs and priorities really are.

But beyond this legislative battle lies a bigger job.

America's problems stem, more than anything else, from a failure of leadership. America needs leaders who can do more than divert public funds into private pockets and exhort workers to work harder to make up the difference. She needs leaders who care about human beings. And it is our task to see that she gets what she needs.

In this last third of the 20th Century, the labor movement is 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.

Labor is united as never before in its fundamental aims and goals. To the greatest extent in years, labor is speaking with a single voice—and it is no secret that President Nixon deserves some of the credit for that. His policies are "bringing us together."

Over the next 14 months, in every state and in every city, labor will be conducting the greatest political education and voter registration drive ever mounted. Our aim is to see that America has, as her elected officials, men and women whose goal is to build America, and who put the interests of all the people above private greed.

The AFL-CIO is confident that the men and women of the Minnesota labor movement will, once again, do their full share.

Thank you for inviting me to participate in this convention. And good luck to you all.

U.S. DEPENDENCE ON COMMUNIST RUSSIA FOR CHROME SHOULD END

HON. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 20, 1971

Mr. BYRD of Virginia, Mr. President, the military procurement bill now pending contains a provision which would

end U.S. dependence on Communist Russia for a vital defense material; namely, chrome.

Chrome is essential for such items as jet aircraft, missiles, and nuclear submarines.

Section 503 of the military procurement bill was approved by 13 members of the Senate Committee on Armed Services. Three members were absent, but the vote was unanimous among those present.

It is not logical that the United States should spend billions of dollars to arm itself against possible aggressors, the foremost being Russia, and yet simultaneously put itself in a position of dependence on Russia for a vital material.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Extensions of Remarks two editorials dealing with this subject.

One, captioned "Open a Door to Chrome," was published in the Nashville, Tenn., Banner on August 12, 1971.

The other editorial, captioned "End Stupid Boycott," was published in the Belleville (Ill.) News-Democrat of August 16, 1971.

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

[From the Nashville, (Tenn.) Banner, Aug. 12, 1971]

OPEN A DOOR TO CHROME

Under the pressing order of urgent public business belongs the legislation, introduced by Sen. Harry F. Byrd Jr., of Virginia, to end dependence of the United States upon Russia for chrome ore.

That is a material vital to our national defense. It is essential for such items as jet aircraft, missiles, and nuclear submarines.

Until 1967 the Nation's chief supplier was Rhodesia—a source moved out of legal reach by the U.N.'s total embargo on Rhodesian trade, joined through unilateral action by then President Johnson. Amazing as it might seem, it is against the law to buy an ounce of chrome from that strongly-anti-Communist country, but not against the law to buy it from Soviet Russia.

That arrangement doesn't make sense now, and never did.

Says Senator Byrd: "I do not believe it is logical to continue to be dependent on Communist Russia for a material vital to our national defense.

"We are spending billions of dollars for weaponry as a protection against possible Russian aggression.

"Russia is the Number One reason—and indeed almost the sole reason—for our huge defense expenditures."

The legislative proposal specifically: That the Chief Executive could not prohibit imports of a strategic material from a Free World country if importation of the same material is permitted from a Communist-dominated country.

The corrective device is sorely needed, and Congress should get on with it immediately.

[From the Belleville (Ill.) News-Democrat, Aug. 16, 1971]

END STUPID BOYCOTT

Sen. Harry F. Byrd Jr. of Virginia has introduced a piece of legislation which is vital to the future of the United States as a free nation.

Byrd's bill provides simply that importation of strategic materials from a Free World country cannot be prohibited so long as imports of the same commodities are permitted from a Communist country.

The purpose of this provision is to correct

an almost insane situation which has been permitted to develop and which now endangers America's capacity to defend herself in the event of Soviet aggression.

This is the refusal of the United States to buy chrome ore, vital to defense production, from Rhodesia, and its increasing reliance upon none other than Russia for this strategic material.

The United States refuses to trade with Rhodesia because it is ruled by a minority government and allegedly is a threat to international peace. As a consequence the U.S. now buys the bulk of its chrome ore from the Soviet Union, a country which is ruled by a brutal one-party dictatorship that habitually instigates threats to world peace.

The result is that the United States has hinged its defense production upon the very nation we are supposed to be defending ourselves against. Dependence now is estimated at more than 50 percent. It will go higher to the point of paralyzing American defenses unless our elected representatives stir themselves.

Byrd's legislation would have the effect of reopening trade with Rhodesia and relaxing the Soviet grip on America's defenses.

The issue is nothing less than our survival as a free and independent nation. But official Washington today is so hung up on optimistic hopes of peace that neither the administration nor Congress will act unless they hear from the people.

MIZELL NEWSLETTER AND QUESTIONNAIRE

HON. WILMER MIZELL

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 16, 1971

Mr. MIZELL. Mr. Speaker, I want to advise my colleagues that I am sending to every residence in North Carolina's Fifth Congressional District a newsletter/questionnaire designed to inform my constituents of the business at hand in the Congress and, at the same time, find out how they feel about the issues facing us today.

As I said in my personal message to these Fifth District citizens, if government is to succeed, it must be government on a two-way street.

With this in mind, I intend to inform my colleagues of the opinions expressed by my constituents on the issues raised in the questionnaire, as soon as those questionnaires have been returned and the results tabulated.

I believe it will be informative and helpful to my colleagues, as it will be to me, and I would now like to read into the RECORD the text of the newsletter along with the questions that comprise my 1971 legislative questionnaire:

WILMER D. MIZELL REPORTS TO THE FIFTH DISTRICT, NORTH CAROLINA, FROM CONGRESS

DEAR FRIENDS: In my continuing effort to bring the work of the Government closer to you, the people of the fifth district, I am pleased to begin this new series of newsletters, outlining actions and positions I have taken on the various issues confronting the 92d Congress and the Nation.

With this newsletter, I hope to give you some useful information on a variety of issues—those that affect you personally and directly, and those that have been the subject of intensive national debate.

I solicit your views on all of these issues, because I believe that government that is truly effective must be government on a two-way street. This is the basis of democracy, and we must all do our part if democracy is to succeed.

I appreciate your continued trust and confidence in my efforts to serve you, and I pledge my continued best efforts to be as capable a steward of your trust, and as effective a representative of your views, as I can possibly be.

Sincerely,

WILMER D. MIZELL.

VIETNAM

The war in Vietnam continues to claim high priority in the councils of government and in the thoughts and discussions of all Americans.

Substantial progress is being made toward ending American involvement in that war, while at the same time lowering the risk of future war and enhancing the chance for lasting peace.

There now appear to be some signs of progress in the negotiations at Paris, but we have come to realize that the negotiating process is very slow, often exasperating and not given to rapid progress. All of us, however, pray that these negotiations will bring a swift and just end to the war, so that our fighting men and American prisoners of war can be returned safely home.

Beyond the negotiating front, there are even more positive signs pointing toward a total disengagement of American forces from the war. Our men are now being brought home at a rate of about 15,000 a month, and President Nixon's Vietnamization policy has already brought about the withdrawal of more than 320,000 American soldiers.

This policy of withdrawal contrasts with eight years of sustained escalation of American involvement in Vietnam, beginning in 1961. Casualty figures have reached their lowest point since the massive troop buildup began six years ago.

We will not be satisfied, of course, until there are no casualties, but we must be sure the 45,000 men who have already died in this tragic conflict have not died in vain.

We have taken positive, concrete steps which should meet with the approval of all who truly seek peace, and those steps are now leading us toward a full generation of peace for the American people.

BUSING AMENDMENT

On April 19, the United States Supreme Court handed down its decision in the case of Swann v. Charlotte-Mecklenburg Board of Education, which was regarded as a landmark case in the continuing school desegregation controversy.

The court ruled that the forced busing of school children to achieve racial balance is an acceptable policy. With thousands of you, and with millions of Americans across the country, I find the policy of forced busing completely unacceptable.

I have made my position clear on this issue on a number of occasions. In the 91st Congress, and again in the 92nd, I introduced legislation which would have preserved the right of public school students to attend their neighborhood schools.

Because the Supreme Court ruled, in effect, that the neighborhood schools concept was unconstitutional, any regular legislation passed by Congress supporting that concept would automatically be struck down and nullified as unconstitutional.

The only remaining recourse was an amendment to the Constitution itself, so that it would say, in unmistakable terms: "No public school student shall, because of his race, creed or color, be assigned to, or required to attend, a particular school."

This amendment will have the effect of forbidding forced busing, and if enacted, will be

an important step toward returning our schools to their original, and still most important mission—providing an education of the highest possible quality for every American child, whether he is black, red, yellow or white.

My proposal was introduced in the House of Representatives with co-sponsors representing constituencies from all across the country.

Of particular interest is the fact that Rep. Charles Raper Jonas (R.-N.C.) is one of those co-sponsors. Rep. Jonas is the congressman from the district encompassing the city of Charlotte, where the Supreme Court's decision was primarily directed.

I have written a letter to Rep. Emanuel Celler (D.-N.Y.), chairman of the House Committee on the Judiciary (to which my amendment has been referred for consideration), and I have strongly urged Chairman Celler to hold hearings on this measure in the immediate future.

These hearings are a necessary first step toward passage of this amendment by both houses of Congress, and final ratification by three-fourths of the States, as required by the Constitution. An identical amendment has recently been introduced in the U.S. Senate.

In a further effort toward passage of this amendment, I have written to the Presidents of the Senate and Speakers of the House of every state legislature in the country, explaining why I introduced this amendment and soliciting their views and their support on this issue.

I have also sponsored a Special Order on Busing, during which a great many of my colleagues from all across the country joined me in expressing our strong opposition to forced busing. The Special Order was held in the House of Representatives just before the summer recess began.

I hope these efforts, and others I will make in the future, will speed the day when our public schools return to their primary goal of educating our children.

If you would like to participate in this effort, please write to Rep. Emanuel Celler, 2136 Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20515, and express your desire to see this legislation, House Joint Resolution 646, immediately considered and passed by the Congress.

TEXTILES

One of the greatest problems confronting the people of the fifth district and North Carolina today is the unchecked influx of foreign textile products that are flooding our domestic markets and causing increasing unemployment and plant closings.

Announcement was made several weeks ago that former employees of Arista Mills, a Winston-Salem textile plant which closed last year, are eligible for financial and training assistance from the U.S. Department of Labor, under provisions of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962.

These provisions offer workers unemployment, retraining or relocation allowances if it is established that "as a result in major part of trade agreement concessions an article is being imported in such increased quantities as to be the major factor in causing or threatening to cause unemployment or underemployment of a significant number or proportion of the workers of a firm."

This official recognition of injury brought on by our present textile trade policy is important, but we cannot be satisfied with providing endless government subsidies to displaced textile workers. We must get at the root of the problem—the imports themselves.

Arista Mills is only one example of the growing crisis in our local and national textile industry. There have been plant closings in several of our fifth district counties, and some established textile towns in other parts of the South are becoming little more than ghost towns.

I am trying to alleviate this critical situation through congressional action. Early in this session of the 92d Congress, I introduced legislation calling for a system of fair but effective quotas on textile imports coming into this country.

My bill would establish categorical limitations on textile imports and revert the level of those imports to the 1967-68 standard, with subsequent percentage increases proportionate to the growth of the domestic textile market.

This bill is quite similar to legislation passed by the House last year, but which the Senate did not act on before adjourning. It is needed now more than ever before: textile imports to this country rose 42 percent last year over the previous record high year of 1969, and we can expect no relief until effective quotas are enacted.

I am presently co-sponsoring still another bill which provides authority to the U.S. Tariff Commission to set automatic quotas on imports which the Commission finds injurious to domestic manufacturers of the same product.

In addition, I have made several speeches on the floor of the House of Representatives, including a Special Order on Textiles recently, in which several congressmen joined me in an effort to call attention to the plight of our domestic textile industry. I am taking every step possible in an effort to get effective legislation passed to relieve our growing textile crisis.

RURAL DEVELOPMENT

On two occasions this year, I have outlined plans for major legislation on rural development, incorporating a six-point program to overcome existing shortages in rural jobs, housing and industry, to upgrade rural education and health, and protect the rural environment.

The plan includes the following major points:

(1) Improvement of transportation systems to open isolated areas to trade routes, inviting industrial relocation. In the 91st Congress, I introduced, and the Congress passed, legislation establishing a 70-30 matching share formula for primary and secondary access road construction, a necessary first step in opening up rural America to the flow of national commerce.

(2) Industrial development to provide job opportunities. I have introduced a Rural Job Development bill that would put an end to job-searching before a young man could get past the city limits of his hometown. With a series of tax incentives provided in the bill, together with low tax bases in rural areas, an untapped industrial labor force, available land area and attractive surroundings, industry would be strongly attracted to these underdeveloped areas where job opportunities have been lacking.

(3) Vocational training. This is the best form of manpower training available for the money anywhere, providing skilled labor for local industry and a good income for the laborer. There is a strong vocational training program included in the Appalachian Regional Development Program, which encompasses seven of the fifth district's eight counties. I introduced legislation in this Congress to extend the Appalachian Regional Commission for another four years, and this topic is discussed at greater length elsewhere in the newsletter.

(4) Rural housing. This is a major need in rural America, and a program that deserves a great deal more attention than it has received in the past. I was happy to have played a major part in restoring \$500 million in rural housing money—\$20 million of it for North Carolina—which had been scheduled to be cut out as an economy measure in the budget for this fiscal year. These funds are administered through the Farmers Home Administration.

(5) Preservation of a quality environment, including construction of adequate water and

sewage treatment facilities as areas are developed industrially; enforcement of new antipollution laws, and more careful planning to safeguard our natural resources.

I am now in the planning stage of drafting comprehensive legislation on rural development, which, in addition to the needs mentioned above, would also provide for a better system of health care centers, conveniently located and adequately staffed, to improve the overall level of health care in rural America. I plan to introduce this major legislation sometime during this session of Congress.

WELFARE "REFORM"

The House of Representatives recently passed H.R. 1, the controversial welfare reform package that provides for a guaranteed annual income of \$2,400 for a family of four.

I voted against this measure, and my reasons for opposing the bill were outlined in a speech I delivered on the floor of the House during the debate. A portion of that speech is reprinted here:

"Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my wholehearted support for the efforts being made to reform this country's welfare system.

"None of us in this chamber can take any satisfaction from the present state of the welfare program, and all of us want to see it changed.

"The overwhelming and ever-rising costs of welfare, the administrative chaos that characterizes almost every single welfare office in America, the demeaning effects that present welfare efforts have on recipients, the actual encouragement of family separation that is inherent in the present system—all of these and many more reasons tell us plainly that changes in the welfare system are imperative.

"But how can we justify the American taxpayer's having to subsidize another man's income from private employment, or contribute to public funds that will totally provide that income, when the taxpayer is having a hard enough time making ends meet for his own family?

"How can we justify adding more than 10 million more people to the welfare rolls in this country, and call that reform? How can the State of North Carolina increase its welfare load from 248,200 to 821,600—an increase of 330 percent—when welfare costs are already putting a severe strain on government treasuries?

"And why should the government-subsidized employee—or his employer, for that matter—look any further than to the Congress for future income raises?

"And how can we justify a program that offers no assurance that at some point in time welfare rolls and welfare costs will begin to decrease, rather than continuing in an upward spiral?

"How can we do all of this, and still say we have passed a welfare reform program? I say it can't be done that way. To provide welfare reform that is effective and acceptable to the people who must pay for it, we must get away from the stigma of a guaranteed annual income.

"We must provide the means of helping people help themselves, giving them the incentive to succeed on their own, to train for a job and be gainfully employed, and to get away from being a perpetual burden on the taxpayer."

APPALACHIAN REGIONAL COMMISSION

Since the early days of the 92nd Congress, I have been trying to secure a four-year extension of the Appalachian Regional Development Program, which I consider to be one of the most effective and efficient programs in the entire federal government structure.

Congress recently passed, and President Nixon signed into law, this extension measure which I had sponsored, and which also extended the Economic Development Administration and five smaller regional commis-

sions including the Coastal Plains Commission, which serves several North Carolina counties.

The Appalachian Commission, which serves seven of the eight counties in the fifth congressional district, conducts excellent programs of highway construction, vocational education, health care centers and related services, low-cost housing, sewage and water treatment plant construction, etc.

LEGISLATURE REDEFINES 5TH DISTRICT

The North Carolina State Legislature has passed reapportionment legislation, bringing minor changes in the make-up of the 11 federal congressional districts.

Changes in the 5th District include the loss of Davie and Yadkin Counties and the addition of Wilkes County.

I have been honored to represent the good people of Davie and Yadkin Counties for almost three years, and the loss of these people as constituents is a personal one for me, since I enjoyed so much being associated with them.

At the same time, however, I welcome the opportunity to serve the people of Wilkes County, or "The State of Wilkes," as it is known, and I am sure that the citizens of Alleghany, Ashe, Davidson, Forsyth, Stokes and Surry Counties join me in welcoming Wilkes County to the 5th District.

These changes will not take effect, however, until 1973, and I hope the people of Davie and Yadkin Counties will continue to call on me through next year if there is any way I can assist them.

1971 LEGISLATIVE QUESTIONNAIRE

1. Do you favor the busing of school children to achieve racial balance?
2. Do you believe the present welfare system needs to be reformed?
3. Do you support a welfare reform that establishes a guaranteed income?
4. Do you favor Congress enacting a national health insurance program to cover catastrophic or prolonged illnesses?
5. Do you support the President's Vietnamization program for ending American involvement in Vietnam?
6. Do you support the overall objective of the President's revenue-sharing proposal to move power and control from Washington to the local level?
7. Do you think government workers and other public employees should have the right to strike?
8. Do you believe pornographic material should be sent through the mail only to those who have specifically requested it?
9. Are you satisfied with President Nixon's overall performance?
10. Do you favor restoring the right of voluntary prayer in schools and other public facilities?
11. Do you favor the President's proposed trip to mainland China?
12. Do you favor the admission of mainland China to the United Nations: (Select one)
 - (A) provided Nationalist China retains its seat in the U.N.?
 - (B) even if the result is Nationalist China's withdrawal or removal from the U.N.?

CONSTITUTION WEEK

HON. JOHN J. DUNCAN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 20, 1971

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to see the display here in the Capitol in honor of Constitution Week. Throughout the land, our fellow citizens are likewise displaying documents, the

flag, and copies of the Constitution to call attention to this important time.

We are calling attention to one of the most significant dates in the history of this Nation—September 17, 1787, when the Constitution was signed. Thus, this week I join my colleagues in this Chamber and fellow Americans everywhere in the study and observance of the acts which resulted in the formation of the Constitution.

During many past years we celebrated Citizenship Day rather than Constitution Day. Now we pay particular attention to citizenship as we plan our programs and exhibits for the week that begins on September 17. After all, citizenship and the Constitution are inseparable.

I think this is a great time to welcome new citizens to this country. Naturalized citizens receive warm welcomes in their communities, I know, but this is a special opportunity for us to show our interest in them and our belief in liberty and justice that were given them, and us, with the signing of the Constitution. The community leaders can help promote unity by bringing the naturalized citizens into this week of celebration.

Another group, who is playing an even bigger role in the decisionmaking in this country, is the 18- to 21-year-olds who can now vote in all national elections. I would like to salute their knowledge and talents and recognize their entrance into civic life. With the addition of these young men and women in the voting ranks we have additional reason to celebrate.

I urge every American, native born or naturalized and new or experienced voter, to use this week to learn more about the Constitution and what insurance for freedom and prosperity it has provided.

POWER COMPANIES AND THE REAL ESTATE BONANZA

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, September 20, 1971

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Extensions of Remarks an article entitled "Power Companies and the Real Estate Bonanza," which was published on July 15 in Conservation News, an educational service of the National Wildlife Federation.

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

POWER COMPANIES AND THE REAL ESTATE BONANZA

Before an electric utility can build a hydroelectric dam, it must obtain a construction go-ahead from the Federal Power Commission. When the light turns green the utility acquires the soon-to-be flooded land through the power of condemnation; and the public, through power rates, picks up the tab for its acquisition and maintenance.

As a result, the public becomes beneficiary of the development—the FPC, the trustee. The reservoir formed by the dam soon becomes a recreation focal point. And

the land surrounding the reservoir (which the utility picks up in the condemnation process) in turn becomes highly salable real estate.

In order to cash in on a fast-paced game of monopoly, the utility looks once again to the FPC for permission to transfer the newly born "lake front sites" to a real estate developer who is often a subsidiary of the utility itself. At present, land transfer responsibilities rest with collective decisions by the Commission. But a newly proposed rule would give the FPC Secretary alone a routine final say.

Since the FPC complains it's deluged with utility company transfer requests, it justifies the new rule saying it would "simplify and expedite the handling of such transfers." The Commission feels that the proposed rule is not "a major Federal action significantly affecting the quality of the human environment" and therefore not subject to the National Environmental Policy Act.

The National Wildlife Federation doesn't agree, and has asked the FPC to reject the new proposal. The Federation contends the Commission's concern for the land's future should go beyond a desire "to simplify and expedite" its transfer. For the land involved belongs to the public. And the public should have its chance to say how they want—or don't want—the land to be developed.

The proposed rule, according to the NWF, is unclear as to whether the licensee must describe what sort of use the land will be put to. Should the rule be adopted, the FPC Secretary could approve disposition of the lands even though the applicant hasn't filed an approved project recreation plan.

The NWF feels utilities bent on selling project land's aren't likely to "highlight the presence of environmental problems," which may range from public access complications to sewage disposal problems; from thoughts of high rise luxury view apartments to reflections that perhaps the land might have made an attractive community wildlife refuge.

Instead of easing land transfer decisions, the NWF has recommended that present procedural protection surrounding them be extended. At the very least, the Federation says the Commission should require notice of land sales in local newspapers; and send personal notice to state and local groups or agencies with recreational and wildlife management expertise.

In short, the applicant should do more than merely show that land disposition would not be "inconsistent" with any local land use plans; he should be told instead to prove the transfer of public acreage would promote environmentally sound public land use goals.

NATIONAL 4-H WEEK

HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 20, 1971

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, this year the week of October 3 through 9 has been set aside as National 4-H Club Week and once again it is a distinct privilege and pleasure for me to salute these clubs which are so thoroughly dedicated to the continuing expansion of their multipurpose programs to meet our present-day needs both at home and abroad.

The 4-H theme for 1971, "4-H Bridges the Gap" is most appropriate for the 4 million boys and girls now en-

rolled in this organization because, if ever our Nation and indeed the world, had need for group involvement of young people such as the 4-H'ers, it is now.

To me, one of the major attractions of the 4-H movement is its complete flexibility which accounts for the fact that while it was originally established as a rural organization it has, for the past two decades, been enrolling members from our small towns, metropolitan suburbs, and inner-city areas. Certainly one can truly say that today's 4 million 4-H'ers are "dynamic doers" and wherever they are these young people are superb ambassadors of goodwill. Their activities are so varied that the modern 4-H'ers have much in common with any young person—learning traffic safety rules, helping with a local antipollution program, mixing the proper feed for a dairy cow, teaching a group of inner-city girls how to sew, playing drums in a combo are but a few of the activities of a typical modern 4-H'er.

Today's 4-H program is focused on the young person, regardless of where he or she lives, providing an opportunity for personal development into strong, conscientious, and dedicated citizens.

Mr. Speaker, I am justifiably very proud of the fact that Kentucky is among the four or five States having more than 100,000 4-H'ers and certainly my pride always extends to the splendid accomplishments of these young people in the Second Congressional District.

The basic fact that 4-H is for everyone and benefits everyone, in my opinion, confirms beyond any doubt, the great good that comes from the activities of these young people together with their adult and teenage volunteer leaders, and as they prepare to observe their national week, I want to repeat that it is a distinct privilege and pleasure to congratulate our 4-H clubs in Kentucky and elsewhere and to wish them continued success in all their future endeavors.

NEW HEADQUARTERS FOR COAST GUARD'S GROUP

HON. ROBERT N. GIAIMO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 20, 1971

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, on September 15, 1971, the U.S. Coast Guard's "Group Long Island Sound" began operations in a new headquarters strategically located in New Haven, Conn.

Centralization of Coast Guard functions in this new facility, under the leadership of Comdr. James L. Fleishell, is an effort to make the most effective use of Coast Guard personnel and equipment in their police, environmental, and other coastal regulation activities.

As a recent editorial in the New Haven Register notes, this centralization of coastal and harbor expertise will be important in efforts to save Long Island Sound from both the casual desecration of some small craft owners and fishermen and the disastrous oil spills that

threaten the life, commerce, and recreation potential of the sound.

New Haven and Bridgeport, and many of the coastal communities that decorate the Connecticut shoreline, have discovered that "pointing the finger" of blame gives scant satisfaction once oil leaks or dead fish are discovered, or assorted trash ruins beaches. Preventive action—the kind that a locally based, comprehensive Coast Guard unit may give—seems more promising than "after the fact" remedies in the long run.

Finally, it should be noted that coastal pollution laws, such as those recently debated by the Congress, will require the cooperative efforts of environmental policy agencies and enforcement groups such as the Coast Guard if they are to be effective. Again, a streamlined, well-located, and well-equipped Coast Guard unit will help in such efforts.

I salute the Coast Guard's Group Long Island Sound—a solid tool, not another drawing board effort to control sound pollution—and join the Register in welcoming the start of its New Haven-based efforts.

RESOLUTION OF KNIGHTS OF LITHUANIA

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 20, 1971

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, the outrage expressed by the Knights of Lithuania over the failure of the United States to grant political refuge to Simas Kudirka is justified. This act of refusing asylum was contrary to the American tradition—counter to the very expression of our ideal: "Give me your tired, your poor. Your huddled masses yearning to breathe free."

I share the sentiments of my friends of Lithuania as expressed in the following resolution which was adopted at their past national convention:

RESOLUTION

Whereas, on November 23, 1970, a Lithuanian Seaman, Simas Kudirka, serving on a Soviet vessel, sought asylum aboard the United States Coast Guard ship, the SS Vigilant, and contrary to all American precedent, Soviet sailors were permitted to board an American vessel in American waters, seize and brutally beat him on the SS Vigilant and forcibly take him back to the Soviet ship and to Soviet-occupied Lithuania, where he is now serving a ten-year term in a communist labor camp for the "crime" of having sought freedom in free American territory,

We, the Knights of Lithuania, meeting at the Franciscan Monastery, in Kennebunkport, Maine, at our 58th National Convention, August 25-29, 1971, as Americans of Lithuanian descent, express our grief and confusion over the United States officers' disgraceful abandonment of American policy and tradition in permitting this most un-American action and thus contributing to the subsequent incarceration of one of our Lithuanian people and the harassment of his family;

We, furthermore, firmly petition the President of the United States and the Congress of the United States not merely to state words of protest to the Soviet Union over this illegal infraction of international procedure, but to

use their official powers to extend every positive means to have Simas Kudirka and his immediate family brought to the United States, where, at the risk of his very life, he sought refuge.

Further, we, as Americans deeply believe that by such action our own confidence and respect in basic American principles will be refreshed; and the image of the United States, as the citadel of freedom for all men, will be restored in the eyes of all subjugated nations of the world.

LAWRENCE JANONIS,
JOSEPH BOLEY,
Presidium Cochairmen.

THE SHARPSTOWN FOLLIES—XXXV

HON. HENRY B. GONZALEZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 20, 1971

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, whatever else you may say about Assistant Attorney General Wilson, he sticks by his friends.

A great many people lost faith in Frank Sharp as his dreams and visions of endless business empire grew. These people knew that Sharp was in beyond his depth, and that he never had a chance to realize his dreams.

They knew that when Sharp talked about buying control of Royal Dutch Petroleum—or Shell Oil Co. as it is known more commonly, the man just was dreaming. And even a naive fellow like Astronaut James Lovell, who had been befriended by Sharp, was not long in realizing that he had been had. Lovell had enough when Sharp told him about a \$120 million deal to buy control of Braniff Airlines.

But Will Wilson, if one believes his stories, never realized that good old Frank Sharp was anything but good folks, a good solid businessman. Wilson says that he feared a little bit the dazzling schemes of Frank Sharp, but he stayed with the ship, so to speak, until he had to leave it. And even after the Sharp version of the *Titanic* disaster, Wilson has never said that he doubted good old Frank.

And, of course, he can say nothing else. Having worked with and for a grand schemer and crook, Wilson can hardly maintain his crimebuster image if he admits that he knew the truth about Frank Sharp.

Yet he did know. He must have known, just from the crazy schemes Sharp talked of, that he was on a Texas version of the *Titanic*. And if Wilson dismissed all the crazy talk as just so much country club brags, or the dreams of an ambitious man, he still knew that Sharp was anything but the upright man he posed as. After all, the old crimebusters knew of Sharp's involvement in a spectacular Houston bribery scandal back in the fifties, and he knew of Sharp's involvement in an FHA scandal in 1963, the very year that Wilson went to work for Sharp.

Wilson maintains a pose of innocence and ignorance, but he knows that it is false. But you have got to credit the

guy—he rode the *Titanic* until just before it hit the iceberg laid in its path by the SEC, and even then he was able to see the Justice Department throw a lifejacket to his old friend, benefactor and pal, Frank Sharp. And the life jacket says in its lining, "courtesy of W. Wilson the old crimebuster, and your pal."

TWENTY-FIVE YEARS OF THE HILL-BURTON PROGRAM

HON. NICK BEGICH

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 20, 1971

Mr. BEGICH. Mr. Speaker, while we were on vacation last month, one of the most productive and influential legislative programs in the Nation's history marked its 25th anniversary. On August 13, 1946, President Truman signed into law as Public Law 725 of the 79th Congress, the Hospital Survey and Construction Act of 1946. This law and the great program it created became known as the Hill-Burton Act after its two original sponsors in the Senate, Senator Lister Hill of Alabama and Senator Harold Burton of Ohio.

This legislation and the many amendments that have expanded and improved the program over the years since 1946 have financed and supported the construction and modernization of general hospitals, public health centers, long-term care facilities, mental hospitals, tuberculosis hospitals, outpatient facilities, and rehabilitation facilities across the face of our country. In rural areas where health facilities were formerly few and far between, there are now hospitals and other facilities serving the people—as a result of the financial aid and the public interest that this program has generated. In large metropolitan communities the Hill-Burton has helped to provide funds for the construction and modernization of hospitals, outpatient facilities, and other necessary facilities.

In the 25 years of its existence, the Hill-Burton program has supported 10,471 separate projects in the United States and its territories, aiding 6,185 facilities in 3,808 communities, and providing 456,663 inpatient care beds. All of this construction has cost a total of \$12,143,921,000 with \$3,579,134,000 coming from Federal grants and the remainder from State and local contributions. In my own State of Alaska, the Hill-Burton program has aided 25 projects in 17 facilities, providing 557 inpatient care beds at a total cost of \$25,578,000, with \$7,484,000 coming from the Federal Government.

The Hill-Burton program is probably the most successful Federal-State program in our history. I did not want to let this anniversary pass without making note of it.

Gov. William Egan of Alaska had proclaimed the week of August 15 as Hill-Burton Week. Because Congress was not

in session during the month of August I wish to take the opportunity presented to me now to include the Governor's proclamation into the RECORD, as follows:

PROCLAMATION—HILL-BURTON WEEK

For 25 years the Hill-Burton program, established by the Hospital Survey and Construction Act of 1946, has helped communities throughout the state of Alaska meet the needs of its citizens for hospitals, public health centers, nursing homes, out-patient facilities, rehabilitation centers, and other health facilities.

Federal funds totaling \$11,980,335, made available through the Hill-Burton program, have stimulated the construction of 27 health facility projects in the State costing a total of \$42,722,240. This construction has provided the State 639 in-patient beds in hospitals and nursing homes and has added 5 other types of health facilities.

The Hill-Burton program has pioneered in new approaches to improved patient care through studies into the development and effective use of health facilities and through coordinated planning for facilities and services.

The program has been an outstanding example of Federal, State, and local cooperation to improve the health of all our people.

I, William A. Egan, Governor of Alaska, do hereby proclaim the seven-day period beginning Sunday, August 15, 1971, as Hill-Burton Week.

Dated this 12th day of August, 1971.

WILLIAM A. EGAN,
Governor.

HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.

HON. JOHN L. McMILLAN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 20, 1971

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I was shocked and distressed to learn of the passing of my good friend, the late Honorable George Huddleston, Jr. The Nation has suffered a great loss in the passing of one of its outstanding leaders.

I do not know of any man that I have served with here in the Congress of the United States during the past 34 years that I had higher admiration for than George Huddleston. He was an outstanding gentleman under all conditions and circumstances; he was a man that every Member of Congress could look upon with pride and call him a statesman.

I had the pleasure of serving on the same committee with George Huddleston for a number of years. He was a tower of strength in getting to the bottom of any problem and coming up with a solution. I deeply regretted the time when George Huddleston decided to discontinue serving in the U.S. Congress; however, I understand, with his great brain, he wanted to get out of the legislative business and get into a more productive field of endeavor.

I always considered George Huddleston and his lovely family among my closest personal friends since the first day George was sworn in as a Member of Congress. Mrs. McMILLAN joins me in expressing our deepest sympathy for Mrs. Huddleston and the children. We have all lost a great friend and the Nation has suffered a great loss in the passing of George Huddleston.

WISCONSIN STATE UNIVERSITY AT OSHKOSH MARKS 100TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 20, 1971

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, this weekend I had an opportunity to help observe a benchmark in the history of public higher education. The Wisconsin State University—Oshkosh has completed 100 years as an institution of higher education.

Today's university opened in 1871 as the Oshkosh Normal School, built by money derived from the sale of swamp lands which the State had received from the Federal Government. From this modest beginning, the university has expanded to 180 acres of classrooms, libraries, lecture halls, laboratories, student commons, and dormitories. A total of 11,800 students are registered this semester.

The curriculum and the campus of this university reflect the undertaking of a bold experiment by the people of Wisconsin—the experiment to create a system of public higher education that would compare on quality terms with the best institutions in the country. Mr. Speaker, the experiment is working and continuing to grow. I am pleased to include as a part of my remarks an editorial salute from the Sheboygan Press and descriptive reports of the university from the Oshkosh Daily Northwestern:

[From the Sheboygan Press, Sept. 14, 1971]

ONE HUNDRED YEARS AT OSHKOSH

Oshkosh State University is entering its second century as an institution of higher education. A centennial convocation will be held at the school Thursday evening to mark the anniversary.

The Oshkosh institution is one of the state-operated universities that has experienced phenomenal growth since the present system was established in 1967 under a reorganization act approved by the Legislature. The enrollment for the current term—9,879 undergraduate students, 1,000 graduate students and 462 attending evening classes—is a far cry from the Normal School days when enrollment was in the hundreds. For instance, 1950 the total was 787. It was 173 in 1871.

Oshkosh State, of course, is the outgrowth of the Normal School system. Back in the 1850s it was assumed that private schools would provide the necessary training for teachers, but, as reported in the Wisconsin Blue Book, this did not work. Thus, while the state's constitution did not direct the Legislature to provide teacher training, some recognition of it was made. Beginning in 1866 with the establishment of a school at Plattville, nine schools were created in various parts of the state to train teachers.

Whitewater was next (1868), and Oshkosh Normal came into existence in 1871. Incidentally, this was 14 years prior to the opening of the Normal School in Milwaukee, which since has become the University of Wisconsin—Milwaukee.

The Normal Schools at first offered only two years of training. They later became teacher colleges and offered four years and sometimes five years of training. In 1951, these institutions became State Colleges and kept that designation until the Board of Regents of State Colleges decreed them to be universities in 1964. The Legislature gave

the board the more prestigious "university" designation three years later.

It was at Oshkosh that many who taught public schools in the Sheboygan area received their training. It is probable that a large number of those still among the living will attend the dedication of the new School of Education buildings that will serve as part of the convocation Thursday or at other dedications scheduled for the near future. Unless they have visited the campus in recent years they will be amazed at the changes that have taken place. The campuses at Oshkosh and other university communities have become cities in themselves. They reflect the great attention that has been given to higher education by the people of Wisconsin during the past 100 years.

This attention currently is centered on Governor Lucey's proposal for merger of the two systems—the University of Wisconsin and the Wisconsin State Universities. Although action on this proposal has been slowed, it seems inevitable on the basis of past developments in the state's program of higher education, that a merger will come in time.

[From the Oshkosh Daily Northwestern,
Sept. 17, 1971]

QUALITY INSTRUCTION IS ONE BASIC OBJECTIVE OF SCHOOL

(By Judy Russell)

Quality instruction.
Research and innovation.
Public service.

These are basic objectives of the school of education at Wisconsin State University—Oshkosh, which not only seeks new, revolutionary approaches to teacher preparation but also attempts to streamline approaches used for many years.

"We practice what we preach" says Dr. David L. Bowman, live-wire dean of the school which averages an enrollment of 4,300 students.

He insists, "We cannot separate theory and practice. Unrest comes from students who do not see relevance between what they see and hear in a lecture and what happens on the outside. There must be a relationship between our teaching and reality."

The new school of education building "personifies the gearing up needed for changes in teacher education," according to Dr. Bowman, who stressed the "video capabilities, we have now."

"The whole technology capability is being tapped by us in teacher education preparation. We have a 5,000-foot research area in the basement of the school of education where we can innovate and research anything using a controlled group—from one child to 150, from nursery school to graduate school" Dean Bowman explained.

He emphasized, "If we can improve the quality of student teaching and lower the costs to the taxpayers, the kind of research in which we are engaged is justifiable."

"Technology relates to finding better answers to problems we face in education and in teaching students," he added.

The school has closed circuit television "to show prospective teachers what characteristics they can expect to see in certain children"; the capability for two-way communication between the laboratory school (Swart Campus School) and the school of education building, and a main console and hookup to all rooms in Campus School, with the potential for remote control from the school of education.

This complex will be hooked into the University distribution system. From there it could be put into use anywhere on the campus, according to Dr. Bowman.

The research center has a "fake floor," which could be raised for installation of an electronic response system. There are also a data control analysis room, remote control units and individual study carrels.

Overhead projectors, videotape, cassette and tape recorders, 8 millimeter film—"We not only teach students how to operate this equipment, but when to use it," Dr. Theron Freese, associate dean of the school of education, noted.

"Twenty years ago, tape recorders revolutionized education. Now video replay is more realistic. We can see if there is a contagion about student teachers' enthusiasm or if, when they speak, the kids sleep," Dr. Bowman declared.

"It is really effective when a student teacher, via videotape, sees and hears himself in operation. He begins pointing things out. A professor can also point things out to a class immediately, via videotape, without interrupting the class students are viewing," Dr. Freese stated.

To improve the teacher education program, the school took eight of the student teaching credits and two of the teaching problems credits and combined them into a 10-point package.

"We set up a clinical experience, which includes heavy use of video equipment for analysis and tie-up with methodology courses, for juniors. They are encouraged to purchase blank videotapes which they may keep, reuse or sell at the end of a semester," Dr. Bowman said.

He added, "The main purpose of this is to have students tape themselves in important segments of pupil-teacher relationships."

In so doing, WSU-O students help answer questions like the following: What do you look like when you talk to a child? Is there a barrier? How do you give directions to 20-30 kids? How do you and the children look during one minute of time? What happens when you summarize a 20-minute presentation given by the regular teacher? Do you get the kids involved in your summary?

"We try to compartmentalize this prior to the time students get admitted to student teaching. Some who have mediocre grades have a great relationship with people. The cutoff point (for entering student teaching) is purely academic—it is a pretty unreliable means for determining who goes on," Dr. Bowman commented.

He added, "In questionable cases, students can use their videotape to show their teaching capabilities. Students can build a videotape in their senior year and make it available to those hiring. In 10 years, the placement business could be a videotape of a student actually teaching. This is what a superintendent of schools would see."

Dr. Freese stated, "If I were a superintendent, an interview would tell me something, but a 20-minute tape might help me pick out which three or four people I wanted to give contracts to. For a student looking for a job is a chance to really sell himself."

One of the "most exciting ventures" for the school of education is the teaching-learning clinic, involving 60 juniors and seniors from Lourdes High School, 12 student teachers and one supervising teacher.

For the second year, LHS students attend classes in social science and language arts for two and one-half hours daily in the research center. "We had been doing this for five years at the elementary and junior high level at Campus School, but this is the first time with high school students," Dr. Bowman said.

The teaching-learning clinic helps maintain "high quality control," which is difficult to maintain "when a student teacher is in a school 75 to 200 miles away from WSU-O," according to the dean.

Students from Lourdes and WSU-O "talk about objectives and cooperatively plan their goals in the first day. This proved to be a very profitable experience for both student teachers and high school students," Dr. Bowman explained.

He feels "the team approach to teaching

used in the clinic is unique in every respect. University students feel they could teach anywhere, and in any situation, because of it. They learn how to use the strengths of another teacher and get away from the 'My room' and 'My class' attitude."

Dr. Freese said, "Student teachers meet daily to discuss how they are doing and to talk about individual high school students and how they can help them."

By the second semester of this school year, "we hope to have a controlled situation where maybe we can match 12 student teachers with others," Dr. Bowman remarked.

"We also want to get some measurement devices to insure that we do produce as good a product—if not better—than if a student teacher worked alone in Community X with Teacher X. If this is true, we could set it up as a prototype for this area," the dean stated.

The school of education is also conducting an Oshkosh middle school pilot program for 1971-72, in cooperation with the Oshkosh public schools which will have middle schools in September of 1972, after the new high school opens.

"We have the responsibility to have the resources . . . to build with Oshkosh to better the education of Oshkosh kids, to supply better answers to educating kids and to provide better and stronger teacher education programs," Dr. Bowman declared.

The middle school project "is trying different approaches to scheduling, gradedness, non-gradedness, etc. A joint committee supervises activities of this pilot program. This may enable the Oshkosh public schools to do a little bit better job next year," Dr. Bowman pointed out . . .

Dr. Freese said the Oshkosh system "will release prospective middle school teachers to see what they asked us to try out, to participate in it or to teach. The special education people would also like to work out something along these lines."

WSU-O is also concerned about education of minority groups and in poverty areas. Students are taken to the inner city in Milwaukee to observe or student teach. They are also offered a course in "Education and Minority Groups." The University is increasing this component in other courses also, according to Dr. Freese.

He commented, "There is still a great need for teachers of the disadvantaged—those with learning disabilities, emotional disturbances, mental retardation. We have to reflect the trends . . . as well as be ahead to the point where teachers going out recognize the problems they are going to face."

Dr. Bowman added, "Many people don't know it, but the Head Start program here was written by the school of education. We are the only University in Wisconsin that has a program for four-year-old, disadvantaged children."

The school also maintains regular contact with Shawano school officials and the Indian reservation where WSU-O faculty and students work during the summer.

WSU-O's school of education has also done research recently on attrition of freshman students—research which has had national impact. "When a student fails, a teacher fails. Freshmen who come into college don't need to fail," Dr. Bowman emphasized.

He pointed out that "all freshmen enrolled in the school of education have to participate in a personal development seminar."

The school of education also houses offices of the executive secretary of the Fox Valley Curriculum Study Council, which puts it at the pulse of activities and programs affecting "at least 20 large and small school systems in the Valley. This is a very viable vehicle for us to be of service—and that brings us back to one of our basic objectives," Dr. Bowman concluded.

[From the Daily Northwestern,
Sept. 17, 1971]

FROM MODEST BEGINNING, WSU-O GROWTH IS GREAT

From its modest beginning a hundred years ago of one three-story building with 18 rooms for classes and administrative offices, Wisconsin State University-Oshkosh has grown to a vast network of structures.

Included in that vast network is close to 2,776,000 square feet of floor space.

Academic buildings account for 1,462,000 of that square footage. The balance comes under self-amortizing uses such as the Reeve Memorial Union, dormitories, food commons and Titan Stadium.

From its original six acres along Algoma Boulevard, WSU-O had grown by the time of its 75th anniversary to 26 acres. During the last 25 years has been the rapid expansion to more than 180 acres of University property.

When Oshkosh Normal School opened in 1871, its sole building, built at a cost of \$70,000, already was inadequate to house the number of students seeking admission. Four classrooms were added in 1874 with the addition of a two-story wing. Two years later the building was expanded again to provide quarters for the Model Department, the name used then for today's Campus School.

Since physical education classes met in small, cramped attic rooms under the eaves, a gymnasium was added in 1888. This later was converted into an auditorium and continued in use until slightly less than 50 years ago when it was condemned and razed.

A new unit was added to the south end of the original structure in 1894. Its first floor contained offices and classrooms, the second floor was devoted entirely to an assembly hall and the third floor was used for the geological and ornithological collections.

To the northeast of the assembly building was added in 1900 a three-story "science building." On its first floor were lecture rooms, laboratories and offices for the physics department plus the third and fourth grades of the model school. The second floor had a study room for senior women. Biology and chemistry departments were located on the third floor. Manual training, introduced that year into the school curriculum, was housed in the basement.

The increasing demand for physical education training and the growth of the athletic program led to the construction of a new gymnasium in 1909. Industrial arts moved from its basement location to a new building of its own when what is now Harrington Hall was opened in 1913.

Dempsey Hall came into being in 1917 as the replacement of the original 1871 structure which had burned. It housed the grade school classes until the opening in 1928 of Rose C. Swart Campus School. Dempsey Hall is the university's administrative center now and was expanded in 1968.

Dempsey Hall and Harrington Hall are named respectively for two former members of the Board of Regents, Edward J. Dempsey and John Harrington.

Also named for a former Regent is Radford Hall, named after Frank W. Radford. Originally a dormitory when built in 1954, it now houses the student health center and faculty offices.

Past University presidents for whom buildings are named are George Sumner Albee, the school's first president, for whom the gymnasium is named; Rufus H. Halsey for whom Halsey Science Center is named, and Forrest R. Polk, whose name is borne by the library.

Albee Hall was built in 1956, Halsey Science Center in 1964 and expanded in 1969 and Polk Library in 1963 and expanded in 1969 also.

Faculty members whose names are carried on academic buildings are Rose C. Swart, a member of the first faculty and who was with the University for 51 years, for whom

the Campus School is named; Frederick C. Clow, a 35-year member of the faculty in the social science field, and Robert M. Kolf, a student and for 44 years a faculty member, athletic director and coach, for whom the new Kolf Physical Education and Sports Center, which will open later this fall, has been named.

Residence halls are named for many of the former faculty members. Thus recognized with the years of their University service, are: Emily Webster (student 1871-75 and faculty member 1875-1926), Earl A. Clemans (1906-44), Barbara Donner, now Barbara Donner Montleth (1926-56), J. A. Breese (1932-52), Hilda Taylor (1928-44), Walter H. Fletcher (1918-44), N. Peter Nelson (1924-62), Maysel Evans (1929-63), May L. Stewart (1926-60), Richard E. Greunhagen (1909-47) and Louise E. Scott (1929-62).

These residence halls were built during the 1958 to 1967 period.

Several buildings are named after their donors or relatives of the donors. Reeve Memorial Union, built in 1957 and expanded in 1964, was named for Thomas T. Reeve, grandfather of Mary R. Fraker, who donated the grounds and original house for union purposes.

Buckstaff Planetarium, completed in 1964, was named for Ralph Buckstaff, Oshkosh industrialist and astronomer who also gave to the University his observatory in the north part of the city. The observatory also carries his name.

Pollock Alumni House is the former home of W. E. Pollock, an industrialist. Prior to being assigned to the WSU-O Alumni Association, it had been used for a residence hall, classrooms and offices. The Alumni Association had assisted the University in acquiring the property in 1943.

Completed during the last year were the combined School of Nursing-School of Education building, the Arts and Communication Center and Titan Stadium.

Food service facilities on the campus are Elmwood Commons, built in 1966, River Commons, also built in 1966, and Blackhawk Commons, opened in 1970.

To heat these many buildings, the central heating plant was constructed in 1965.

Also used by the University are other buildings which it had acquired in recent years such as the Intercultural Center and the Reeve Union Annex on Elmwood Street, five houses on Algoma Boulevard used for the testing center, reading center, counseling center and journalism, the Journalism Building on High Avenue, the Intercollegiate Athletics-Security Building and Hydrobiology Laboratory on Rockwell Avenue and maintenance and vehicle storage buildings along the Fox River.

WASHINGTON SENATORS FRANCHISE

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 20, 1971

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that most of my colleagues have heard rumors or have read some of the articles in local newspapers to the effect that the Washington Senators may be sold. Tomorrow, I am introducing a "sense of Congress" resolution which, hopefully, will preclude a move by the Senators. This resolution declares that the American League should compensate the District of Columbia Armory Board for any loss of revenue resulting from a

transfer of the Washington Senators' franchise to another city.

In 1957, the Congress enacted the District of Columbia Stadium Act with the understanding that a major league baseball team would use the stadium. The revenue from the use of the stadium by a major league ball team is essential to the independent operation of the facility. Therefore, it is my belief that the American League should suffer the financial consequences if the Nation's Capital is left without a major league baseball franchise.

I hope the owners of the other American League clubs will not give Short permission to move the Senators to another city. If they do give Short the votes he needs to make the move, they also should be prepared to make adequate compensation to the District of Columbia Armory Board.

RICHARD M. NIXON ON RED CHINA AFTER VIETNAM

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 20, 1971

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, writing in October 1967, in Foreign Affairs, official publication of the Council on Foreign Relations of which he was listed as a member from 1962 to 1964, Richard M. Nixon expounded his philosophy on the Red China menace in a treatise entitled "Asia After Vietnam."

Significantly, Mr. Nixon said:

Any American policy toward Asia must come urgently to grips with the reality of China. This does not mean, as many would simplistically have it, rushing to grant recognition to Peking, to admit it to the United Nations and to ply it with offers of trade—all of which would serve to confirm its rulers in their present course. It does mean recognizing the present and potential danger from Communist China, and taking measures designed to meet that danger. It also means distinguishing carefully between long-range and short-range policies, and fashioning short-range programs so as to advance our long-range goals.

Taking the long view, we simply cannot afford to leave China forever outside the family of nations, there to nurture its fantasies, cherish its hates and threaten its neighbors. There is no place on this small planet for a billion of its potentially most able people to live in angry isolation. But we could go disastrously wrong if, in pursuing this long-range goal, we failed in the short range to read the lessons of history.

The world cannot be safe until China changes. Thus, our aim, to the extent that we can influence events, should be to induce change. The way to do this is to persuade China that it *must* change: That it cannot satisfy its imperial ambitions, and that its own national interest requires a turning away from foreign adventuring and a turning inward toward the solution of its own domestic problems.

This was Richard M. Nixon in 1967 on his way to the White House. This was not Richard M. Nixon in 1971 on his way to the Republican National Convention for reelection in 1972. And its not after Vietnam—yet.

I insert the full text of the "Asia After Vietnam" as it appeared in CFR publication Foreign Affairs in October 1967, as follows:

ASIA AFTER VIET NAM

(By Richard M. Nixon)

The war in Viet Nam has for so long dominated our field of vision that it has distorted our picture of Asia. A small country on the rim of the continent has filled the screen of our minds; but it does not fill the map. Sometimes dramatically, but more often quietly, the rest of Asia has been undergoing a profound, an exciting and on balance an extraordinarily promising transformation. One key to this transformation is the emergence of Asian regionalism; another is the development of a number of the Asian economies; another is gathering disaffection with all the old isms that have so long imprisoned so many minds and so many governments. By and large the non-communist Asian governments are looking for solutions that work, rather than solutions that fit a preconceived set of doctrines and dogmas.

Most of them also recognize a common danger, and see its source as Peking. Taken together, these developments present an extraordinary set of opportunities for a U.S. policy which must begin to look beyond Viet Nam. In looking toward the future, however, we should not ignore the vital role Viet Nam has played in making these developments possible. Whatever one may think of the "domino" theory, it is beyond question that without the American commitment in Viet Nam Asia would be a far different place today.

The U.S. presence has provided tangible and highly visible proof that communism is not necessarily the wave of Asia's future. This was a vital factor in the turnaround in Indonesia, where a tendency toward fatalism is a national characteristic. It provided a shield behind which the anti-communist forces found the courage and the capacity to stage their counter-coup and, at the final moment, to rescue their country from the Chinese orbit. And, with its 100 million people, and its 3,000-mile arc of islands containing the region's richest hoard of natural resources, Indonesia constitutes by far the greatest prize in the Southeast Asian area.

Beyond this, Viet Nam has diverted Peking from such other potential targets as India, Thailand and Malaysia. It has bought vitally needed time for governments that were weak or unstable or leaning toward Peking as a hedge against the future—time which has allowed them to attempt to cope with their own insurrections while pressing ahead with their political, economic and military development. From Japan to India, Asian leaders know why we are in Viet Nam and, privately if not publicly, they urge us to see it through to a satisfactory conclusion.

II

Many argue that an Atlantic axis is natural and necessary, but maintain, in effect, that Kipling was right, and that the Asian peoples are so "different" that Asia itself is only peripherally an American concern. This represents a racial and cultural chauvinism that does little credit to American ideals, and it shows little appreciation either of the westward thrust of American interests or of the dynamics of world development.

During the final third of the twentieth century, Asia, not Europe or Latin America, will pose the greatest danger of a confrontation which could escalate into World War III. At the same time, the fact that the United States has now fought three Asian wars in the space of a generation is grimly but truly symbolic of the deepening involvement of the United States in what happens on the other side of the Pacific—which modern transportation and communications

have brought closer to us today than Europe was in the years immediately preceding World War II.

The United States is a Pacific power. Europe has been withdrawing the remnants of empire, but the United States, with its coast reaching in an arc from Mexico to the Bering Straits, is one anchor of a vast Pacific community. Both our interests and our ideals propel us westward across the Pacific, not as conquerors but as partners, linked by the sea not only with those oriental nations on Asia's Pacific littoral but at the same time with occidental Australia and New Zealand, and with the island nations between.

Since World War II, a new Asia has been emerging with startling rapidity; indeed, Asia is changing more swiftly than any other part of the world. All around the rim of China nations are becoming Western without ceasing to be Asian.

The dominant development in Asia immediately after World War II was decolonization, with its admixture of intense nationalism. But the old nationalist slogans have less meaning for today's young than they had for their fathers. Having never known a "colonialist," they find colonialists unconvincing as scapegoats for the present ills of their societies. If dissatisfied with conditions as they see them, the young tend to blame those now in power.

As the sharp anticolonial focus blurs, the old nationalism is evolving into a more complex, multi-layered set of concepts and attitudes. On the one hand are a multitude of local and tribal identifications—the Montagnards in Viet Nam, the Han tribes in Burma, the provincial and linguistic separatisms that constantly claw at the fabric of Indian unity. On the other hand, there is a reaching-out by the governing élites, and particularly the young, for something larger, more like an Asian regionalism.

The developing coherence of Asian regional thinking is reflected in disposition to consider problems and loyalties in regional terms, and to evolve regional approaches to development needs and to the evolution of a new world order. This is not excessively chauvinistic, but rather in the nature of a coalescing confidence, a recognition that Asia can become a counterbalance to the West, and an increasing disposition to seek Asian solutions to Asian problems through cooperative action.

Along with the rising complex of national, subregional and regional identification and pride, there is also an acute sense of common danger—a factor which serves as catalyst to the others. The common danger from Communist China now in the process of shifting the Asian governments' center of concern. During the colonial and immediately post-colonial eras, Asians stood opposed primarily to the West, which represented the intruding alien power. But now the West has abandoned its colonial role, and it no longer threatens the independence of the Asian nations. Red China, however, does, and its threat is clear, present and repeatedly and insistently expressed. The message has not been lost on Asia's leaders. They recognize that the West, and particularly the United States, now represents not an oppressor but a protector. And they recognize their need for protection.

This does not mean that the old resentments and distrust have vanished, or that new ones will not arise. It does, however, mean that there has been an important shift in the balance of their preceptions about the balance of danger, and this shift has important implications for the future.

One of the legacies of Viet Nam almost certainly will be a deep reluctance on the part of the United States to become involved once again in a similar intervention on a similar basis. The war has imposed severe strains on

the United States, not only militarily and economically but socially and politically as well. Bitter dissension has torn the fabric of American intellectual life, and whatever the outcome of the war the tear may be a long time mending. If another friendly country should be faced with an externally supported communist insurrection—whether in Asia, or in Africa or even Latin America—there is serious question whether the American public or the American Congress would now support a unilateral American intervention, even at the request of the host government. This makes it vitally in their own interest that the nations in the path of China's ambitions move quickly to establish an indigenous Asian framework for their own future security.

In doing so, they need to fashion arrangements able to deal both with old-style wars and with new—with traditional wars, in which armies cross over national boundaries, and with the so-called "wars of national liberation," in which they burrow under national boundaries.

I am not arguing that the day is past when the United States would respond militarily to communist threats in the less stable parts of the world, or that a unilateral response to a unilateral request for help is out of the question. But other nations must recognize that the role of the United States as world policeman is likely to be limited in the future. To ensure that a U.S. response will be forthcoming if needed, machinery must be created that is capable of meeting two conditions: (a) a collective effort by the nations of the region to contain the threat by themselves; and, if that effort fails, (b) a collective request to the United States for assistance. This is important not only from the respective national standpoints, but also from the standpoint of avoiding nuclear collision.

Nations not possessing great power can indulge in the luxury of criticism of others; those possessing it have the responsibility of decision. Faced with a clear challenge, the decision not to use one's power must be as deliberate as the decision to use it. The consequences can be fully as far-reaching and fully as irrevocable.

If another world war is to be prevented, every step possible must be taken to avert direct confrontations between the nuclear powers. To achieve this, it is essential to minimize the number of occasions on which the great powers have to decide whether or not to commit their forces. These choices cannot be eliminated, but they can be reduced by the development of regional defense pacts, in which nations undertake, among themselves, to attempt to contain aggression in their own areas.

If the initial response to a threatened aggression, of whichever type—whether across the board or under it—can be made by lesser powers in the immediate area and thus within the path of aggression, one of two things can be achieved: either they can in fact contain it by themselves, in which case the United States is spared involvement and thus the world is spared the consequences of great-power action; or, if they cannot, the ultimate choice can be presented to the United States in clear-cut terms, by nations which would automatically become allies in whatever response might prove necessary. To put it another way, the regional pact becomes a buffer separating the distant great power from the immediate threat. Only if the buffer proves insufficient does the great power become involved, and then in terms that make victory more attainable and the enterprise more palatable.

This is particularly important when the threat takes the form of an externally supported guerrilla action, as we have faced in Viet Nam, as is even now being mounted in

Thailand, and as could be launched in any of a half-dozen other spots in the Chinese shadow. Viet Nam has shown how difficult it is to make clear the distinction between this and an ordinary factional civil war, and how subject the assisting power is to charges of having intervened in an internal matter. Viet Nam's neighbors know that the war there is not internal, but our own allies in Europe have difficulty grasping the fact.

The fragmenting of the communist world has lent credence to the frequently heard argument that a communist advance by proxy, as we have seen attempted in Viet Nam, is of only peripheral importance; that with the weakening of rigid central control of the communist world, local fights between communist and non-communist factions are a local matter. This ignores, however, the fact that with the decentralization of communist control has come an appropriately tailored shift in communist tactics. National communism poses a different kind of threat than did the old-style international communism, but by being subtler it is in some ways more dangerous.

SEATO was useful and appropriate to its time, but it was Western in origin and drew its strength from the United States and Europe. It has weakened to the point at which it is little more than an institutional embodiment of an American commitment, and a somewhat anachronistic relic of the days when France and Britain were active members. Asia today needs its own security undertakings, reflecting the new realities of Asian independence and Asian needs.

Thus far, despite a pattern of rapidly increasing cooperation in cultural and economic affairs, the Asian nations have been unwilling to form a military grouping designed to forestall the Chinese threat, even though several have liberal bilateral arrangements with the United States. But an appropriate foundation-stone exists on which to build: the Asian and Pacific Council, ASPAC held its first ministerial-level meeting in Seoul in June 1966, and its second in Bangkok in July 1967. It has carefully limited itself to strengthening regional cooperation in economic, cultural and social matters, and its members have voiced strong feelings that, as Japan's Foreign Minister Takeo Miki put it at the Bangkok meeting, it should not be made "a body to promote anticommunist campaigns."

Despite ASPAC's present cultural and economic orientation, however, the solidifying awareness of China's threat should make it possible—if the need for a regional alliance is put in sufficiently compelling terms—to develop it into an alliance actively dedicated to concerting whatever efforts might be necessary to maintain the security of the region. And ASPAC is peculiarly well situated to play such a role. Its members (South Korea, Japan, Taiwan, Thailand, Malaysia, South Viet Nam, the Philippines, Australia and New Zealand, with Laos as an observer) all are acutely conscious of the Chinese threat. All except Malaysia have military ties with the United States. It has the distinct advantage of including Australia and New Zealand, which share the danger and would be able to contribute substantially to its strength, without an unbalancing great-power presence.

I do not mean to minimize the difficulties of winning acceptance of such a concept. In Japan, public opinion still lags behind official awareness of military needs. The avowedly neutralist nations under China's cloud would be reluctant, at present, to join any such grouping. But looking further down the road we can project either an erosion of their neutralism or the formation of their own loose association or associations, which might be tied into a military oriented ASPAC on an interlocking or cooperative basis. One can hope that even India might finally be

persuaded to give its support, having itself been the target of overt Chinese aggression, and still cherishing as it does a desire to play a substantial role beyond its own borders.

III

Military security has to rest, ultimately, on economic and political stability. One of the effects of the rapidity of change in the world today is that there can no longer be static stability; there can only be dynamic stability. A nation or society that fails to keep pace with change is in danger of flying apart. It is important that we recognize this, but equally important that in trying to maintain a dynamic stability we remember that the stability is as important as the dynamism.

If a given set of ends is deemed desirable, then from the standpoint of those dedicated to peace and an essential stability in world order the desideratum is to reach those ends by evolutionary rather than revolutionary means. Looking at the pattern of change in non-communist Asia, we find that the professed aims of the revolutionaries are in fact being achieved by an evolutionary process. This offers a dramatic opportunity to draw the distinction between the fact of a revolutionary result and the process of revolutionary change. The Asian nations are showing that evolutionary change can be as exciting as revolutionary change. Having revolutionized the aims of their societies, they are showing what can be achieved within a framework of dynamic stability.

The "people," in the broadest sense, have become an entity to be served rather than used. In much of Asia, this change represents a revolution of no less magnitude than the revolution that created the industrial West, or that in the years following World War II transformed empires into new and struggling nations. It is precisely the promise of this reversal that has been at the heart of communist rhetoric, and at the heart of the popular and intellectual appeal which that rhetoric achieved.

Not all the governments of non-communist Asia fit the Western ideal of parliamentary democracy—far from it. But Americans must recognize that a highly sophisticated, highly advanced political system, which required many centuries to develop in the West, may not be best for other nations which have far different traditions and are still in an earlier stage of development. What matters is that these governments are consciously, deliberately and programmatically developing in the direction of greater liberty, greater abundance, broader choice and increased popular involvement in the processes of government.

Poverty that was accepted for centuries as the norm is accepted no longer. In a sense it could be said that a new chapter is being written in the winning of the West: in this case, a winning of the promise of Western technology and Western organization by the nations of the East. The cultural clash has had its costs and produced its strains, but out of it is coming a modernization of ancient civilizations that promises to leap the centuries.

The process produces transitional anomalies—such as the Indian woman squatting in the mud, forming cow-dung patties with her hands and laying them out to dry, while a transistor radio in her lap plays music from a Delhi station. It takes a long time to bring visions of the future to the far villages—but time is needed to make those visions credible, and make them achievable. Too wide a gap between reality and expectation always produces an explosive situation, and the fact that what the leaders know is possible is unknown to the great mass of the peasantry helps buy time to make the possible achievable. But the important thing is that the leaders do know what is possible, and by and large they are determined to make it happen.

Whether that process is going to proceed at a pace fast enough to keep one step ahead of the pressure of rising expectations is one of the great questions and challenges of the years ahead. But there is solid ground for hope. The successful Asian nations have been writing extraordinary records. To call their performance an economic miracle would be something of a semantic imprecision; it would also be a disservice. Precisely because the origins and ingredients of that success are not miraculous, it offers hope to those which have not yet turned the corner.

India still is a staggering giant, Burma flirts with economic chaos, and the Philippines, caught in a conflict of cultures and in search of an identity, lives in a precarious economic and social balance. But the most exciting trends in economic development today are being recorded by those Asian nations that have accepted the keys of progress and used them. Japan, Hong Kong, Taiwan, Thailand, Korea, Singapore and Malaysia all have been recording sustained economic growth rates of 7 percent a year or more; Japan has sustained a remarkable average of 9 percent a year since 1950, and an average 16.7 percent per year increase in exports over the same period. Thailand shifted into a period of rapid growth in 1958 and has averaged 7 percent a year since. South Korea, despite the unflattering estimates of its people's abilities by the average G.I. during the Korean War, is shooting ahead at a growth rate that has averaged 8 percent a year since 1963, with an average 42 percent a year increase in its exports.

These rapidly advancing countries vary widely in their social traditions and political systems, but their methods of economic management have certain traits in common: a prime reliance on private enterprise and on the pricing mechanisms of the market as the chief determinant of business decisions; a pacing of monetary expansion to match growth in output; receptivity to private capital investment, both domestic and foreign, including such incentives as tax advantages and quick government clearance of proposed projects; imaginative national programs for dealing with social problems; and, not least, a generally restrained posture in government planning, with the government's role suggestive rather than coercive. These nations have, in short, discovered and applied the lessons of America's own economic success.

IV

Any discussion of Asia's future must ultimately focus on the respective roles of four giants: India, the world's most populous non-communist nation; Japan, Asia's principal industrial and economic power; China, the world's most populous nation and Asia's most immediate threat; and the United States, the greatest Pacific power. (Although the U.S.S.R. occupies much of the land map of Asia, its principal focus is toward the west and its vast Asian lands are an appendage of European Russia.)

India is both challenging and frustrating: challenging because of its promise, frustrating because of its performance. It suffers from escalating overpopulation, from too much emphasis on industrialization and not enough on agriculture, and from too doctrinaire a reliance on government enterprise instead of private enterprise. Many are deeply pessimistic about its future. One has to remember, however, that in the past five years India has fought two wars and faced two catastrophic droughts. On both the population and the agricultural fronts, India's present leaders at least are trying. And the essential factor, from the standpoint of U.S. policy, is that a nation of nearly half a billion people is seeking ways to wrench itself forward without a sacrifice of basic freedoms; in exceedingly difficult circumstances, the ideal of evolutionary change is

being tested. For the most populous representative democracy in the world to fail, while Communist China—surmounting its troubles—succeeded, would be a disaster of worldwide proportions. Thus the United States must do two things: (1) continue its aid and support for Indian economic objectives; and (2) do its best to persuade the Indian Government to shift its means and adjust its institutions so that those objectives can be more quickly and more effectively secured, drawing from the lessons not only of the United States but also of India's more successful neighbors, including Pakistan.

Japan has been edging cautiously and discreetly toward a wider leadership role, acutely conscious at every step that bitter memories of the Greater East Asia Co-Prosperty Sphere might rise to haunt her if she pressed too hard or too eagerly. But what would not have been possible ten, or even five years ago is becoming possible today. Half the people now living in Asia have been born since World War II, and the new generation has neither the old guilts (in the case of the Japanese themselves) nor the old fears born of conquest.

The natural momentum of Japan's growth, the industry of her people and the advanced state of her society must inevitably propel Japan into a more conspicuous position of leadership. Japan's industrial complex, expanding by 14 percent annually since 1950, already is comparable to that of West Germany or the United Kingdom. Japan's gross national product (\$95 billion) is substantially greater than that of mainland China with seven times the population. Japan is expected soon to rank as the world's third-strongest economic power, trailing only the United States and the Soviet Union. Along with this dramatic economic surge, Japan will surely want to play a greater role both diplomatically and militarily in maintaining the balance in Asia. As the Prime Minister of one neighboring country put it: "The Japanese are a great people, and no great people will accept as their destiny making better transistor radios and teaching the underdeveloped how to grow better rice."

This greater role will entail, among other things, a modification of the present terms of the Japanese Constitution, which specifically provides that "land, sea and air forces, as well as other war potential, will never be maintained." (Japan's 275,000 men presently under arms are called "Self Defense Forces.") Twenty years ago it was considered unthinkable that Japan should acquire even a conventional military capability. Five years ago, while some Japanese thought about it, they did not talk about it. Today a substantial majority of Japanese still oppose the idea, but it is openly discussed and debated. Looking toward the future, one must recognize that it simply is not realistic to expect a nation moving into the first rank of major powers to be totally dependent for its own security on another nation, however close the ties. Japan's whole society has been restructured since World War II. While there still are traces of fanaticism, its politics at least conform to the democratic ideal. Not to trust Japan today with its own armed forces and with responsibility for its own defense would be to place its people and its government under a disability which, whatever its roots in painful recent history, ill accords with the role Japan must play in helping secure the common safety of non-communist Asia.

Any American policy toward Asia must come urgently to grips with the reality of China. This does not mean, as many would simplistically have it, rushing to grant recognition to Peking, to admit it to the United

Nations and to ply it with offers of trade—all of which would serve to confirm its rulers in their present course. It does mean recognizing the present and potential danger from Communist China, and taking measures designed to meet that danger. It also means distinguishing carefully between long-range and short-range policies, and fashioning short-range programs so as to advance our long-range goals.

Taking the long view, we simply cannot afford to leave China forever outside the family of nations, there to nurture its fantasies, cherish its hates and threaten its neighbors. There is no place on this planet for a billion of its potentially most able people to live in angry isolation. But we could go disastrously wrong if, in pursuing this long-range goal, we failed in the short range to read the lessons of history.

The world cannot be safe until China changes. Thus our aim, to the extent that we can influence events, should be to induce change. The way to do this is to persuade China that it must change: that it cannot satisfy its imperial ambitions, and that its own national interest requires a turning away from foreign adventuring and a turning inward toward the solution of its own domestic problems.

If the challenge posed by the Soviet Union after World War II was not precisely similar, it was sufficiently so to offer a valid precedent and a valuable lesson. Moscow finally changed when it, too, found that change was necessary. This was essentially a change of the head, not of the heart. Internal evolution played a role, to be sure, but the key factor was that the West was able to create conditions—notably in the shoring up of European defenses, the rapid restoration of European economies and the cementing of the Atlantic Alliance—that forced Moscow to look to the wisdom of reaching some measure of accommodation with the West. We are still far from reaching a full détente, but at least substantial progress has been made.

During the next decade the West faces two prospects which, together, could create a crisis of the first order: (1) that the Soviets may reach nuclear parity with the United States; and (2) that China, within three to five years, will have a significant deliverable nuclear capability—and that this same China will be outside any nonproliferation treaty that might be signed, free, if it chooses, to scatter its weapons among "liberation" forces anywhere in the world.

This heightens the urgency of building buffers that can keep the major nuclear powers apart in the case of "wars of national liberation," supported by Moscow or Peking but fought by proxy. It also requires that we now assign to the strengthening of non-communist Asia a priority comparable to that which gave to the strengthening of Western Europe after World War II.

Some counsel conceding to China a "sphere of influence" embracing much of the Asian mainland and extending even to the island nations beyond; others urge that we eliminate the threat by preemptive war. Clearly, neither of these courses would be acceptable to the United States or to its Asian allies. Others argue that we should seek an anti-Chinese alliance with European powers, even including the Soviet Union. Quite apart from the obvious problems involved in Soviet participation, such a course would inevitably carry connotations of Europe vs. Asia, white vs. non-white, which could have catastrophic repercussions throughout the rest of the non-white world in general and Asia in particular. If our long-range aim is to pull China back into the family of nations, we must avoid the impression that the great powers or the European powers are "ganging up;" the response should clearly be one of active defense rather than potential offense, and must be untainted with any suspicion of racism.

For the United States to go it alone in containing China would not only place an unconscionable burden on our own country, but also would heighten the chances of nuclear war while undercutting the independent development of the nations of Asia. The primary restraint on China's Asian ambitions should be exercised by the Asian nations in the path of those ambitions, backed by the ultimate power of the United States. This is sound strategically, sound psychologically and sound in terms of the dynamics of Asian development. Only as the nations of non-communist Asia become so strong—economically, politically and militarily—that they no longer furnish tempting targets for Chinese aggression, will the leaders in Peking be persuaded to turn their energies inward rather than outward. And that will be the time the dialogue with mainland China can begin.

For the short run, then, this means a policy of firm restraint, of no reward, of a creative counterpressure designed to persuade Peking that its interests can be served only by accepting the basic rules of international civility. For the long run, it means pulling China back into the world community—but as a great and progressing nation, not as the epicenter of world revolution.

"Containment without isolation" is a good phrase and a sound concept, as far as it goes. But it covers only half the problem. Along with it, we need a positive policy of pressure and persuasion, of dynamic detoxification, a marshaling of Asian forces both to keep the peace and to help draw off the poison from the Thoughts of Mao.

Dealing with Red China is something like trying to cope with the more explosive ghetto elements in our own country. In each case a potentially destructive force has to be curbed; in each case an outlaw element has to be brought within the law; in each case dialogues have to be opened; in each case aggression has to be restrained while education proceeds; and, not least, in neither case can we afford to let those now self-exiled from society stayed exiled forever. We have to proceed with both an urgency born of necessity and a patience born of realism, moving step by calculated step toward the final goal.

V

And finally, the role of the United States. Weary with war, disheartened with allies, disillusioned with aid, dismayed at domestic crises, many Americans are heeding the call of the new isolationism. And they are not alone; there is a tendency in the whole Western world to turn inward, to become parochial and isolationist—dangerously so. But there can be neither peace nor security a generation hence unless we recognize now the massiveness of the forces at work in Asia, where more than half the world's people live and where the greatest explosive potential is lodged.

Out of the wreckage of two world wars we forged a concept of an Atlantic community, within which a ravaged Europe was rebuilt and the westward advance of the Soviets contained. If tensions now strain that community, these are themselves a byproduct of success. But history has its rhythms, and now the focus of both crisis and change is shifting. Without turning our backs on Europe, we have now to reach out westward to the East, and to fashion the sinews of a Pacific community.

This has to be a community in the fullest sense: a community of purpose, of understanding and of mutual assistance, in which military defenses are coordinated while economies are strengthened; a community embracing a concert of Asian strengths as a counterforce to the designs of China; one in which Japan will play an increasing role, as befits its commanding position as a world economic power; and one in which U.S. lead-

ship is exercised with restraint, with respect for our partners and with a sophisticated discretion that ensures a genuinely Asian idiom and Asian origin for whatever new Asian institutions are developed.

In a design for Asia's future, there is no room for heavy-handed American pressures; there is need for subtle encouragement of the kind of Asian initiatives that help bring the design to reality. The distinction may seem superficial, but in fact it is central both to the kind of Asia we want and to the effectiveness of the means of achieving it. The central pattern of the future in U.S.-Asian relations must be American support for Asian initiatives.

The industrial revolution has shown that mass abundance is possible, and as the United States moves into the post-industrial world—the age of computers and cybernetics—we have to find ways to engineer an escape from privation for those now living in mass poverty. There can be no security, whatever our nuclear stockpiles, in a world of boiling resentment and magnified envy. The oceans provide no sanctuary for the rich, no barrier behind which we can hide our abundance.

The struggle for influence in the Third World is a three-way race among Moscow, Peking and the West. The West has offered both idealism and example, but the idealism has often been unconvincing and the example non-idiomatic. However, an industrialized Japan demonstrates the economically possible in Asian terms, while an advancing Asia tied into a Pacific community offers a bridge to the underdeveloped elsewhere. During this final third of the twentieth century, the great race will be between man and change: the race to control change, rather than be controlled by it. In this race we cannot afford to wait for others to act, and then merely react. And the race in Asia is already under way.

DISC: BILLION-DOLLAR TAX LOOP-HOLE HIDDEN IN NEW ECONOMIC POLICY

HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 20, 1971

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, in Sunday's Washington Post, Prof. Stanley S. Surrey of the Harvard Law School, detailed what he described as a "billion-dollar tax loophole" in the President's new economic policy. The loophole is called the Domestic International Sales Corp., or DISC.

Essentially, DISC defers the income tax on export profits, but in reality the deferral may take as long as 15 years, allowing the company to invest the deferred taxes. As Professor Surrey notes, the deferral is just about worth the amount of the tax itself which makes deferral the equivalent of exemption.

All a company engaged in export trade has to do is set up a DISC which, to serve its purposes, need only be a paper subsidiary, Professor Surrey says. And tax experts say that export profits may be used for activities that have nothing to do with exports once deferred. According to Professor Surrey, the DISC proposal will not materially affect our export trade but it can reduce substantially our revenue from the tax money lost. At this point, I would like to insert Professor Surrey's article in the RECORD for my colleagues:

DISC: A BILLION-DOLLAR TAX LOOPHOLE HIDDEN IN NEW ECONOMIC POLICY

(By Stanley S. Surrey)

The President's speeches on the New Economic Policy do not mention the "DISC" proposal, and so it receives almost no notice in the daily press discussions.

The silence cloaks the efforts of the Treasury Department once again to slide the DISC proposal into the tax law. Last year the attempt was made as part of the Trade Bill, when the fierce legislative battle waged over import restrictions permitted the DISC proposal to pass through the House, almost unnoticed and unseen and certainly not understood. Fortunately, the Senate Finance Committee then viewed the proposal with suspicion and it died at the end of the session.

There is good reason to keep the DISC proposal out of the spotlight. The proposal opens up a billion-dollar loophole in the income tax, through permitting U.S. exporters—especially our largest corporations—to escape that tax.

It would be a cruel irony to have the first significant technical income tax legislation to pass the Congress after the 1969 Tax Reform Act—the kind of legislation that only technicians and experts can follow—open up one of the largest tax escapes ever legislated by the Congress. Yet we find the Treasury Department being the moving force behind this attempt.

A DISC—Domestic International Sales Corporation—would be a new type of corporation conjured forth by this change in the tax law designed to "defer" the income tax on the "export profits" received by a domestic corporation engaged solely in the export trade. The quotation marks are used because the words they enclose turn out, as is so often the case in tax legislation, to have a significance far beyond their normal usage.

American businesses manufacturing goods that are sold abroad would be expected to organize DISCs—which need be only paper subsidiaries—through which their present exports would be channeled. The profits of a DISC from its export sales would not be subjected to income tax if the profits are used in export activities of the DISC or loaned to the parent-manufacturer corporation for "export-related activities"—again the significant quotation marks. This is the way the Treasury describes the proposal.

But under the terms of the actual legislation, it turns out that "deferral" would in practice become exemption; that "export profits" would very often include manufacturing profits; that "export-related activities" of the parent-manufacturer become activities having nothing to do with exports, extending even to investment for manufacture abroad; and that the references in title and description to "domestic" export subsidiaries cloak in practice and inducement to form foreign subsidiaries and, moreover, to form them in tax-haven countries, thus bringing back a pattern of abuse against which Congress legislated in 1962.

These are aspects that the Treasury does not talk about when it urges the proposal. For example:

1—The Treasury stresses in urging DISC that only a deferral of tax is involved, in terms that imply deferral is really not much—the tax is not paid now but must be paid a bit later on. Indeed, "deferral" for most Congressmen is a word that lulls them into believing very little is being given away. But the Treasury and corporate controllers know better. Thus, a high Treasury official, in talking recently to a professional group on aspects of accounting, said:

"I need not tell this group that tax deferral is the name of the game. A tax deferred one, two, or several years is simply a lower amount of tax on those who achieve such deferral—a burden that must be assumed by all other taxpayers."

For a profitable company, the present value of 15 years deferral—at the least the period the Treasury and business have in mind under DISC; indeed the deferral for many will be indefinite—is just about worth the amount of the tax itself, which makes deferral the equivalent of exemption. The reason is that the deferred tax—money that a company keeps over such a period (in effect an interest-free loan for that period) can be put to work earning additional money. In a typical case, the real cost to a profitable company for each \$100 in deferred taxes would only be \$18 to \$20.

2—The Treasury stresses that domestic subsidiaries will be used and that this is helpful to unsophisticated businesses. But the tax experts who study the technical details know that the arrangement which gives the greatest tax windfall under the proposal is to combine DISC with a foreign tax haven subsidiary—a Swiss or Panamanian company. In 1962 the Congress rightly legislated against tax haven abuses. Now in 1971 under the cloak of a few technical words in the DISC proposal, the Treasury is sweeping away that legislation and directly legalizing and encouraging the widespread use of these tax havens.

3—The Treasury stresses that the profits of a DISC, freed from taxes, will be used to promote export activities. But the tax experts who study the technical details know that these tax-free funds can be used for activities that have nothing to do with exports. Thus, the funds can be used by large manufacturing companies, who are presently exporters, for purely domestic activities where the favored companies are able to compete with tax-free DISC money against companies not so favored. They can be used even to build manufacturing plants abroad—and thus reduce the export trade of the United States. The DISC money is simply made available to the companies and the Treasury will ask no questions on how it is so used.

The purpose claimed for this proposed tax-favored treatment of our exporters—exempting an entire activity from the income tax—is that it will stimulate our export trade and thereby help our balance of payments. But the revenue loss in the billions occurs even if not a single dollar of new exports occurs. Moreover, no one—not even the Treasury—has offered any public documentation and serious economic study of just how and to what extent and for what goods this windfall to exporters will increase our exports. On the contrary, most economists believe just the opposite, that the change will have only a slight effect on our exports out of all proportion to the revenue loss involved. No other country, even among those most incentive-minded, has adopted such a sweeping tax escape from its income tax.

When the questions are asked why is our tax system so unfair, why are there such gross escapes for some from the tax burdens borne by others, why do we have so much difficulty in focusing our scarce funds on pressing needs, the DISC proposal is a sharp and bitter answer.

Some corporations are of course pushing for the legislation, as are some law firms which see profits for them in reorganizing the business structures of their clients to fit DISC into the corporate organization charts. But to their credit, many a business concern and its executives, as well as their tax advisers, know the proposal is wrong—wrong for them because it means a windfall received which will not materially affect their level of exports and wrong for the country in terms of our national priorities. But it comes hard not to offer support when the Treasury pushes for their backing of the proposal.

In fact, I suspect almost everyone concerned knows DISC to be a bad tax provision. Surely the House Ways and Means Committee which initiated the tax reform legisla-

tion in 1969 should know better. One can believe that it does know better—after all, a dissenting report filed last year by some committee members explained in detail how the proposal was seriously wrong and had no place in our tax system. One suspects also that the Treasury tax experts know better. Nevertheless, the proposal has found a place in the New Economic Policy of the President.

One suspects a cultural lag. Last year, pushed by Commerce, the Treasury came up with the DISC proposal to show it was trying to "do something" about exports. This year in August, however, the Treasury moved directly to get at the crux of our trade imbalance—the unfairness to our trade that resulted from the relationship of our dollar to foreign currencies—and is now seeking a realignment of those currencies. It is also using a temporary device—the 10% surcharge on imports—to emphasize the need for currency adjustments and other trade related changes such as removal of unfair restrictive practices in other countries.

But the DISC proposal, which will not really help our exports and instead will create a large tax escape, was left around from the earlier blueprints. It is now being quietly carried along as a windfall to business, even though we have a new set of blueprints really designed to do the job that must be done to improve our trade position.

The DISC proposal should simply be dropped as a bad idea—a major loophole if viewed as a tax provision; utterly in conflict with our national priorities if viewed as an expenditure device; ineffective and now supplanted by meaningful, direct steps if viewed as a trade measure.

MISTER NATIONAL GUARD RETIRES

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 20, 1971

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, Gen. Winston P. Wilson has retired as Chief of the National Guard Bureau. To the Congress, to the Air Force, to the National Guard and to a very substantial segment of the American public, "Wimpy" Wilson is recognized as a dedicated, outstanding, patriotic American whose contributions to defense and to America are many and lasting. It has been my privilege for years to work closely with General Wilson in matters affecting defense in general and the National Guard in particular. It is indeed a rewarding experience to work with a man of his ability and vision. I know how very much he has meant to America's defense programs and to those who wear our country's uniform.

The Air Reservist for August-September 1971 contains an inspiring article entitled "Mister National Guard Retires." It is about General Wilson. It is with pleasure that I submit it for reprinting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I know that my colleagues who share my sentiments will applaud this fine tribute.

The article follows:

MISTER NATIONAL GUARD RETIRES

"You wouldn't believe the difference in the National Guard today and in 1929 when I joined."

These are the words of "Mr. National Guard," Major General Winston P. (Wimpy) Wilson, retiring chief of the National Guard Bureau.

The year 1929 is best remembered as the year of the big stock market crash. But Wimpy Wilson remembers it as the year he finally was accepted into the National Guard of the State of Arkansas.

General Wilson retired officially Tuesday, August 31. But the day before he was honored with what probably was the most elaborate retirement ceremony ever held for a two-star general. The Vice Chief of Staff, USAF; dozens of other generals from all services, members of Congress and dignitaries from a host of states were there to pay homage to the ranking major general in the Air Force and to the man regarded by many as the man who proved the Reserve Forces Concept as a workable and vital part of our National Defense Forces.

Reflecting back through his 42 years of National Guard and Air Force service, this colorful Arkansan said:

"Nobody would get out of the Guard—and nobody died—so I just stayed a private for 10 years. I got my private flying license in 1932 and was tow-target operator on PT-1s, O-38s and then O-47s, so I was happy, even as a private. I went to Cadet Observer school in 1938-39 and was one of two selected for commission (1940) as a second lieutenant.

"I've gone from Jennies to jets, from a private and a mechanic in the National Guard to my present job, and I have seen the Guard progress from a stepchild in the military to a full-fledged member of the first team.

"My greatest desire has been to make the Air Guard more meaningful . . . not only as a flying organization but for definite missions to meet total Air Force requirements.

"The first major improvement in the Air National Guard was in 1952 when we persuaded policy makers to let the Guard stand runway alerts with our P-51s. Today the Air Guard carries 61 per cent of the total ADC mission load in the continental U.S.

"Probably the most important innovation came in 1960 when we proposed the gaining command concept to General Curtis E. LeMay, then Chief of Staff. Guard units were taken from Continental Air Command and assigned to major air commands for supervision of training and inspections. Other innovations included replacing nightly drills with weekend drills; addition of 36 flying periods to reduce accident rates; and, after longtime non-concurrence by the Air Staff, final approval of year-round training.

"The mobilization of Air Guard units during the Berlin Crisis proved we had mobility and response capability and could move and operate anywhere in the world. Our mass movement of jet aircraft overseas—the largest in the history of the Air Force—without a single accident proved the quality of the peacetime Guard training.

"We've proven time and again—and particularly in the 1960s—that any weapon systems the Air Force has can be operated and maintained by the Air National Guard if properly supported. Many Air Guard innovations were later adopted by other Reserve components.

"One thing still disturbs me. Many in the active force still don't understand the Guard and are not willing to tap the capability we have. It's hard to convince some active officers that Guardsmen want to be part of the team—they want to be challenged—and that our units can be just as combat ready and professional as the Regulars if adequate resources are given to us. Vietnam proved that.

"There's still lots to be done but the future of the Army and Air National Guard is brighter than ever. As long as the Guard can furnish combat-ready units at a peacetime training cost, the Guard will remain a vital part of the total military structure.

"It's been fun—and rewarding."

MINNEAPOLIS HEALTH HEARINGS

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 20, 1971

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, at the hearings held in Minneapolis, Dr. Warren Lawson, the secretary and executive officer of the Minnesota Department of Health, gave a cogent statement dealing with the medical situation in the State of Minnesota. He highlighted the problems of distribution and discussed some of the existing health organizations in the State. I commend his professional remarks to all my colleagues:

A VIEWPOINT ON HEALTH DELIVERY PROBLEMS

(By Dr. Warren R. Lawson)

In the few minutes allotted there is only time to touch lightly upon a few of the problems relating to the health care system.

A visiting lecturer at a large university recently stated that the American health care delivery system had at least two weaknesses—the high cost of inpatient care and the inadequacies of the public effort at primary and preventive services, and it is certainly true that the health care system in the United States is heavily oriented toward inpatient medical services. Witness, for example, the numbers and types of inpatient care facilities in Minnesota alone. There are approximately 200 general hospitals in the State with over 18,000 beds distributed so that a patient rarely has to travel more than 25 miles to receive hospital services; seven psychiatric hospitals and 19 psychiatric units of general hospitals; three inpatient institutions for the mentally retarded and epileptic; four tuberculosis hospitals; and four Federal hospitals. There are 400 licensed nursing homes in the State with more than 30,000 beds and over 250 boarding care homes representing about 8,500 beds. Further, there exist six complete rehabilitation agencies in the State and 37 rehabilitation units associated with other care facilities.

There are over 4600 licensed medical doctors in Minnesota and about 2200 practicing dentists. The population of the State is 3,695,000. This is a ratio of one physician for each 800 persons and one dentist for each 1700 persons. Problems of distribution of physicians, dentists, and patients, however, exist. There is a poorer ratio of persons per physician and dentist in rural areas than in the metropolitan centers, as is generally typical throughout the country. Supporting health care personnel are in very short supply, both in metropolitan and non-metropolitan areas. The shortage of nurses has been especially critical for a number of years, though recently and probably related to the changing economic picture, some improvement has occurred with nurses previously inactive rejoining the work force. The problem of health manpower shortages is so complex that it will apparently be resolved only over a number of years.

The nation's health and medical care expenditures amounts to \$67.2 billion in fiscal year 1970, representing an increase of 12.2 percent over the health bill for the previous year. As a representation of the Gross National Product, health represented 7.0 percent of the market value of all goods and services produced in the United States. Just one year before, that percentage was 6.7.

In another area, some observers indicate that emphasis in the care delivery system on fee-for-service medical care has fostered crisis intervention medical services. Insur-

ance plans developed within this framework and, therefore, have been designed primarily to pay costs of hospital services and part of the fees paid to physicians. The fact that most individuals have only this kind of insurance coverage means that almost everyone wants to be cared for in the hospital rather than at home. The consequent pressures on hospitals have been enormous. In addition, inpatient medical care is the most expensive kind of health service, and since it is directed principally to remedial, palliative, and restorative procedures, the present emphasis of most insurance plans fosters a negative view of health care.

It is interesting to note that by far the larger share of the medical care dollar has always come from private funds, but as Medicare and Medicaid were added in fiscal year 1967, a shift to more public financing occurred. In fiscal year 1966 (before Medicare and Medicaid), the public share was 25.6 percent. By fiscal year 1969, the government share had risen to 38 percent. Three fifths of personal health care expenditures were met by third parties (government, private health insurance, philanthropy, and industry), with government responsible for 58 percent of the third-party bill. Expenditures for hospital care continue to be one of the fastest growing categories of expenditures. The continuing rapid rise in hospital costs, together with an increase in hospital use by the population under age 65, contributed to the continuing large increase in outlays for this purpose. Hospital utilization for the nonaged (under 65 years of age), for example, whose care is for the most part paid for privately, rose at four times the rate for the aged, whose care is in general paid for from public funds. The range of services covered by the many available insurance plans, of course, varies considerably. Privately financed health insurance actually pays less than 5 percent of the health care costs throughout the country once expenditures for hospital care and hospital-connected physician services are excluded. Most plans do not cover costs for home or office visits to physicians, out-of-hospital drugs, private duty nurses, or home nursing care.

The increasing numbers and varieties of proposals for mechanisms which will influence the existing care delivery system reflect the widespread concern about the direction of the entire system. Utilization review, a concept adopted by Congress and implemented in the Medicare Program, has encouraged physicians, hospital administrators, and others to find and implement more effective ways to evaluate patterns of care and the use of health and medical care services. Physicians also recognize their important role in guiding the changes that are inevitable, and in Minnesota the State Medical Association has just completed a study designed to establish effective arrangements and procedures to assure high quality care throughout the State. A similar effort, initiated by the Hennepin County Medical Society, is also underway in the metropolitan area. Both of these efforts are important developments within the State and they merit every possible support.

Last month in his State of the Union Message, President Nixon proposed six goals for his administration. He gave first priority to welfare reform and he pledged "a program to insure that no American family will be prevented from obtaining basic medical care by inability to pay." Although details are still lacking, the President emphasized increases in the number of doctors and health personnel, incentives to improve the delivery of health services, use of assistants, health care as opposed to medical care, and preventive medicine. President Nixon's choice of words, it would appear, reflects a recog-

nition of the fact that the term "medical care" is not synonymous with "health care," nor with "preventive medicine," and that he recognizes that the nation is becoming compellingly conscious of what we have always known but seldom practiced, that "health" rather than "medical" care is the goal for our country. It is evident that we must begin to develop a health delivery system which will create conditions and services and will organize the necessary resources to nourish health and vitality for all persons, by the establishment of mechanisms that emphasize the promotion of health and well-being rather than the care of illness and disease.

To accomplish the objective, the medical care system must be restructured to emphasize comprehensive preventive services. The concept of health maintenance organizations, where provider groups furnish prepaid health services to enrolled patients on a per-person rather than a per-service basis is receiving increased attention in many circles, and the Federal government has indicated that it intends (probably through the Medicare and eventually through the Medicaid Program) to make HMO's an accessible option in all parts of the country for individuals and practitioners who choose this kind of an arrangement. Only time will tell whether the HMO concept represents an improvement over the more traditional methods for the provision of personal medical care. It appears to some, however, that the prepayment insurance system has built-in incentives for more provider emphasis on prevention and primary health care.

Many other proposals are being and will be made to alter the care delivery system in the years ahead, including, for instance, a greater emphasis on establishing mechanisms by which a wider range of levels of care and a greater variety of health services are available. The home health agency which has developed in the last five years, for example, has established an additional level of care, and these agencies have already demonstrated that they can be effective in reducing the need for care in more costly facilities and often with a much kinder end result for the patient.

Many other changes can be anticipated and one, in my view, needs special consideration.

Prevention is the key which may be the only hope of bringing about a significant reversal of rising health and medical care costs, and prevention of illness and disease is the only really acceptable health goal for the country. Methods are known and available for preventing much ill health. There is a great need to develop additional knowledge about techniques of prevention for many other health-robbing conditions and diseases, and the resources required must be mobilized to assure their implementation. To some extent, there is a tendency to consider disease and ill health as inevitable, but this need not be so. Tuberculosis only 50 years ago was a constant risk to every person, but today it is rapidly disappearing. Why? Medical treatment of tuberculosis has been important, but the laying to rest of this human scourge has been due primarily to the establishment of effective systems of prevention. A medical journal article recently stated that one half of all illnesses in the country are preventable. I do not know how accurate that estimate is, but why shouldn't we try to find out. The direct cost of medical care in Minnesota, and across the nation are several orders of magnitude greater than the total expenditures for the promotion, protection, and preservation of the public's health.

The President has put us on notice that the period ahead will be one of intense activity and promise. Changes in the existing medical care delivery system are occurring and will continue. It might well be, however, that the really basic change that

must occur is to reorganize our efforts more positively toward the promotion of wellness and health instead of concentrating all of our efforts on illness and disease, and this is the real challenge in the years to come so that we may add "healthiest" to "wealthiest" in the description of our status as a nation. Thank you.

CHATTANOOGA AND HAMILTON
COUNTY DOCTORS SUPPORT INSURANCE
INDUSTRY'S PROPOSAL FOR NATIONAL HEALTH INSURANCE PROGRAM

HON. LAMAR BAKER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 20, 1971

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, the Chattanooga and Hamilton County Medical Society, Inc., has recently adopted a resolution in support of a national health insurance program which will strengthen the free enterprise system of this country and at the same time provide for those who suffer from catastrophic illnesses. The resolution expresses a preference for the insurance industry's proposal.

Inasmuch as the Ways and Means Committee will soon begin hearings on all of the national health insurance proposals, I feel my colleagues will appreciate having the benefit of the sound reasoning behind this resolution. I am pleased to place it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for their study:

CHATTANOOGA & HAMILTON COUNTY
MEDICAL SOCIETY, INC.,

Chattanooga, Tenn.

It is the belief of the members of the Chattanooga & Hamilton County Medical Society that:

1. The best medical care in the world is provided to the people of the United States of America.
2. The most important advances in medical science in recent times through basic and clinical research have been made in the United States of America.
3. Medical authorities in all nations of this earth recognize that medical training in the United States of America is the best available, as is evidenced by the large numbers from other nations who come to this country for advanced study.

We further believe that this enviable position has not come by accident, but is the results of a free people working together in a free enterprise system. We believe that the right for the patient to choose his doctor and the right for the doctor to provide the service for a fee should be retained in this country, if adequate quality medical care is to be available for the people.

It is our belief that the insurance companies of this nation have developed a fine flexible system of medical and hospital insurance to help the people meet their varied needs in prepaying medical costs.

Because of these beliefs we are unalterably opposed to the legislation which has been introduced by Senator Kennedy.

We recognize that if such legislation is enacted our system of medical practice will be completely changed:

1. The patients' freedom of choice of doctor will be eliminated drastically, altering the personal doctor-patient relationship.
2. The doctor will be salaried on some capitation basis, eliminating the fee for service system and the initiative it produces.
3. The federal government will exclude all

insurance companies from the health insurance field and thus do away with competition and the economies that result therefrom.

Congressman Baker, we request that you continue to oppose socialistic legislation as has been introduced by Senator Kennedy, and to support legislation designed to strengthen the free enterprise system that has made the United States of America number one.

We recognize that the system of medical practice in the country is not perfect even though it is the best. We realize that time brings about changes to meet current problems. It is our hope that legislation that may be enacted will be based on the principles that have made our nation great.

We believe that those who can provide for themselves should do so, and that those who cannot should be helped through government support. We also believe that those who suffer catastrophic illnesses should have support to prevent family economic ruin.

Congressman Baker, we know that your beliefs in basic principles are the same as ours. For this reason we are glad that we helped elect you, and feel fortunate to have you in Washington representing our interests.

Thomas L. Buttram, M.D., Chairman,
Wm. P. Aiken, M.D., Jimmy B. Davis,
M.D., Joseph Graves, M.D., Paul V. Nolan, M.D., Wm. E. Rowe, M.D., James R. Royal, M.D., Harry A. Stone, M.D.,
David H. Turner, M.D.

Legislative Committee.

A TRIBUTE TO YOUTH

HON. NICK BEGICH

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 20, 1971

Mr. BEGICH. Mr. Speaker, in an age when many people are highly critical of rebellious youth across this Nation, I feel it imperative to pay tribute to the large majority of our young who have constructive dreams and desires and goals. Most youngsters in this country choose to participate in the mainstream of American life. We must take note that never before have so many young minds been extremely involved in bettering us as individuals and as a country. The youth today are not content to rest on the achievements of their elders nor quietly reap the benefits of the riches they inherited. Instead they prefer to be part of actions and achievements that will further build this great land. We must credit them with a serious intent to question traditional beliefs, doubt society's institutions and to attack those willing to take many things for granted.

Youth feel a responsibility to encourage innovative solutions to age-old problems, assimilate persons of all ethnic and racial backgrounds and to further develop a world in which sensitive individuals may be proud to live. They are not doing these at the expense of shirking institutions designed by their predecessors. Our young are still attending the churches of their parents, joining leadership training groups and enrolling in youth organizations founded at the turn of this century. But within these institutions they are creating a new spirit which is awakening their elders to a deep

sense of social consciousness as well as to a greater desire for intellectual stimulation. I ask each of us not to turn away from the challenges young people set forth nor from the ideals in which they ask this country to aspire. Let us recognize their commitment to better this Nation with high praise.

In tribute to the youth of Alaska, Gov. William Egan has declared September 1-7 as Youth Week. I join him in his salute to our young citizens and I include for the RECORD, his statewide proclamation:

PROCLAMATION: YOUTH WEEK

September 1 to September 7 is annually designated National Youth Week in recognition of the valuable contributions which young people make to society, and to encourage them in their efforts toward helping build an ever greater America and a better world.

This year, in Alaska, National Youth Week holds special significance. It is a year in which great strides have been made, and will continue to be made, toward continuing the closing of a gap which over the years has kept young people from full involvement in the decision-making processes of government.

The State is now in the process of implementing legislation approved during the 1971 Session for the involvement of young people in government. In this program, young people will serve in the executive offices of government, as special assistants to the Governor and department heads in the State Cabinet, and will also serve on various important boards and commissions of the State.

As a result of a constitutional amendment approved by voters, Alaskans now become voting citizens at the age of 18 instead of, as previously, at 19. The State is engaged in a concentrated effort to help young people register to vote and, in the high schools, over 4,000 have registered, compared to only a few hundred previously.

The State now has a generous new scholarship loan program which young people, in both the academic and job-training fields, can take advantage of in equipping themselves for meaningful participation in the workings of their government.

Most important, it is the performance of young people which has made possible these strides, and others, in Alaska. It has not been a matter of "giving" privileges but, instead, of recognizing deserved rights.

Therefore, I, William A. Egan, as Governor of Alaska, do hereby designate the period of September 1 to September 7 as Youth Week in the state of Alaska, as it will be in the Nation and throughout the world.

I urge that appropriate programs of observation and participation be engaged in not only by our youth but by all Alaskans. Dated this 19th day of August, 1971.

MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN—HOW LONG?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 20, 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?

SWEDISH LESSON IN SOCIALISM, TAXPAYERS SUPPORT OF THOSE WHO WILL NOT WORK

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 20, 1971

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, since many of our intellectual bureaucrats run to the test tube of socialism, Sweden, for the latest theories on how to eradicate freedom and collectivize the United States. I thought the Members would be interested in the results of a recent survey from Sweden.

From Stockholm we are advised that 80 percent of the population of Sweden—the most advanced socialist state as well as the most heavily taxed people in the world—feel there is no point in working for more money because "everything is sapped off by the taxation department."

The American people are continually promised socialized medicine, guaranteed annual income, day care centers, full mental health programs, food stamps more welfare, and free homes to some, but little publicity is given to the paying end of the programs which results in higher and higher taxes. The day may not be far off, if not already here, when Americans will decline raises, additional responsibilities, and applied initiative, because there will be no financial gain after taxes.

History fails to record any country which has attained greatness by confiscation of the property and earnings of its productive working class. Regimented Sweden today is a classic example of the stagnation of socialism resulting from excessive taxation from those who work and being given to those who will not work.

I ask that the Swedish story and related news articles on educated chisellers—apparently our young people feel beating the government is the thing to do, every foreign nation does it—be inserted in the RECORD.

The articles follow:

[From the Sunday Star, Sept. 19, 1971]

NO POINT TO RAISE

STOCKHOLM.—A survey indicates that 80 percent of the population of Sweden, the most heavily taxed nation in the world, feels there is no point in working for more money because "everything is sapped off by the taxation department."

[From the Indianapolis Star, July 11, 1971]

DEFAULT, BANKRUPTCY "GIMMICKS" NOW TOP \$26 MILLION IN U.S.

Defaults and bankruptcy filings—the newest gimmicks to dodge legally the repayment of interest-free, government-insured student loans—have reached more than \$26 million, an investigation by The Indianapolis Star has disclosed.

The figure could reach more than \$30 million with the reporting of bankruptcies filed by collegians or recent graduates who secured educational funds through state-administered programs.

The widespread use of taking bankruptcy or defaulting on educational loans already has cost the taxpayers \$8 million, according to the Office of Education in Washington.

The \$8 million represents taxpayer dollars paid to lending institutions to cover \$6,750,-

000 in defaults of federally insured student loans plus 6 or 7 per cent interest.

Reports of bankruptcy filings from state-administered scholarship programs which are, in part, federally funded, have been received from only one-third of the states, say Washington officials.

Additional reports could hike the total to the \$30 million figure, it was estimated.

Officials of the Office of Education at Washington minimize the disclosures which reveal:

1. Bankruptcy filings by current or recent college graduates whose educations were financed wholly or in part through student loans—involve in excess of \$1,285,590. This has occurred primarily the last 18 months. This figure does not include reports from more than half the states.

2. The total defaults, which are subject to improbable collection, and do not include the bankruptcies, have reached a staggering \$24,621,410 out of total loans in force of \$3,684,227,000.

The loans to students come from three sources: (a) 100 percent Federal insured loans; (b) state scholarship loans involving both state and Federal funds, and (c) student loans secured through private associations funded in part by the Federal government and also by private contributors.

The federally insured program was launched in late 1967.

Nearly 30,000 students or former students, to date, have defaulted on loans obtained from one of the three sources.

Alarmed over the spiraling filings of bankruptcies, which began in California and are spreading eastward, and the "attitudes of defaultees who feel they have no obligation to repay," officials of lending institutions at Indianapolis are sitting tight before authorizing any new loans.

Their current reluctance to process any new student loans stems from the expiration June 30 of Federal legislation guaranteeing the government will make good any losses.

All the lending institutions have is a memorandum from Health, Education and Welfare Secretary Elliot Richardson saying it is his judgment that an appropriation bill still bogged down in Congress provides "adequate authority" to continue making loans to students who have not previously borrowed under the Insured Student Loan Program.

But one man's "judgment" is not official enough for lending institutions that take a dim view of making additional millions of dollars in loans without legislative assurance the government project is backed up with a promise to pay, if defaults occur.

The attitude of Howard R. Sites, vice-president in charge of installment loans of Merchants National Bank and Trust Company, is typical.

"We've had cases where a student gets a degree one week and files bankruptcy the next week," Sites said. "We've had letters from kids who obtained a loan, got their degree and something in their thinking—like the Vietnam conflict—gives them the idea they have no obligation to pay back the loan. "Since the law expired June 30—and I've seen no publicity about it—we don't know where we stand. We tell a new applicant there's no guarantee he'll get a loan until the law is clarified."

American Fletcher National Bank and Trust Company Loan Officer G. Richard Alsip, who oversees the processing of \$2 million in student loans, viewed recent defaults and bankruptcies as "upsetting."

"Most of our defaults and bankruptcies have come since the first of 1971 and it certainly hasn't reached a peak," he said. "The attitudes of defaultees are terrible. We can't even contact them."

Indiana National Bank assistant Vice-President Malcolm (Bud) Buck, whose bank

has \$5 million in student loans, decried the thing."

"We hear," said Buck, "the word is out to go the bankruptcy route as a way out."

Buck said one female law student backed by a student loan through INB filed a bankruptcy petition as soon as she was graduated. "We couldn't touch her," he said.

The liberal Federal bankruptcy laws provide that all debts—no matter how great or small—are erased with the filing of a petition indicating the petitioner is broke.

Indiana—so far—has set no national records in either defaults or bankruptcies involving student loans.

But Referee in Bankruptcy Nicholas A. Sufana says such filings are growing and "there's nothing we can do about it."

Student loans in Indiana, from all sources, currently total \$95.9 million, according to Robert C. Sinnaeve, manager of the United Student Aid Fund (USAF), a nonprofit educational association that has loaned more than \$300 million to students across the country since 1961.

Defaults of USAF-secured loans alone total \$9,371,410 involving 10,000 borrowers, while bankruptcies from such loans have reached \$635,590, Sinnaeve said.

Sinnaeve said the economic factor plays a role in some states, but "the bankruptcy move, which began in California, is strictly a gimmick in that state."

As far as USAF funds are concerned, said Sinnaeve, bankruptcies first began appearing 18 months ago on student filings in California with the name of the same lawyer appearing on the petitions as counsel.

"Due to reports and evidence of the increase in bankruptcies we have begun to isolate claims against USAF so we could monitor them for a trend," he said.

"It was through this check we discovered the idea originating in California with this particular lawyer representing student petitioners."

USAF, with nearly \$10 million in defaults, has recovered \$2 million from delinquent student or graduate borrowers—an achievement, Sinnaeve feels, due in part to the fact USAF borrowers are required to pay the interest, plus the cost of collection of a bad debt.

Student loans secured through full Federal funding are interest-free to students whose adjusted family income is less than \$15,000 a year.

And, Uncle Sam doesn't send a bill for the collection costs to the borrower.

But, the government does pay the interest, generally 6 or 7 per cent, to the lending institution.

"Defaults are the next thing to bankruptcy," said Sinnaeve.

"Not having to pay back the interest gives the student an incentive to default. By not filing bankruptcy he maintains his credit standing and the government foots the bill for collecting whatever part of the principal they can get.

In Washington, officials pooh-pooh the alarm being sounded about the rash of bankruptcies filed by collegians.

Roy A. Splitgerber, loan specialist with the Office of Education, said:

"We're not aware of any special trend in regard to the bankruptcies. We expect a certain amount of debts."

Splitgerber said he is as much in the dark as anyone about the status of the expired law guaranteeing the loans.

"Officially, we don't know what to do ourselves," he declared. "We're awaiting instructions. It's like gazing into a crystal ball to predict what Congress will do."

A low-key reaction to the bankruptcy movement also was gotten from Maurice Tansy, chief of claims and collections for the Office of Education.

Tansy said: "It's something to keep our eye on, but it's nothing alarming."

"After all," said Tansy, "it isn't cheap for a kid to file bankruptcy. It costs him a \$200 filing fee and a \$250 attorney fee."

He conceded, however, the route was far less expensive than paying back a loan—or loans—of several thousand dollars.

Tansy said that, while Washington isn't worrying about the situation, a collection division is being set up which will have 50 field offices to try to catch up with the borrowers who won't pay.

"WE TEACH THE PRICE OF EVERYTHING, THE VALUE OF NOTHING"

Although no one can collect legally on bankruptcies, judgments may be obtained on defaults. This legal move, however, is no assurance the bad debt will be repaid.

Sinnaeve, for one, cast a jaundiced eye toward the new collection division of the Office of Education.

"If it costs more to administer the bureaucracy of running a welfare program than the benefits provide, the taxpayer is the real loser," he said.

EX-STATE COLLEGIANS TAKE BANKRUPTCY ROUTE: JIM "LIVED LIKE A MILLIONAIRE," THEN DECIDED TO "GO FOR BROKE."

James Pond Sanford, a glib, handsome bachelor of 23 years, was president of his junior class at Indiana University in 1968.

He ran for his senior class presidency the next year and won.

But, the challenge of a political fight ended, handling the job was "Mickey Mouse stuff." So Jim, a Zionsville youth, turned over the gavel to his vice-president.

Less than two years after his August, 1969, graduation with an accounting degree, Jim Sanford—on Feb. 12, 1971—filed a petition in bankruptcy in Federal Court at Indianapolis.

He listed debts totaling \$19,451.59, including two student loans totaling \$2,237, and assets of only \$500.

In the 18-month period he had "lived like a millionaire" because I thought in order to become one I should act like one.

Jim piled up a \$1,250 bill at his Summit House apartment, a \$1,300 bill at the William H. Block Company, a \$2,600 debt through two bank charge cards and a \$7,000 debt to a local businessman, among other bills.

His Aquarium Leasing Inc. venture, financed by the businessman, was an immediate failure. This "brainstorm" revolved around the leasing of tropical fish aquariums to business buildings, physicians' offices and hospitals.

Jim, now living in a \$40-a-month apartment at the rear of 3843 Washington Boulevard, went back to school this summer.

He's attending Indiana University School of Law of Indianapolis, financed, he says, by the sale of \$3.95 reports of his ill-fated rent-a-fish venture to fish lovers who might profit by his experience.

Jim has another idea about selling artificial fish that move like the real thing, but he has yet to find a sponsor who will finance the estimated \$4,000 it will cost to manufacture the phony guppies.

Jim isn't proud of having taken bankruptcy, he says.

In fact, he's so ashamed he didn't want it in the newspaper because "the people I'm trying to do business with don't know about it."

He drives a Volkswagen purchased when Aquarium Leasing was in business.

"I feel morally obligated to pay back what I owe, including the student loans, if I make really big money in the future," Jim insists.

He feels students take advantage of the student loans "giveaway."

"I had one professor at Indiana tell me to get the money (student loan) even if I didn't need it and put it in the stock market," Jim said.

He concedes he "could have made it" (through Indiana University) without the loan, but said he wanted to participate in

campus politics and other extracurricular activities and without the loan he would have had to find a time-consuming, part-time campus job.

Jim, about to be drafted in December, 1969, served four months in the National Guard—from which he receives \$175-a-year income.

Mrs. Doris Jean Woods, a 38-year-old sociology graduate of Indiana University in 1968, has fared far better since she filed bankruptcy proceedings in February, 1970—a few weeks after she went to work in a "very responsible position" for the Indianapolis Urban League.

Today, Mrs. Woods, formerly of 3536 North Pennsylvania Street, Apt. 3A, is en route to Yale University, where she will enjoy the benefits of a year-long grant awarded by the National Urban Fellows Program.

Mrs. Woods secured a \$500 student loan through the State Scholarship Commission in October, 1966.

Mrs. Woods' recent grant, made after letters of recommendation from Mayor Richard G. Lugar and others, is a "very substantial one," according to league director Sam Jones and Deputy Mayor John W. Walls.

Jones said he couldn't disclose the exact amount but the Urban Fellows Program "has a fantastic amount of money."

Both he and Walls said Mrs. Woods had done a "marvelous job" as director of educational and youth incentives for the league.

Both Jones and Walls said they had no knowledge of Mrs. Woods having been declared bankrupt a month after she went to work for the league.

At the time she requested bankruptcy, Mrs. Woods listed debts of \$3,873.97 and assets of \$500.

Her attorney, Ronald S. Lieber, said he could not discuss the reasons why she took bankruptcy because it would be in violation of the attorney-client relationship.

Efforts to locate additional Hoosier student loan borrowers who have gone the bankruptcy route were futile.

Thomas M. Almaguer, a bachelor drama instructor at Franklin College last year whose contract was not renewed, had two student loans totaling nearly \$3,000 during his undergraduate work at Emerson College at Boston, Mass., and the University of Denver.

His 1969 income was \$10,000 and his 1970 income was listed as \$8,400 on the bankruptcy petition he filed last month.

Almaguer's last known address was 1431 East Sturmer Avenue. A next-door neighbor said a "teacher" lived there, but she didn't know his name.

Clarence E. Suthard of College Corner, Ind., now a restaurant manager at Oxford, Ohio, secured a \$464.50 student loan while he was attending Indiana University.

When he filed for bankruptcy two months ago, his debts exceeded his assets by only \$1,300.

It had been only 14 months earlier that he had secured a federally insured loan for \$700 to help pay his educational costs.

He said he was \$4,200 in debt but had assets of \$1,200 when he was declared bankrupt in December, 1967.

At that time, he was living at 1711 North Talbot Street, but a bearded youth now residing there said, "Don't left about a year ago. I don't know where he went."

The State of Indiana has discontinued its scholarship program.

Michael B. Cracraft, chairman of the State Scholarship Commission, said loans totaling \$5,166,000, involving 5,657 actual borrowers, were made from Aug. 1, 1966, through Sept. 30, 1967.

"By that time," he said "the Federal government had jumped in and we felt there was no need to continue the state program."

Defaults and bankruptcies from the year-

long project have totaled \$72,363, Cracraft said.

The state program was in addition to many loans secured by Hoosier students through the federally insured and privately endowed projects.

TERRAPIN CREEK WATERSHED PROJECT IS DEDICATED

HON. TOM BEVILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 20, 1971

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Speaker, recently I was privileged to take part in the dedication of the Terrapin Creek watershed project, near Centre, Ala. On this occasion, Mr. Kenneth E. Grant, Administrator, Soil Conservation Service, delivered an excellent address. His remarks focused so clearly on the problems we faced prior to the construction of this project and on the meaning of this watershed to the people of this area, that I wanted to share it with my colleagues in the House. At this time, I include Mr. Grant's remarks and urge you to give it your close attention.

The address follows:

TERRAPIN CREEK WATERSHED PROJECT IS DEDICATED

This is a beautiful part of Alabama. And the hills and valleys of Appalachia are a beautiful part of America.

The Appalachian region, one of our earliest settled areas, has had a long and colorful history—and has produced some of the finest people and some of the most severe economic ups-and-downs that this Nation has known.

Some of those sharp dips in economic tides have been due in large part to water:

Not enough water on a steady basis for homes and businesses; but

Too much water, too often, that kept farmers from harvesting a healthy crop and brought chronic flood damage to farm and town property.

In the Terrapin Creek watershed project, you have been working for 16 years to solve water and related land problems. As soon as one more structure is finished and two more miles of stream channel improvement work is done, you can hang up the "construction completed" sign. That one more structure controls a third of the watershed, so although peak streamflow already has been reduced during the recent heavy rains, when site # 31 is finished the difference in flooding should be dramatic.

You've had a long struggle with funds, and planning, and construction work, and more delays than you'd like. Landowners have spent a million dollars for conservation land treatment work. But you have done the job.

This is a good time to stand back and be proud of what you have accomplished, and to assess what you want to do with your improved land and water resource.

A watershed project is a complex activity that requires a lot of local leadership and support, timely assistance from State and Federal agencies, and the ability of many people and agencies to work together. That Terrapin Creek has come this far, with structural measures nearly done and land treatment nearly 90 percent completed, is a tribute to many people:

The leaders of the Terrapin Creek Watershed Conservancy District;

Supervisors, past and present, of the five soil and water conservation districts involved;

Members of the boards of commissioners of Calhoun, Cleburne, and Cherokee counties; Your Congressmen, Tom Bevill and Bill Nichols;

The State Forestry Commission, the USDA Forest Service and the Soil Conservation Service;

And several hundred farmers who have put conservation measures on their land to aid in flood prevention and to take best advantage of its benefits, and who have shifted bottomland acres to improved pasture and in the process made a beautiful valley along Nances Creek.

And I know that the list of people involved in your project is much longer than that.

A completed watershed project can bring many things to a community, if the citizens know what they want and will use the project to its fullest to help get there.

It can mean freedom from floods and the security that freedom can bring to farmers, townspeople, and business interests whose property formerly was threatened.

It can mean other savings related to flood protection. Roanoke, for example, was able to construct three sewage lagoons to lower pollution of High Pine Creek and save money on the effort because of greater protection from flood damage.

A project can mean more fish and wildlife and the increased income that can bring from hunters and fishermen.

It can mean more opportunity for recreation, both for local residents to enjoy themselves and to give a boost to the tourist business.

It can mean better land use, increased application of conservation practices, and a stronger agriculture.

And over the long run, the new and improved water supplies that a project provides will help attract industry.

The City of Piedmont, for example, gets its water from Terrapin Creek. That supply should be better in both quantity and quality in the future.

Conservation work on the land and the seven floodwater-retarding structures upstream from Piedmont will help keep sediment and other pollutants from reaching the stream and make for a steadier base flow in Terrapin Creek.

It may interest you to know that more than 200 communities in 29 states have thought enough of the water-supply opportunity to invest in 198 watershed projects with multiple purpose reservoirs. These combination flood-prevention and community water-storage lakes will provide more than half a million acre-feet of water supply to serve 1.2 million rural residents.

Eight of these lakes are planned in Alabama. One is near Roanoke, in the High Pine Creek watershed.

It may also interest you to know that in more than 40 States, communities have planned full-scale recreation developments as part of watershed projects, along with 99 smaller-scale water resource improvements. These will create about 60,000 surface acres of water area and provide more than \$20 million in recreation benefits annually.

Nationwide, watershed projects under Public Law 566 had brought the following benefits by the end of Fiscal Year 1970:

Prevented \$180 million in flood damages. Brought \$4.4 million in recreation benefits each year.

Improved wildlife habitat on 204,900 acres of land and water.

Created 56,900 new jobs and added \$170,700,000 yearly to local payrolls.

That's a healthy boost to both the environment and the economy, and virtually all of it has accrued to people living in rural towns and surrounding farmlands.

The Department of Agriculture has been working for both rural development and en-

vironmental improvement for several decades. I'm encouraged by the fact that these are now important issues in the press, in legislatures and in the minds of an increasing number of citizens and citizen groups.

The Terrapin Creek watershed project is an example of rural development carried out by local people with help from their government. Local sponsors assume important responsibilities in planning, installation, and followup maintenance of the works of improvement. They assume a substantial share of the installation costs, particularly in projects that have other purposes besides flood prevention and watershed protection.

So a watershed project requires a lot of local leadership, hard work, and dedication—these you have had. And since the project is flexible enough to meet many local aims, it attracts varied groups of people who want to do something about making their community better. These you also have had.

The heightened interest in rural development today is due to the twin facts of bulging super-cities and declining rural towns that no longer can support the public facilities and services most Americans take for granted. Rural America is home for about one-third of our population. But it encompasses the bulk of our land area, nearly half of the nation's poor, and about 60 per cent of the nation's substandard housing.

USDA is willing to help rural communities achieve more adequate housing, clean water, electric and telephone facilities, and regional cooperation in planning for effective use of area wide resources.

Watershed projects like Terrapin Creek will aid in the rural development process by improving the environmental base on which economic growth and social amenities rest.

Changing the rural environment must be more than keeping what we have left, more than restoring what we once had. We need to make the rural environment of high enough quality that it will beckon some of the city people to return to the open spaces and bring their families, their jobs, and their industries with them.

For you, rural development success will be measured by what you want to happen in your communities and how you go about getting it. Your watershed project is virtually completed. You have already begun to reap some of its benefits. Others will follow, some of them not even hinted at in the plan. I mean to say that you can get more out of your project than was envisioned in 1955 or 1960.

Your improved resource base can accomplish several things. And you can take advantage of the relationships you've developed in these 16 years to work together in meeting other needs.

A further thought is that, in several ways, your watershed project won't be finished next spring. The conservation land treatment is a never-ending job because land uses will change, and because some measures are of a recurring nature. The dams will need proper maintenance to keep them effective and safe and the same is true of the improved channels. If their banks are not well kept or if they are allowed to fill with sediment and debris, you could have a recurrence of bottomland water troubles. You could once more have difficulty in finding the channel along Nances Creek.

I'd like to close by repeating something Under Secretary of Agriculture, Phil Campbell, said recently:

"Year by year our farm people become fewer, but their contributions to America become greater . . . farmers, ranchers, forest and woodland owners—with the help of USDA and other government agencies—have done more than any other part of our society to improve the natural environment.

"Virtually all of the soil conservation and

improvement that has been achieved in this country has been done by these people.

"They have carried out the major proportion of our water conservation and flood prevention efforts.

"At the same time, through their stewardship of soil, water, and forest resources they have made possible the most abundant food supply the world has ever seen—plus safer drinking water for a higher percentage of our people than in any previous generation—plus facilities for outdoor recreation unmatched in history—plus vastly increased opportunities for fishing and hunting.

"I think these facts need to be clearly established in the public eye."

He went on to say, of course, that we must do much more if the nation is to solve its environmental problems. But I would mirror his thoughts that you have been active for a long time in doing a job that some Americans are just now getting interested in talking about. This watershed project is ample proof.

Congratulations and best wishes in your future efforts.

PEOPLE WANT WORK

HON. JOHN E. MOSS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 20, 1971

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, the unemployment situation in my congressional district was brought into focus last week as 500 individuals stood in line for up to 24 hours seeking to qualify for 14 jobs. The 14 jobs were being offered by the county of Sacramento through participation in the Federal Emergency Employment Act of 1971.

The following article from the September 13 edition of the Sacramento Bee should dispel any thinking that people do not want to work. They do want to work, and will when jobs are available:

500 LINE UP, VIE FOR JOBS

(By Ed Dolan)

The first of Sacramento County's unemployed will know—probably next week—whether a night-long wait will be rewarded with a job under the National Emergency Employment program.

Some of the job seekers began lining up as early as 11:30 a.m. yesterday to apply for one of 14 positions for which the county was accepting applications today. With more than 500 applicants on hand by mid-morning today, the odds against success seemed great.

County officials, however, pointed out the 14 jobs are those initially funded by the federal government under the new program and chances are excellent that further funding will be received. Even with additional funds, however, the number of jobs will only be about doubled.

The 14 positions are part of 54 now funded and for which the county will be accepting applications today, tomorrow and Wednesday.

The desire for work was indicated by the first two in line.

Ken Macon and James Thomas fell into line yesterday morning at 11:30 at 8th & I Streets and stayed there until 8 a.m. today when the doors of a special county civil service office opened.

Macon, sitting on a folding chair, said he was anxious to get a job as an assistant analyst; one of these positions opened today.

He had the advantage of first-hand knowledge of what he was seeking. He recently completed a session as a student trainee in the county executive's office.

He said his chances for catching up on his sleep today seemed small. He already holds a bachelor's degree but after filing his job application he headed for Sacramento State College to register for classes where he hopes to obtain a master's degree.

Thomas chose an air mattress for his long wait. He was seeking the job of assistant information officer for which applications also were being accepted today.

Thomas said he had studied to become a teacher and last year worked as a substitute teacher but found his timing was bad with teaching positions hard to come by this year.

Another applicant who fell into line last night for the assistant information job was Mrs. Mauvra Osborn who until April 30 had been seen in many Sacramento homes as the conductor of a children's preschool program on a television station.

As might be expected, former Aerojet General Corp. employees were well represented in the waiting line. One of these was Tom Wiggins who until a year ago was an operations control analyst with the liquid rocket plant of Aerojet. After a year of unemployment he joined the waiting line at 6 a.m. today.

Willard Keck was after a junior civil engineer's job. He had accepted retirement from McClellan Air Force Base rather than take a transfer as an electronics engineer. He said it was the first time in 30 years that he had ever stood in line for a job.

The wait was broken for some of the applicants when civil service officials started at midnight passing out numbered cards indicating the order in which the applicants would be taken. This allowed them if they wanted, to leave the line and get some sleep before the 8 a.m. opening.

The officials said a similar system will be instituted for tomorrow's applicants with cards again passed out starting at midnight tonight. These applicants, however, will be asked to sign the cards in order that their signatures can be compared with application signatures tomorrow to assure the cards have not been handed from one person to another.

NATIONAL WEEK OF CONCERN

HON. WILMER MIZELL

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 16, 1971

Mr. MIZELL. Mr. Speaker, some months ago the Nation observed a National Week of Concern for American soldiers being held prisoner of war or missing in action in Vietnam.

In a speech I made at that time, I said these prisoners of war, far from being forgotten men, were America's most remembered citizens. And so they still are.

It has now been 7 years and 174 days since the first American soldier was captured by the enemy in Vietnam.

With my colleagues and with all Americans, I anxiously await the day when all prisoners of war can be returned home safely.

But until that time, those courageous men may rest assured they are very much on our minds and in our hearts. The National Week of Concern for Prisoners of War is being observed every week by every grateful American.

MINNEAPOLIS HEALTH HEARINGS

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 20, 1971

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, at the recently completed health hearings, Mr. Jack Beidler, representing the Committee for National Health Insurance, presented the following statement summing up the major provisions of the legislation favored by the committee. The committee is playing a central role in reform of our health care system. This legislation is entitled the Health Security Act of 1971. As a cosponsor of this legislation, I found Mr. Beidler's statement to be a most accurate and clear explanation of the provisions of the bill.

As Mr. Beidler pointed out in his verbal testimony, the response in Congress has been extremely good. He indicated that in one congressional office, of 100 letters received concerning health insurance, 99 were in favor of the Health Security Act. This grassroots support for this legislation provides increased incentive for Congress to act promptly on this important domestic problem.

His statement follows:

JACK BEIDLER'S STATEMENT

Mr. Chairman, I believe that Congress is on the verge of enacting legislation to deal with the crisis situation in medical care. I know that the issues and problems in health care conflict. There is, I think, a simple choice before us and that is whether or not we are going to go about this problem by patching and tinkering with the system or whether we are going to face the fact that what we need and must have is a unified, rational, well-financed and carefully planned health care system.

There is a crisis and I think there is now wide consensus about the five major causes of that crisis. Good health care for all Americans will not be available unless we deal meaningfully with the major causes of the health care crisis. These causes are: (1) skyrocketing health care costs. We now spend over \$70 million a year for health care purposes which is about 7 percent of our entire Gross National Product. Under the present system of health care, there is no end in sight for these sharply rising costs. (2) Health manpower shortage continues. We are short of doctors. We are short of nurses and we are short of all kinds of medical personnel. (3) The system for availability and delivery of medical care is grossly inadequate and it will continue to fail unless strong and directed national measures are taken. (4) The quality of medical care ranges from superb to poor and we lack necessary and sufficient controls for the assurance of that high quality of care which the American people have a right to expect. (5) Our system of medical care basically functions better for the providers of service and for the insurers of service than for the users of service.

Each of these five causes of the crisis is interrelated. A sound and adequate program must therefore deal with all of them simultaneously. The Committee for National Health Insurance has developed a most thorough and complete program for evolutionary movement in the health system. It is a plan for an improved system for the efficient delivery and financing of high-quality, continuous comprehensive health services for all in our nation. It is a plan for assured

financial security for American families against the unpredictable costs of serious illness which can be crushing to almost any family and which can unpredictably come to almost any family.

Most importantly it is a single plan, it is not a piecemeal approach, it is not a hodge-podge of badly fitting mosaic pieces poorly related to the needs of the American people. It is not fragments of ideas developed to accommodate special interests rather than the general public interests. It is a plan whose operation can be readily understood and utilized by the American people. The Health Security Program as it has been introduced in the Senate by Senator Kennedy as S. 3 and in the House of Representatives by Representative Griffiths as H.R. 22. I'm happy to say that Mr. Fraser is a co-sponsor of that bill. The bill would deal simultaneously with manpower shortage, with the basic problems of cost, unacceptable variations and uncertainties in quality of care and the root cause of all these—the lack of effective organization for the delivery of services. This combined and comprehensive approach favors a rationalized system of national health insurance.

The bill would provide the framework for a living program adaptable to emerging technology and delivery mechanisms. It does not propose nationalized or socialized medicine. It does not propose that the federal government take over the nation's resources for providing medical care. The hospitals, or the physicians, dentists, nurses and other personnel, nor would it arbitrarily compel the health professionals in our country to reorganize and coordinate their fragmented services into a more efficient health care system. It leaves the furnishings of medical care in the private sector with wide choices of elections for patterns of practice carefully preserved.

The bill proposes, rather, the thoroughly American approach of utilizing national economic resources to provide the financial and professional incentives and supports to improve the health care delivery system with built-in quality and cost controls. It would provide viable and acceptable alternative payment methods to the fee for service systems without excluding this traditional practice. If the Health Security program is described as nationalization or monolithic as some are doing, it should be clear that these words fairly apply only to the basics of its financing. They do not apply to the continuing private provision of medical care which preserves diversities, alternatives and voluntary actions of many kinds. Benefits under the Health Security Program would be available to all residents in the country. Eligibility would not require either an individual contribution or any means test. With very modest limitations, the benefits are intended to embrace the entire range of personal health services including care for the prevention and early detection of disease, the treatment of illness and physical rehabilitation.

There are no restrictions on needed services, no cutoff points, no co-insurance, no deductibles and no waiting period. A special feature of this bill would provide a resources development fund. A fixed percentage of overall program funds will be earmarked and used to strengthen the resources of health personnel and facilities, and its system for delivery of care. Services covered under the health security program will be financed on a budgeted basis. Advanced budgeting will restrain the speed of rising costs and provide a method of allocating available funds among categories of covered services. By a system of regional allocation of funds, annual budgetary review and approval of institutional service expenditures, and financial reviews and controls on service costs.

The bill provides the means of effecting important health cost controls. Avoidance of

waste reduction beneficencies and many other packages in the health security bill would mean that in its first year of operation the health security program would cost no more to provide a comprehensive health services to 210 million Americans than would be expended in that year for fragmented and partial services for fewer people. Needed funds for the program would be derived in part from general revenues and in part from earmarked taxes on employers and on individuals, similar to social security tax we now pay. We believe the doctor and the patient could both be free to choose an organized health service plan as an alternative to fee-for-service. In either case there should be freedom of choice to select a doctor or accept a patient.

The program includes significant provisions to safeguard the quality and care. It would establish national standards for participating individuals and institutional providers. Independent practitioners would be eligible to participate upon meeting licensure and continuing education requirements. Provision is made for professional review and competent peer judgments to assure a level of service delivery kept compatible with good medical standards.

Mr. Chairman, this country ranks 12th among industrial nations of the world on infant mortality, 18th in life expectancy for males and 10th for females. Death rate due to diabetes, heart disease and other controllable mankillers are higher in the United States than in 10 or more other industrial nations. Reasons for this deplorable state of affairs is not a lack of medical knowledge or technique. It is a lack of a modern delivery system adequately financed. For the good of us all, it is time to modernize the practice of medicine.

STRANGE PRAISE FOR NIKITA KHRUSHCHEV

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 20, 1971

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, the death of former Soviet Premier Nikita Khrushchev brought forth an interesting array of comments from American political leaders. Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, for example, declared that Khrushchev "broke the monolith of international communism" and brought down "many barriers which previously had isolated Russia from the political and economic institutions of the West." Senator EDWARD KENNEDY, to cite a further example, declared that Khrushchev "wisely chose to put the cause of peace and the fate of mankind above national interest." These laudatory proclamations by such legislators as Senators HUMPHREY and KENNEDY have been accompanied by similar statements by so-called Kremlinologists, Harry Schwartz and Harrison Salisbury of the New York Times.

This is the same Nikita Khrushchev who was Stalin's loyal accomplice all through the purge years of the 1930's and beyond. According to Edward Krankshaw, editor of Khrushchev's memoirs, even in the secret speech in which Khrushchev disassociated himself from Stalin's "excesses" he spoke "only of Stalin's crimes against the party, not of his crimes against the Soviet people as a whole."

In his introduction to the Khrushchev memoirs, Krankshaw notes that—

The most usual estimate of the number of party members arrested is close to one million. Non-party citizens arrested were at least seven times this number. It is worth mentioning that the deliberate torturing of prisoners under the interrogation was forbidden under the regulations until 1937. Early in 1937 or late in 1936 secret instructions were issued saying that torture might be used. It was finally approved by the Central Committee in 1939.

During all these years the same Khrushchev hailed by Senators KENNEDY and HUMPHREY and by Journalists Schwartz and Salisbury was a dedicated and devoted accomplice in the murder of millions of innocent men, women, and children.

Commenting upon the strange praise heaped upon Nikita Khrushchev, the Chicago Tribune pointed out that—

If sending tanks and Mongol divisions to suppress the freedom fighters in 1956 was a contribution to breaking the Communist monolith, Khrushchev is entitled to that dubious credit . . . Khrushchev will be remembered for his denunciation of Stalin at the 20th party congress in 1956, but he neglected to emphasize that he had been Stalin's faithful henchman in all that oriental tyrant's bloody works.

The Tribune concludes that—

The embodiment of a certain raw power of personality he certainly was. A friend of the United States, the West, or of mankind he was not.

I wish to share this editorial with my colleagues, and insert it into the RECORD at this time:

[From the Chicago Tribune, Sept. 14, 1971]

HARDLY A FRIEND

Nikita Khrushchev went to his grave a non-person in the Soviet Union, the country he ruled for 11 years as first secretary of the Communist Party. His death was recorded in seven lines in Pravda and not one of his successors in the Kremlin hierarchy which ousted him in 1964 attended the funeral in Moscow's second best cemetery, where the burial was made in an obscure corner with elevated trains passing overhead.

Yet in the United States the passing of the one-time Soviet premier evoked effusive tributes, verging on the sentimental. Sen. Hubert Humphrey, Democratic Presidential candidate in 1968, said Khrushchev "broke the monolith of international Communism" and brought down "many barriers which previously had isolated Russia from the political and economic institutions of the West."

If sending tanks and Mongol divisions into Hungary to suppress the freedom fighters in 1956 was a contribution to breaking the Communist monolith, Khrushchev is entitled to that dubious credit. Sen. Humphrey also seems to forget the "Brezhnev doctrine," enunciated by Khrushchev's successor as party secretary, which holds that once any country is engorged by Communism, it remains in that state forever.

Mr. Humphrey talks about breaking barriers to the West. Khrushchev certainly endeavored to do so when, in 1962, he implanted Soviet missiles with a range from Lima, Peru, to Hudson Bay in Castro's Cuba. He brought the world perilously close to thermonuclear destruction.

Sen. Edward M. Kennedy also seems unduly charitable in saying that during the Cuban missile crisis Khrushchev "wisely chose to put the cause of peace and the fate of mankind above national interest." Mr. Kennedy's brother, John, as President, had to deal with the Cuban threat, and certainly it is strange that a member of the family forgets

that there would have been no peril to peace if Khrushchev hadn't put the missiles there in the first place.

Harry Schwartz, a Kremlinologist of sorts for the New York Times, terms Khrushchev "a giant among men." It was this same giant who sneeringly informed the United States, "We will bury you" and "Your grandchildren will live under Socialism," which is to say Communism.

Harrison E. Salisbury, in the same publication, says that the day may come when Russians will sense that Khrushchev deserves "a place close to—if not beside—Lenin," whose mummified remains are kept under glass in Red Square. These worthies certainly deserve each other. The murderer of the czar and of Russia's brief acquaintance with parliamentary government is a fitting sidekick for Khrushchev, "the butcher of the Ukraine," who carried out Stalin's liquidation of the kulaks, some millions of whom were executed or perished of starvation.

As the apostle of "peaceful coexistence"—a phrase borrowed from his predecessor, Georgi Malenkov, Khrushchev got undeserved credit in the West for carrying on the revolutionary struggle of the Communist enterprise against the non-Communist world by all the methods of multidimensional warfare except for general and thus, in our age, nuclear combat.

Khrushchev will be remembered for his renunciation of Stalin at the 20th party congress in 1956, but he neglected to emphasize that he had been Stalin's faithful henchman in all that oriental tyrant's bloody works. Khrushchev will also be remembered for his Chesterfieldian behavior at the United Nations, where he called a Filipino diplomat a "funky" and pounded his shoe on his desk.

The embodiment of a certain raw power of personality he certainly was. A friend of the United States, the West, or of mankind he was not.

CHANGING BLACK ATTITUDE TOWARD DESEGREGATION STUDIED

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 20, 1971

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, recently Mr. John Mathews of the Washington Star wrote a perceptive article on the changing attitude by black leaders toward school desegregation.

I should like to call Mr. Mathew's article to the attention of the House.

On August 6 I placed into the RECORD a study which shows that massive busing ordered by some courts is actually leading to resegregation; white students are leaving the public school system where such busing has been ordered by the courts and the schools are being re-segregated all black.

It occurs to me, Mr. Speaker, we need a continuing dialog on this entire matter particularly in light of Chief Justice Burger's recent statement on busing.

Mr. Mathews has performed a notable public service in placing this issue into sharp perspective. His article follows:

[From the Washington Star, Aug. 29, 1971]

CHANGING BLACK ATTITUDE TOWARD DESEGREGATION STUDIED

(By John Mathews)

Repeated instances of black parents in the South balking at school desegregation plans are making civil rights lawyers and govern-

ment officials wonder whether a new outlook toward integration is developing among Southern blacks.

"We often find ourselves between what the Constitution requires and what the black community wants," said A. J. (Jay) Cooper, a black civil rights lawyer representing plaintiffs in the Mobile, Ala., school desegregation case.

"Many black communities are now pushing, as are their Northern brothers, for community control and for black studies and other programs," said Mrs. Ruby Martin of the Washington Research Project, a private organization that serves as a watchdog over desegregation.

Mrs. Martin, a former director of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare's Office of Civil Rights, added in an interview that blacks "often have a very big feeling they have been had" when desegregation plans put the burden of busing exclusively on black children and when the closing of formerly black schools results in black principals and teachers losing their jobs.

POTTINGER ON "NEW MOOD"

J. Stanley Pottinger, civil rights director of the Health, Education and Welfare Department, early this month gave HEW Secretary Elliot L. Richardson the contents of a memorandum suggesting a new black mood toward desegregation is developing. Pottinger cited specifically the acceptance by NAACP Legal Defense Fund lawyers in Southern school districts such as Mobile, Jackson, Miss., and Nashville of desegregation plans that retain some all-black schools.

Pottinger's analysis is believed to have had some influence in the administration's decision on Aug. 3 to appeal to a higher court a limited desegregation plan approved by a federal judge for Austin, Tex., but to disavow a more extensive busing plan submitted by HEW.

Some administration officials felt that, particularly in Austin, HEW was making greater demands for integration than the minority communities—blacks and Mexican-Americans—wanted. Last week, however, both the NAACP and a group representing Mexican-Americans moved to enter the appeal of the Austin case, seeking to have the 5th U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals reinstitute the extensive cross-busing HEW plan.

PREMISE IS DISPUTED

The premise that Southern blacks are turning away from integration as a long-range goal is vigorously disputed by a number of civil rights lawyers.

In the Mobile case, for example, Jack Greenberg, director of the NAACP Legal Defense Fund, said the alternative was "accepting a few black schools or going to war with an unsympathetic school board, judge and national administration. Greenberg also pointed out in a telephone interview that in Mobile and Jackson all-black schools will be eliminated in 2 or 3 years under terms of the desegregation plans.

"We have to remember that there is no black community in the South, or anywhere," Greenberg said. "There are many black communities. But, I think, generally, most of them believe still that integration is the only way to insure equality of educational opportunity."

Julius L. Chambers, the black lawyer who argued the Charlotte-Mecklenburg County school case that led to the U.S. Supreme Court's key desegregation decision April 20, also maintained the black community still demands complete desegregation.

"The black community believes that desegregation cannot be a one-way process," he said. "What they advocate is that everybody must share the burden; black teachers and principals must not be fired and black students must have equal opportunity in desegregated classes and cannot be discriminated against in desegregated schools."

WHOLE NEW BALL GAME

Chambers predicted that a "whole new legal ball game" is developing revolving around discrimination within desegregated schools.

In the Charlotte-Mecklenburg County school district, which operated last year under an extensive cross-busing and individual school racial quota system—sustained by the Supreme Court—Chambers said legal action will be needed to insure equal treatment of black students.

About 4,000 students—90 percent of them blacks—were either suspended or expelled from junior and senior high schools during the first year of desegregation, Chambers said. Black students are being discriminated against in class assignments and teachers are being denied promotions, he added.

Chambers fears increased polarization between black and white students and the possibilities of violence this year, especially in the high schools. "Black kids are not going to be willing to take what they took last year," he said, "and white kids, inspired by Nixon and Wallace, are going to feel they don't have to go to integrated schools."

LAW AND ORDER ISSUE

In Columbia, S.C., Hayes Mizell, an elected school board member and a civil rights worker for the American Friends Service Committee, said the "law and order issue is being transferred to the schools." Suspension and expulsion of black students increased last school year, although reliable figures are not available, he said.

In Mobile, authorities have instituted the unusual practice of bringing criminal charges such as breach of the peace and assault against students involved in school incidents, said Jay Cooper, the black plaintiffs' lawyer.

Two weeks ago, HEW approved a desegregation plan for Columbia schools that will result in a small amount of additional busing and retention of seven virtually all-black schools. Mizell, who is white, but was elected to the school board with extensive black support, said the black community accepted the moderate desegregation plan.

"There's a sense of emotional exhaustion about the whole desegregation issue," he said. "It has been so thoroughly discussed and debated over the years that many people are now saying, 'We don't care; we just want schools open.'"

Mizell added that the black consciousness mood, among young people particularly, has resulted in the feeling "that an all-black school can be a good school."

STATEMENT OF CHURCHES AND RELIGIOUS ENTITIES IN OPPOSITION TO PROPOSED CONSTITUTIONAL PRAYER AMENDMENT

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 20, 1971

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, it is of the most vital importance that every Member of the House of Representatives acquaint himself with the statement of opposition to the proposed constitutional prayer amendment, signed September 15, 1971, by various religious groups. I ask that the Members study this thoughtful statement carefully. This statement makes it clear that opposition to the proposed prayer amendment is not by any means confined to nonbelieving people. It is a sensitive statement rooted in deep religious faith.

The statement follows:

STATEMENT OF OPPOSITION TO PROPOSED CONSTITUTIONAL PRAYER AMENDMENTS

The undersigned national religious organizations and leaders express their united opposition to H.J. Res. 191, now pending in the House of Representatives, and to other similar proposals for constitutional amendments to authorize "nondenominational" prayer in public buildings. We express the long-standing official positions of the nation's religious faiths which affirm the adequacy of the First Amendment to protect religious interests and to ensure religious rights.

The major faiths themselves have never been able to achieve consensus on a definition of prayer, much less a definition of "nondenominational" prayer. We deny that any elected body or governmental authority has the right to determine either the place or the content of prayer, as implied in the proposed constitutional prayer amendment. To authorize government by a constitutional amendment to intervene in the sacred privilege of prayer, long enshrined in the character and tradition of our nation, is to make of government a judge of theology and an administrator of religious practice. If such a proposed amendment should become a part of the Constitution of the United States, a new religion of "nondenominationalism" would in a measure become established which could destroy the integrity of both church and state.

The proposed constitutional amendment would introduce divisiveness into our national life and among the institutions of religion. Ostensibly proposed in behalf of religion, it would paradoxically proscribe and distort freedom of religious expression.

If the proposed prayer amendment should become a part of the Constitution, the Bill of Rights would have been amended for the first time in our nation's history. Such an amendment would open the doors for governmental intrusion into the religious affairs of the people. This we protest.

On the other hand, we affirm the right of school children or any other segment of the population to engage voluntarily in their own prayers without government authorization or supervision. This right is adequately protected by the First Amendment as it now stands. For this reason we also affirm the wisdom of the Supreme Court decisions in 1962 and 1963 which properly prohibited government intrusion into the religious activity of school children.

We therefore respectfully petition the Congress of the United States to preserve the religion clauses of the First Amendment intact and to oppose any and all prayer amendments to the Constitution.

SIGNATORIES

Dr. W. Hubert Porter, Associate General Secretary, American Baptist Convention, American Ethical Union,

American Humanist Association,

Rev. Warren R. Magnuson, General Secretary, Baptist General Conference,

Baptist Joint Committee on Public Affairs, The Church of the Brethren,

Executive Council of the Episcopal Church,

Friends Committee on National Legislation,

General Board of Christian Social Concerns, The United Methodist Church,

Mennonite Central Committee-Peace Section,

Dr. Joseph H. Jackson, President, National Baptist Convention, U.S.A., Inc.

National Council of the Churches of Christ in the U.S.A.

Rev. G. K. Zimmerman, Executive Secretary, North American Baptist General Conference.

Joint Advisory Committee of the Synagogue Council of America and the National

Jewish Community Relations Advisory Council, consisting of: American Jewish Committee, American Jewish Congress, B'nai B'rith-Anti-Defamation League, Central Conference of American Rabbis, Jewish Labor Committee, Jewish War Veterans of the USA, National Council of Jewish Women, Rabbinical Assembly, Rabbinical Council of America, Union of American Hebrew Congregations, Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations of America, United Synagogue of America, and 85 state, county, and local Jewish Community Councils.

Rev. Richard J. Niebanck, Secretary for Social Concerns, Board of Social Ministry, Lutheran Church in America.

Office of Church and Society, United Presbyterian Church in the United States.

Dr. S. S. Hodges, Executive Secretary, Progressive National Baptist Convention, Inc.

Rev. Alton L. Wheeler, General Secretary, Seventh Day Baptist General Conference.

Dr. Carl E. Bates, President, Southern Baptist Convention.

Council for Christian Social Action, United Church of Christ.

Unitarian Universalist Association.

Dr. William P. Thompson, Stated Clerk, United Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A.

Mrs. Marcus Rohlf, President, American Baptist Convention.

IT IS THE END OF THE BUS RIDE THAT MATTERS

HON. ROBERT F. DRINAN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 20, 1971

Mr. DRINAN. Mr. Speaker, I attach herewith an extraordinarily fine article from the New York Times of September 15, 1971, by the distinguished president of the University of Notre Dame, Father Theodore M. Hesburgh.

Father Hesburgh has served as Chairman of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights having been appointed to that position by President Nixon.

The perceptive and vigorous article by Father Hesburgh indicates the vacillation of the Nixon administration on the entire question of furnishing integrated schools for white and black children. The article follows:

IT'S THE END OF THE BUS RIDE THAT MATTERS—WE MUST TRANSCEND OUR "DISMAL HISTORY" OF RACIAL INEQUALITY

(By Theodore M. Hesburgh)

NOTRE DAME, IND.—After seventeen torturous years, the United States was about to desegregate many of its formerly segregated schools, North and mostly South. Following a decision of the Supreme Court, many of the school districts were using busing as a means—often the only possible means—of doing so. After more than a decade and a half of legal struggles, the law seemed clear and finally, through the heroic efforts of many school boards, mainly in the South, the law was about to be followed. The result would be that finally, more than a century after slavery was ended in America, the great-grandchildren of former slaves would finally have the opportunity to obtain a first-class education—the key to final liberation and upward social mobility.

At this strategic point, the President of the United States declared that he was opposed to busing. The case in point seemed to be Austin, Tex., which was following a plan devised by the Department of Health, Education and Welfare and seemingly ap-

proved by the Department of Justice and the White House. Then came the intervention by a powerful Texas Senator that led to the repudiation of the Federal Government's plan by its leader. All who had worked for the implementation of the Brown decision during these seventeen dreary years were stunned, but little was said. It was the August doldrums. Then came the second blow with the White House press office reiterating the President's statement, and indicating that anyone in the Government opposing it might well find himself working elsewhere.

Who could respond? Most of those who might have responded were long since gone—from H.E.W., Justice, White House. The only maverick left was the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights—an independent, bipartisan agency created under President Eisenhower in 1957 to try to discover the facts on equal protection and discrimination and to advise the President and Congress regarding corrective action. The commission is a peanut. It has a budget that is one-fourth the cost of a single fighter plane, a staff of about 150, and six commissioners who are employed full time elsewhere.

Even so, they spoke out, indicating that the President's statement, at this particular time, could only give aid and comfort to those who opposed the desegregation of schools, and render the task of those trying to comply with the law immensely more difficult.

Moreover, the President's statement, while obviously popular with those who are unwilling to pay the price for a united America with freedom and justice and good education for all, especially blacks, really ignores the facts of busing. Forty per cent of all school children in America are bused to school—two billion miles a year—at a cost of 98 million dollars for 250,000 buses. To be opposed to busing is to not want 40 per cent of American youngsters to get to school.

If the commission had hired Governor Wallace, he could not have performed better. The day after the commission's statement, Wallace began to help the President. All across the South, and also in the North where school buses were fire-bombed in Pontiac, Mich., the forces of obstruction arose anew, buoyed by the President's stance, and the battle already won, had to be joined again. Numerous Federal judges had to restate their cases and even the Chief Justice of the United States had to speak again—on the side of the angels, but with reservations.

Busing is really not the issue. What is important is the education that awaits the child, especially the minority child, for the first time good education, at the end of the bus ride. Busing never aroused emotions when it was done for all the wrong reasons—like the black youngsters in Wallace's Alabama who were bused 100 miles a day from Selma to Montgomery and back to attend a black vocational school when there was a lily-white vocational school where the buses left from in Selma. I remember Medgar Evers saying that his first recollection of busing was the new school buses passing him and other black children on the way to school—a very bad school—splashing them with mud as the white children on their way to a good school yelled out the window, "Nigger, nigger!" No objections to busing then.

One can argue about the costs of equality in America today. God knows we have known the costs of inequality—wasted talents, frustration, poverty piled on poverty, generation after generation. Laws have been grudgingly passed and more grudgingly obeyed, with every possible legal evasion tested. If we are ever to emerge from our present state of inequality, it will not be by insisting on minimum compliance with minimum laws. Generosity, magnanimity, and human understanding will alone allow us to transcend, in our day, our dismal history of racial inequality.

ROSH HASHANA

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 20, 1971

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, sundown last evening marked the beginning of Rosh Hashana, the Jewish New Year. This begins the holy period known as the "Days of Awe" and concludes with the most sacred day in the Jewish calendar—Yom Kippur, the "Day of Atonement."

These high holidays are a time of both great joy and anxiety for Jews. It is a time when families gather and also a time that signifies a new beginning. But, before the individual begins the new year, he looks at the old and attempts to come to a greater understanding of himself and God.

On the beginning of this new year, we should rededicate ourselves to two goals. First, we must preserve the security of Israel and, second, we must take immediate and determined steps to call upon the Soviet Government to permit the free expression of ideas and the exercise of religion by her Jewish citizens.

Mr. Speaker, efforts are being made from many quarters to pressure Israel into relinquishing those lands she captured during the 6-day war in June 1967. Efforts are being made to force Israel to trade her security for a "contractual agreement."

Mr. Speaker, too many times in the past, Israel has relied on international agreements that were violated. As far back as 1917, Great Britain promised the Jews that it would establish Palestine as a Jewish state, but later, it reneged on that promise.

In 1956, Israel was promised that the Suez Canal would be kept open for Israeli shipping—and it was not.

The United Nations promised that the Golan Heights would not be armed for Arab shelling of Israeli farmlands—but the bombardments resumed.

Mr. Speaker, over the last few years, we have witnessed a string of broken promises.

Today, with tension rising in the Middle East, we must remain a true and constant friend of Israel. We must not ask her to jeopardize her security.

Second, Mr. Speaker, we, who freely possess religious freedom, have an obligation to speak for those who do not. We cannot stand by without using our influence on behalf of those Soviet Jews whose desire is for spiritual and cultural expression.

We must exert diplomatic and moral resources in support of the courageous Soviet Jews who daily incur great risks and suffer inhuman treatment rather than submit to the destruction of their Jewish identity.

In addition, we must utilize all available channels to convey our desire to allow Soviet Jews the right to emigrate to countries of their choice. It is a tragic crime for the Soviet Government to imprison its own citizens in a society where they can neither practice their religion

nor make their way to countries where they might give full expression to their religious and cultural identity.

Mr. Speaker, on the beginning of this Jewish New Year, let us reaffirm our commitment to preserve the security of Israel, and let us rededicate ourselves to make every effort to relieve the plight of those Jews in Russia who do not enjoy the privileges of free men.

FINANCING FOR THE POOR

HON. WALTER E. FAUNTROY

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 20, 1971

Mr. FAUNTROY. Mr. Speaker, this country has come to the point where the poor are drowning in a sea of opulence, and there does not seem to be any lifeboats in sight. One of the critical problems is the lack of sufficient money for meaningful programs. Even when the war in Vietnam ends, it appears that there will, unfortunately, be no peace dividend. In other words, we are at the exhausting point in finding additional sources of revenue. In this regard, I call your attention to a recent lead article published in the August 29, 1971, Washington Post, entitled "Putting Money to Work," written by Georgetown Adjunct Professor of Law Jason Newman, and Pierce H. O'Donnell, a Georgetown law student. I urge every Congressman to read it and call for the appropriate committees in Congress to hold hearings on it. A more detailed version of this article appears in the Georgetown Law Journal. The article establishes an innovative fiscal policy that releases existing funds for poverty programs without any cost.

PUTTING MONEY TO WORK

(By Jason I. Newman and Pierce H. O'Donnell)

(Note.—Newman is an adjunct professor of law at Georgetown University Law Center, teaching courses in urban affairs and poverty. O'Donnell, a third-year law student at Georgetown, was a member of Ralph Nader's task force on the First National City Bank. A more detailed version of their article appeared in the May issue of the Georgetown Law Journal.)

Now that President Nixon has announced a New Economic Policy for the United States, the time has come also for a New Fiscal Policy that would transform a multi-million-dollar wasteland into a productive resource for helping to meet the credit needs of the nation's poor and near-poor.

Only a major restructuring of our fiscal policies can free the magnitude of funds necessary to counter poverty and urban decay. By linking fiscal policies to specific programs deemed socially valuable, at least an extra \$5 billion to \$10 billion could be applied to fight poverty.

Without significant congressional appropriations, a series of models for creative fiscal management can be constructed:

A "National Linkage System" to require the deposit of all idle public funds, and encourage the deposit of private funds, in banks which participate in projects aimed at helping the poor and eliminating urban blight.

A "Judibank" (judicial bank) program to use funds held in trust by federal and state courts to promote economic justice.

A "Poor People's Bond" and a "National Lottery for the Poor" to raise revenue for financing otherwise unfunded social welfare programs.

A new government corporation—the "Federal Bonding and Linkage Insurance Corp." (FBLIC)—to initiate and coordinate these New Fiscal Policy programs.

A "poverty bank" classification by which the Federal Reserve Board's reserve requirement would be lowered to free more loanable funds for social welfare programs.

Although these models have been designed to assist financially hard-pressed poverty programs, they can easily be transferred to other public interest goals, including refinancing the cities, rural redevelopment and environmental protection. Hopefully, state and local governments will also adopt these models.

From the outset it should be noted that the details of any one proposal are not as crucial as the underlying conceptual framework. Furthermore, all the proposals should be viewed as interlocking—as part of a program to restructure the mechanisms by which the nation's financial and credit resources are allocated to make them less wasteful and more responsive to the needs of the disadvantaged.

THE NATIONAL LINKAGE SYSTEM

Every year billions of dollars in public funds are placed in commercial banks throughout the country.

As of October 1970 there was \$6.93 billion of federal monies in interest-free demand deposits in 12,000 commercial bank tax and loan accounts.

Between \$50 million and \$500 million are kept in checking accounts by more than 20 U.S. government agencies and departments. State and local governments have \$30.7 billion in commercial bank deposits, much of which draws no interest.

State and local government trust and insurance systems have assets exceeding \$49.6 billion.

Federal and state credit unions have more than \$13.8 billion saved in interest-bearing deposits in commercial banks.

Federal and state courts are estimated to have in excess of \$400 million in court registry funds.

Presently there are no provisions under federal or state law requiring banks to allocate a portion of these public monies, when idle, for secondary public purposes. In fact, the preponderance of these accounts do not even bear interest. The interest alone from the \$6.9 billion in Treasury tax and loan accounts would amount to at least \$350 million a year. This represents almost one-half the entire proposed OEO budget for fiscal 1972.

Under the National Linkage System the depositing of all public funds would be "linked" to, or conditioned upon, a bank's participation in programs designed to assist minority enterprise, consumer borrowing and education, ghetto redevelopment, and other top priority domestic programs. In the words of Sen. Adlai Stevenson (D-Ill.), no longer would the deposit of public funds resemble a patronage system for "rewarding one's friends and punishing one's foes."

In addition to using idle public funds themselves for social purposes, they would also be used as an incentive for banks, credit unions and other financial units to participate in certain publicly approved government and private programs requiring financial inputs.

Public funds would also be deposited in only those banks satisfying two basic criteria:

1. At least a 40 per cent loan-to-deposit ratio, thereby indicating a proven commitment to lending as an investment alternative.

2. A past record of lending to minority

business enterprises and low-income consumers, or a commitment that future lending programs will service these needs.

Once public funds have been deposited, a portion must be used for marginal and high-risk loans to minority entrepreneurs, community development projects, low-income consumers and similar groups not otherwise capable of obtaining such financial assistance. The exact formula would depend upon the amount of funds that a bank must have at its disposal to service the account and make it modestly profitable. All linkage-connected loans would be subject to a maximum interest rate. Marginal and high-risk loans would be insured against default by the FBLIC.

Participation in the National Linkage System would not be limited to federal, state and local government deposits. Government alone cannot shoulder the enormous task of responding to the credit needs of America's poor. Therefore, an essential feature of the National Linkage System would be the active involvement of many sources of private capital. Through tax and other incentives, corporations, life insurance companies, labor unions, foundations, educational institutions, credit unions and private citizens would be encouraged to deposit their funds in "linkage banks."

The idle capital of the private sector represents the largest potential source of available funds. For example, by mid-1970 all United States corporations combined had net working capital totaling \$215.1 billion, of which \$49.9 billion represented cash holdings. Life insurance companies have assets exceeding \$200 billion. Federal and state credit unions have combined assets of more than \$16 billion. The system would have built-in inducements such as tax-free interest on a certain portion of linkage deposits and higher interest rates on these accounts. In addition, knowledge that these funds are destined for social welfare programs would serve as another motivating factor for placing private funds in the National Linkage System.

Several existing government and private programs have adopted one or more features of the National Linkage System. These precedents illustrate the soundness of a linkage program as well as the viability of new approaches to fiscal management.

In 1967, Sen. Stevenson, then Illinois state treasurer, instituted a new state investment program that sought to maximize the benefits to the public stemming from the deposit of public funds. Utilizing a linkage system, Stevenson placed almost \$240 million in idle public funds with banks throughout Illinois.

One of the basic assumptions of the Stevenson program was that public funds should be used creatively to allow and encourage private investment to serve the state's neighborhoods and communities. Participating banks became involved in many varied public interest activities, including critical redevelopment and Small Business Administration loans, bank training of inner-city businessmen, and loans to hospitals, educational institutions, students and others. A Ford Foundation study has concluded that the Stevenson linkage program is a highly successful scheme for demonstrating the potential of a working partnership between the public treasury and private banks to finance public programs.

In the fall of 1970 the federal government announced a joint government-private program to augment the deposit balances in minority banks by \$100 million by next Oct. 1. Government deposits would represent \$35 million of this total, with the balance coming from voluntary participation by corporations, educational institutions, religious organizations, foundations, labor unions and state and local governments. By aiding minority banks, the federal government is seeking to increase the amount of loanable funds for minority borrowers.

At the time of the inauguration of the Minority Deposit Program, there were 28 minority-owned and operated banks in the United States with combined deposits of less than \$300 million. If successful in raising the full \$100 million, the program's deposits will thus constitute a one-third increase in total deposits in these banks. However, minority-owned bank deposits still would constitute less than one-thousandth of 1 per cent of all commercial bank deposits in the United States.

The Minority Deposit Program includes one important element of a linkage program in that it seeks to use federal funds for secondary social impact purposes. Yet, in another respect, it falls far short of a true linkage system. Deposits are conditioned only upon the ethnic ownership of the bank and are not based upon any specific lending program. Minority banks are still free to loan these funds to large corporate customers instead of marginal or high-risk ghetto entrepreneurs or low-income consumers. In many instances this is exactly what is happening. Nonetheless, even with these deficiencies, a properly administered Minority Deposit Program could form an integral part of a National Linkage System.

JUDIBANK

Every year federal, state, and local courts act as trustees for millions of dollars. Ordinarily, these funds are paid into a state or federal court pending the outcome of litigation. These suits most often involve alimony and support actions and land condemnation proceedings for the construction of interstate highways and urban renewal. Most of these funds are presently maintained in noninterest-bearing accounts with local banks. Available figures indicate that at least \$400 million is involved here, with \$56.2 million in 93 federal district courts and the balance coming from the 12,500 state and local courts.

The Judibank concept calls for a restructuring of the role of our judicial system so that courts may assume a more active role in promoting economic and social justice. Courts could either deposit their funds in National Linkage System banks or establish their own procedures for providing full banking facilities in low-income communities lacking them. In this manner, courts might help alleviate the serious problem that the poor face in gaining access to legitimate sources of reasonably priced credit.

Courts have an overriding duty as trustees to protect the value of funds in their care. Therefore, every Judibank account and loan would be fully insured and guaranteed by the FBLIC.

POVERTY BANKS

Another potential source of linkage funds, perhaps upwards of \$5 billion, would be the monies freed by reducing the Federal Reserve requirement for linkage banks in specified poverty areas.

There are presently 6,000 Federal Reserve member banks in the United States with over 80 per cent of all commercial bank deposits. Banks are divided into "city" and "country" bank categories. Each classification has a different reserve requirement (percentage of funds that must be "frozen" and not used for loans or other extensions of credit).

The present reserve requirement distinction between city and country banks serves as a precedent for a new "poverty bank" classification. By lowering reserve requirements for linkage banks in certain ghetto or low-income communities, more funds would be released for lending programs aiding local residents.

Since more money will be flowing into the general economy, this programmatic approach would most likely require the Federal Reserve Board to raise the overall requirements in order to maintain the desired credit conditions of the entire nation. This

graduated reserve requirement would constitute a flexible, innovative mechanism for responding to the localized credit needs of the poor.

POOR PEOPLE'S BONDS

Like the National Lottery for the Poor, Poor People's Bonds (PPBs) represent both a method for financing FBLIC's poverty programs as well as a device for funding social welfare programs without materially increasing appropriations. PPBs would parallel the U.S. Savings Bond program with changes in yield maturity period, denomination and tax status necessary to make the bonds competitive with comparable securities in the capital markets.

Responsibility for issuing and guaranteeing PPBs would rest with the proposed Federal Bonding and Linkage Insurance Corp. The debt service on PPBs would be funded by the proceeds from the National Lottery for the Poor and/or by the FBLIC.

Employers would be able to make tax-deductible matching contributions toward the purchase of PPBs by their employees. Students would also be encouraged to participate in the PPB program. Similar to the inducements for participation in the National Linkage System, state and local governments would receive increased revenue sharing if a certain percentage of their investment portfolios were in PPBs. Furthermore, tax-deductible contributions of PPBs to charitable organizations by individuals and corporations would not be limited by any maximums imposed by existing federal laws.

The precedent for PPBs has been established. At various times the federal government has issued certain types of special purpose bonds to finance government programs and functions—war bonds in the Spanish-American War and two world wars, and Panama Canal Bonds in 1902. In the private sector, several banks are now selling anti-pollution and environmental bonds. Proceeds from these sales are used for loans to environmental and "quality of life" projects, including housing and urban development.

NATIONAL LOTTERY

Americans are particularly fond of gambling. Legal betting at race tracks reaches a gross annual figure of more than \$5 billion, and enforcement officials believe that illegal betting on horses, lotteries and sporting events totals at least an additional \$20 billion annually. A National Lottery for the Poor would provide a carefully regulated outlet for this gambling instinct, while at the same time raising billions of dollars for FBLIC's efforts to assist the poor. In addition to the attraction of winning prize money, citizens would know that money from their lottery ticket was aiding worthwhile social programs.

Lotteries have frequently been proposed but rarely given serious consideration as an alternative for raising revenues. Despite the traditional objection that a public lottery is immoral, surveys have shown that the American people favor a national lottery by margins ranging from 60 to 73 per cent.

The use of lotteries to raise public revenue dates back to ancient Rome, medieval France, Elizabethan England, and colonial and 19th-century America. At least 88 foreign countries employ the lottery as a means of funding government programs. In 1965 alone, these countries took in gross receipts of almost \$2.5 billion, with total net income of more than \$975 million for hospitals, schools, housing, welfare, charity, science, medicare, old-age assistance and other social welfare projects.

To date, three states have tried their hand at a lottery to raise funds for public education and state programs: New Hampshire, New York and, most recently, New Jersey. As of October, 1970, New York and New Hampshire had taken in well over \$166.4 million in gross lottery revenues.

A NEW AGENCY

Implementation of the New Fiscal Policy outlined in this article will require the creation of a new independent government agency—the Federal Bonding and Linkage Insurance Corp. FB LIC would act as a catalyst, coordinator and policy-maker in developing and administering a comprehensive nationwide program for encouraging public and private participation in programs generated by the New Fiscal Policy. Only with broad statutory authority could FB LIC hope to bring about the substantial reform of federal fiscal policies mandated by this New Fiscal Policy for the poor.

In fulfilling its mandate, FB LIC would perform various carefully coordinated functions. It would develop, implement and administer the National Linkage System; provide technical assistance to federal, state and local governments, linkage banks and Judibanks; monitor and evaluate the lending programs of linkage banks and Judibanks; and insure all deposits in the National Linkage System in excess of FDIC coverage.

It also would provide seed capital for the creation of low-income consumer credit unions and similar financial institutions; conduct research and development programs to identify new methods for funding social welfare programs; administer the issuance and sale of Poor People's Bonds; oversee the general operation of the National Lottery for the Poor; and insure certain high-risk loans, as well as Judibank loans.

FB LIC would have several possible proceeds—from the sale of Poor People's Bonds, profits from the National Lottery for the Poor, assessments upon linkage banks and Judibank facilities, investment income, and sale of stock if the corporation were to become profit-making or were to issue stock.

If poverty is to be eradicated, the New Fiscal Policy must be initiated. President Nixon has stated that "we are fortunate to live in a nation . . . flexible enough to change its ways dramatically when circumstances call for change. . . ." The plight of a poor man in the billion-dollar wasteland is one situation that cries out for dramatic change.

FOUR WIN MEDAL OF HONOR FROM PICKENS COUNTY

HON. WM. JENNINGS BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 17, 1971

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, Pickens County, S.C., nurtures heroes. We know of no other small, largely rural county, in the United States with four men to win the Congressional Medal of Honor since 1944. Pickens County is rich in history, heritage, patriotism, and love of country. Pickens County was named in honor of Gen. Andrew Pickens, the famous revolutionary hero who participated in the double envelopment of and destruction of the British Army at Cowpens which was the turning point in our struggle for independence. General Pickens was presented a diamond-studded sword by the Continental Congress for his gallantry and genius in this battle. This sword is in the custody of the Order of the Cincinnati, and is on display at Anderson House on Massachusetts Avenue here in Washington. General Pickens' son, Andrew Pickens and his grandson, Francis Wilkinson Pickens, were il-

lustrious and distinguished Governors of South Carolina.

This national service beyond the call of duty is a tradition in Pickens County. The love of liberty remains undiminished in the people of Pickens County as manifested in the heroism of these four gallant men who were awarded the Nation's highest honor. Gen. Dwight Eisenhower is reported as having said that he would rather win the Congressional Medal of Honor than win the Presidency. No Pickens citizen has yet won the Presidency, but four have been awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor. The following article by Jerry Alexander appeared in the Anderson Independent following the Medal of Honor presentation by Vice President SPIRO AGNEW last week to Mr. and Mrs. Otis Howe, parents of Cpl. James Howe:

PICKENS COUNTY LISTS FOUR MEDAL OF HONOR WINNERS

(By Jerry Alexander)

LIBERTY.—The name James D. Howe is spoken proudly by many Liberty citizens today and rightly so. The late Pickens county native was Thursday awarded posthumously the Congressional Medal of Honor for bravery during a ceremony in the Indian Treaty Room of the Executive Office Building in Washington, D.C. by Vice President Spiro Agnew.

The Lance Corporal, son of Mr. and Mrs. Odus Howe of Liberty, gave his life that others might live, on May 6, in Vietnam. His parents received the award.

In making the supreme sacrifice, the 21-year-old became the fourth Pickens County man to win the nation's highest award.

It is believed that no other comparable county in America has four Congressional Medal of Honor winners.

The soldier joins in immortality three other men from other wars who left the soil of Pickens county to win the award for valor above and beyond the call of duty in war.

Pickens County Veterans Affairs Officer Carl Pilgrim said Friday that he is recommending to the county council that the name of Corporal Howe be placed on the stone marker with the three other medal of honor winners situated in front of the county courthouse in Pickens.

The other three are: Furman L. Smith, of Central was killed in Action at Lanuvio, Italy in May, 1944, and was awarded the medal posthumously in Jan. 1945.

William A. McWhorter of Liberty who died on Dec. 5, 1944, at Leyete, Philippine Islands, and was awarded the medal in Sept. 1945, and Charles H. Barker of Six Mile who died on June 4, 1953 in Sokkogae, Korea and was awarded the nation's highest honor on Oct. 27, 1954. All awards were posthumous.

Lance Corporal Howe was a native of Six Mile and worked in Easley prior to enlisting in the U.S. Marines in the fall of 1968.

Officials said the Marine was honored for "conspicuous gallantry and intrepidity at the risk of his life above and beyond the call of duty" while serving as a rifleman, with company I, Third Battalion, Seventh Marines, First Marine Division.

He and two other Marines were occupying a defensive position when enemy sapper attacks began. When a grenade landed in their midst, Howe shouted a warning and threw himself on the missile, protecting the others from death or injury.

In addition to the Congressional Medal of Honor, he has been awarded the Purple Heart, The Combat Action Ribbon, The National Defense Service Medal, The Vietnam Service Medal with one bronze Star, and the Republic of Vietnam Campaign Medal.

THE MAGIC OF "PROFIT"

HON. LAMAR BAKER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 20, 1971

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, opponents of the current wage/price freeze are raising many arguments. None is more misleading—or more incorrect—than the attacks on profits we are hearing. These critics would have a ceiling placed on profit margins. They are saying, "If we have a ceiling on prices and wages, why not have one on profits as well?"

Anyone with any knowledge of how our free enterprise system operates knows the answer. Destroy profits, or the hope for them, and you destroy incentive, the foundation of the entire capitalistic system. Obviously, placing a limit on a businessman's potential profits would do just that.

It is evident a move to set a ceiling on profit would run exactly counter to the President's twin goals of reduced inflation and increased employment.

When we place a ceiling on the profit management can earn, we are placing a ceiling on job opportunities for the labor force. When we limit management's motivation, we limit expansion as well. Investors put capital into an operation in the hope of undetermined gain. If they know in advance profit, hence dividends, will be limited, investors will hedge accordingly. And as investment is limited, so too must be expansion and diversification into new fields.

The consumer also suffers from management's dilemma, with expansion of existing services curtailed and diversification into new fields halted.

Everybody—business, labor, the consumer—stands to suffer from a ceiling on profits. But the individual who would be gripped tightest by the resulting squeeze would be the very target of the President's expanded employment goal—the returning Vietnam veteran. He would be hurt most by the resulting slack in hiring and creation of new jobs.

As we move from war to a peacetime economy, nothing would be more detrimental to our Nation's future growth than profit limits. Nothing is further from the aim of President Nixon's economic goals.

A thoughtful and cogent argument expressing these views appeared in the September 9, 1971, Chattanooga, Tenn., News-Free Press. The following editorial expresses a well-taken point one well worthy of the attention of all members of Congress.

THE MAGIC OF "PROFIT"

In the controversial discussions over the current wage and price freeze program, some have had harsh words to say about "profits"—sometimes indicating they really don't know what makes our system work.

Do away with profits, or the chance for them, and we are all economically doomed. Assure a good chance to earn profits and everybody is going to be better off economically. Why, then, curse "profits"?

The reasons, primarily, are misunderstanding on the part of some and class warfare propaganda on the part of others.

The free enterprise system is based on the idea that for the chance of earning a profit, there are those who will invest their money at a risk. Sometimes the investors lose. Sometimes they win. This effort to earn profit results in the purchase of plants and equipment and the hiring of labor for the purpose of producing goods and services for sale at prices that will cover the costs and have a "wage" left over for the one who put up the capital and took the risk.

This procedure, of course, makes jobs for workers, promotes other industries from which machinery and buildings are purchased and provides something that consumers want to buy. This is constructive. It is the way of progress.

But there always seem to be those who object to the fact that someone earns a profit. Without the profit motive, there would be no jobs, no payrolls, no purchases and no goods.

The easiest raises that any workers ever get, and the best chance of big ones, are those paid when their employers are earning a good profit. It is far easier to pay top wages out of a good profit than it is to pay mediocre wages out of a marginal operation. For that reason, it should be clear that workers and investors should not consider themselves opponents or enemies but partners. The workers who help their employers earn a good profit are helping make dollars available for their own payroll. Workers who help prevent their employers from profiting are digging their own economic graves. Companies that are able to pay good wages are going to attract the best workers and choose the best people.

"Profit" is not a dirty word. Profit is a necessary part of success for every business and for every employee.

Right now, some are critical because there has been no federal lid placed on profits while there are limits on wages and prices. The object of the control program, is to create more jobs for more workers—to bring about full employment, which would solve a great many of our economic problems not only on a personal level but on a national one. If our object is to create job opportunities, then it would be foolish to attack and limit and restrict the forces that are going to create them.

Encouragement of investment in factories and businesses with an opportunity to earn a profit will open up more chances for workers to get jobs and provide the means for them to be paid.

No other system in the history of the world has done so much for the working man as the free enterprise system based on the investment of capital in the chance of earning a profit. We ought not to forget it, for there are still more benefits to be won for all—through profit.

HONORING GEN. CASIMIR
PULASKI

HON. NICK BEGICH

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 20, 1971

Mr. BEGICH. Mr. Speaker, Gen. Casimir Pulaski, the gallant Polish officer who gave his life for liberty and independence in the American Revolution deserves an honored place among the heroes and patriots who built this great Nation.

Pulaski was typical of the brave young men who came here, from various countries of Europe, caught by the contagion

of the American ideal of freedom. They brought their military skills and experience in battle, and they brought selfless and idealistic devotion. In a letter to Col. R. H. Lee in 1778, Pulaski wrote:

Honor and a true desire of distinguishing myself in defense of liberty was the only motive which fired my breast for the cause of the United States.

His example of sacrifice and devotion to our Nation's cause is a model of patriotism for all times.

For us, today, the memory of Pulaski has still a deep meaning. The recollection of the time when, he like many others, gave to America all he had, without thought of return, reminds us of the sacrifices Americans have made and are making today to preserve independence, self-determination, and freedom throughout the world. His example shines down to us through the generations, and will continue to inspire generations of Americans to come.

General Pulaski fell in the terrible struggle to retake Savannah from the British on October 9, 1779, and died 2 days later on board the American brig *Wasp*. His was a gallant death in the cause of his adopted country, and worthy of remembrance on this day by all Americans. Therefore, I urge my colleagues to set aside October 9 as Gen. Casimir Pulaski Day, both as a tribute to his great courage and sacrifices in the American cause, and as a reminder that America shall never abandon her revolutionary struggle against oppression and slavery, wherever they are found.

TESTIMONIAL DINNER HONORING
LEO AND ERNA BONEM BY EZRA
CONGREGATION

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 20, 1971

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, recently, I was privileged to be a guest at the testimonial dinner given by the Ezra Congregation and State of Israel Bonds honoring two outstanding Chicagoans, Leo and Erna Bonem.

Victims of the Nazi movement in Germany, Mr. and Mrs. Bonem came to Chicago in 1937 and went into the cattle business. Over the years they sponsored others wishing to come to the United States seeking freedom and a new way of life.

The Bonems have been very active community leaders, giving unstintingly of their time and money for many organizations to which they belong, including the Ezra Congregation, Self-help Home for the Aged in Chicago, and projects in Israel.

Dr. Franz S. Steinitz, past president of Ezra Congregation and governor of the State of Israel Bonds Organization, delivered an excellent speech concerning the accomplishments of Leo and Erna Bonem, which I should like to place in the RECORD today.

Mr. Speaker, the address by Dr. Steinitz follows:

REMEMBERING THE PAST

(Address by Franz S. Steinitz, M.D.)

Worthy Rabbi Sud, Worthy Cantor Schwimmer, The Honorable Congressman Roman C. Pucinski, President of Ezra Congregation, Mr. Sinay, Officers and Members of the Board of Directors of Ezra Congregation, Representatives of the various organizations to which the Bonems belong and finally, Mr. Leo and Mrs. Erna Bonem, their friends and guests:

First of all I like to thank your Chairman, Mr. Al Gruen, for the privilege to address you tonight. However, when he asked me to speak to you three days ago only, he did not tell me that I would follow such an excellent speaker as the Honorable Congressman Pucinski and no one less but the Chairman of the Speakers' Bureau of the Israel Bond Organization, Mr. Milton Lambert. Then I would like to congratulate your Chairman and his committee for the fine work they have done in preparing this affair and getting the bonds together, as they did.

When, at the turn of this century, a little boy was born, named Leo Bonem, in the small village Tritenheim on the Mosel and about ten years later a girl named Erna in Lauterecken in the Pfalz—nobody of the townspeople could have possibly guessed in Germany at that time that their way of life together would lead them to prominence and culminate in a Testimonial Dinner to which we are assembled today.

Their life story reads like a saga of America—as the life story of many great Americans. After the Hitler movement in Nazi Germany had forced them to give up their cattle business and butcher shop, they moved first to Trier and emigrated from there to Chicago in the year 1937. With his brother Adolph and a Mr. Joseph Hellbrunn they founded a partnership in the cattle business. They owned one whole cattle truck. However, the cab was too small for three, so the third partner Leo had to sit with the cattle in the back of the truck! After a period of time Leo went into the meat peddling business together with his brother Morris on Fulton Street and Erna was doing the book-keeping at home, after having quit her job as a cashier in a butcher shop. Then they had a business called Prime Beef together with partners. In 1947 Leo established, again with partners, the Cee & Bee Packing Company and worked there until he retired in 1961. Retirement became a very disenchanting occupation for Leo—he felt sickly, seemed to age all of a sudden and Erna just could not stand him home any more all the time! What did Leo do? Two years later he imposed on Arthur Berlinger to open up a new Company, called the B & B Packing Company, where an old-time friend Erich Hellborn joined them later. This certainly rejuvenated him and you can see him daily, except Saturday or Sunday, at 6:30 a.m. in front of his house, eagerly waiting to be picked up by Mr. Hellbronn to go to work.

Leo has had throughout his life only three interests:

- His family
- His business and
- How to do good!

Erna was his close co-worker in all his three interests: Leo's father and Erna's mother both lived with them and were cared for with much love and devotion until they died. They also took into their home Leo's brother Morris, whose wife had passed away and who was not well himself. In addition, Leo and Erna brought some 20 people over to this country, among others the Jacob family and they also helped to establish many of them, and gave them a start in their new country. But beyond that, they have helped Ezra Congregation, their Temple family so to say, ever since the Bonems had joined us. It was through their generosity that we were able to remodel and refurbish

the Lower Level Assembly Hall and the grateful congregation named it befittingly, "Erna and Leo Bonem Hall". They have been benefactors to the Selfhelp Home for the Aged in Chicago, whose Honorary Director is Leo. Recently they were the donors in the establishment of the "Elsa, Erna and Leo Bonem Dormitory" in Rehovot, Israel.

The Bonems belong to many organizations, too many to be listed here. They have supported over the years many good causes, here as well as in Israel.

Ezra Congregation indeed is privileged to count Erna and Leo as their most faithful members. From my own experience as former President of Ezra Congregation (1949-51 and 1961-63), I can assure you that there was no more noble couple during my time of office and the same still holds true! If here or abroad, when there is a need for help—the Bonems have always been ready to give a hand, generously and yet with the greatest modesty.

When Erna was asked "What is the highlight of your life?", she answered: "My recent trip to Israel with my beloved Leo!" I feel sure, if Leo would have been asked that question, he would have answered the same way.

Leo and Erna: In recognition of your exemplary way of life, it is my honor and my privilege in my function as Governor of the State of Israel Bond Organization to present to you this plaque.

NEW CURRICULUMS FOR NEW CAREERS

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 20, 1971

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, the following is an excerpt of a speech given by Dr. Theodore Mitau, chancellor, Minnesota State college system. It is a challenge for exploration and change in the educational system. Dr. Mitau's main thrusts are toward the training of students to respond to the needs of our communities and developing a continuity in our lives by lessening the gap between classroom theory and job reality.

I commend Dr. Mitau's ideas to my colleagues. They challenge us to think of our educational system as an integral part of our lives that must change with us. He cautions us not to close the doors to change by conditioning educational aid to our higher educational institutions and to students on their conforming to traditional programs.

The excerpt follows:

EXCERPT OF SPEECH BY DR. THEODORE MITAU

The time may be ready for us in the Minnesota State College system to take some bold moves and structure new programs for the many men and women in this state who seek viable alternatives to teacher education.

I should like to take this opportunity to invite students, faculties, administrators and State College Board members to join in a dialogue and explore the possibility of adopting curricular options that might be called "new curricula for new careers."

These curricula would hopefully be attractive and relevant to students who would wish to combine practical internship experiences with the more theory-oriented classroom work and to earn a degree other than the traditional bachelor of arts or bachelor of science. We might begin to de-

velop such a pilot program in four broad areas: health care; human services; business systems; environmental control.

Emphasis would be on development of the ability to work with people of different backgrounds, social settings, cultural attachments, political interests and intellectual viewpoints.

Students would be able to combine skills acquired in vocational schools, junior colleges or on-the-job experiences with further education in both specialized and general education.

Learning, special or general, would emphasize the development of problem-solving skills rather than a narrow expertise; the focus would be interdisciplinary rather than disciplinary.

A bachelor's degree in the four areas mentioned (or other areas that might be defined) would be obtained in three calendar years and include an internship with credit for on-the-job training.

Far from pointing toward the stereotyped view of vocationalism, these new careers would challenge the idealism of our young men and women by demonstrating to them how they can enlist the discipline of skill and the dignity of work—not merely for materialism, but on behalf of causes and commitments that transcend personal gain or acquisition.

Curricular experimentation or innovation is never easy. The personnel in our office is keenly aware of the fact that we are a coordinated system of cooperating but diverse collegiate institutions. The dialogue concerning the strengthening of new career alternatives to teaching that we are innovating will necessarily have to begin at each campus involving faculty, students, and administrators.

Some of our colleges, or one of them, or all of them, may wish to probe more deeply into the implications of these proposals. They may wish to structure a pilot program. This then is an invitation to such a venture.

It is important that our Minnesota State College system continues to welcome new ideas, new approaches, new methods of teaching, the building of bridges between campus and community, and greater participation in curriculum building by students and non-professional teachers.

SALUTE TO AMBASSADOR GEORGE BUSH

HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 20, 1971

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow will bring the opening of the 26th session of the United Nations General Assembly. As the historic question of China's admission to the U.N. comes under consideration by the General Assembly, I want to take the opportunity to commend our former colleague, Ambassador George Bush, for the exceptional job he is producing as U.S. Ambassador to the U.N. I know that all of us join in extending heartfelt wishes for the continued success of his work as our chief representative in the world body.

As part of my remarks I wish to include a report written by Ambassador Bush, which appeared in yesterday's Milwaukee Journal. Also included are two news columns reporting the work that

Ambassador Bush has been undertaking in his role as America's chief diplomat and strategist.

The items follow:

[From the Milwaukee Journal, Sept. 19, 1971]
OPENING OF THE 26TH SESSION OF THE UNITED NATIONS GENERAL ASSEMBLY

(By George Bush, U.S. Delegate to the UN)

United Nations, N.Y.—Plato put it this way—"The only thing permanent is change." And Justice Holmes wrote—"Behind every scheme to make the world over lies the question, what kind of world do you want?" In my view, these quotes encompass the immensely important and challenging issues confronting member nations at the 26th General Assembly of the United Nations, starting Tuesday.

In the fall of '71, more than ever, issues will be brought before the General Assembly that demand flexibility, that demand a UN that is responsive to constructive change, that demand a UN that is willing to look ahead in its quest for a world truly at peace.

TWO REALITIES

Here are some of the issues that will challenge the US this fall:

CHINA

The US has enunciated a new policy on China at the UN. It is a realistic and a simple policy. If it's successful, it will represent a significant step in helping shape the UN into a much more representative body. What we hope to accomplish at the General Assembly is to have the UN accommodate two realities—the People's Republic of China (Peking) and the Republic of China (Nationalist China), without prejudicing either's claims. This does not represent a "two China" policy as has been erroneously reported.

Our policy offers representation to the People's Republic of China, but also seeks to prevent the expulsion from the UN of the Republic of China, our friend and ally of long standing. It points up the importance of their continued representation in the UN. Importantly, our policy, unlike the Albanian resolution, avoids the dangerous precedent of expulsion of a member.

The Republic of China is bigger than 92 other countries represented in the UN. Indeed, a dues paying and important member, playing a useful role in a variety of ways. The Republic of China represents a large number of people and we want to see them stay there. We want to see the General Assembly on record as favoring their retention and will be battling every moment to achieve this goal.

On the other side of this issue, the president is determined in his effort to communicate effectively with another reality, a very large reality—the People's Republic of China. UN representation for that reality will be an important move in this direction.

A BOLD REAPPRAISAL

The fact is that President Nixon has made a bold reappraisal of our China policy. This move has the support of the American people. Through this UN policy we are not promising a millennium. We simply face up to a fact: The People's Republic of China is there. Within the context of our commitment to freedom and to peace, what are we going to do about it?

The answer is the UN offers representation to the People's Republic of China and at the same time refuses to kick out the Republic of China.

MIDDLE EAST

While the China question will certainly be a focal point for world attention, the Middle East will be the subject both of behind the scenes discussions and perhaps public debate in the Security Council or the General Assembly.

For the past several months attention has

been focused on efforts to achieve an interim agreement on reopening the Suez Canal. The U.S., at the request of Israel and Egypt, has been actively seeking to promote such an agreement. While problems remain, we believe the door to an interim agreement on the canal is still open and we are cautiously hopeful progress on this front will be made. In the event an interim agreement on the canal is made, we consider that this will materially contribute to efforts to bring about an overall settlement.

When it comes to the Middle East, the U.S. believes quiet diplomacy offers the best prospect for success rather than heated debates in the Security Council and General Assembly.

While we are continuing our quiet diplomatic efforts, our basic position remains unchanged. That is, we support Security Council Resolution 242, including the efforts of Ambassador Jarring, and we adhere to the policy set forth in the secretary of state's speech of Dec. 9, 1969, and the president's foreign policy report to the Congress, Feb. 25, 1971.

INDIA-PAKISTAN

During the General Assembly, there will be discussion of the report of the UN High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR). This year major attention will be focused on the activities of the UNHCR in assisting refugees from East Pakistan. Here exists a situation in which the UN and the secretary can help dramatically in organizing and planning relief activities both in India and in East Pakistan.

SECRETARY GENERAL

Another question of change permeating discussion in the corridors of the UN today, and one certainly to arise during the General Assembly, is that of a successor to U Thant. He has stated publicly his intention to step down at the end of his term of office following this session. He has expressed such a desire to many UN ambassadors in private discussions and I feel he is totally sincere in this conviction. In view of this, we are prepared now to engage in the very necessary consultations that will eventually result in determining his successor.

ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL ISSUES

Narcotics, population, health, environment, food distribution, refugees—these issues of international concern will receive close scrutiny this fall.

ROOT CAUSES OF WAR

Granted these economic and social issues haven't captured the imagination of many people, nor will they garner many headlines in the fall, but they are issues on which we will be expending large amounts of time in order to find creative and meaningful new solutions; and, more important, in the knowledge that success will indeed mean elimination of some of the tensions that cause war.

In the fall of '71, we can move toward a UN system responsive to change—change on the political front and change on the entire economic and social front. For our part it's a challenge that the USA welcomes.

[From the New York Daily Mirror, Sept. 10, 1971]

AT THE UN WITH AMBASSADOR BUSH

(By Robert F. Goldman)

A member of the N.Y. State Bar Association, Robert F. Goldman is a special advisor on public opinion to U.S. Secretary of State William P. Rogers. He also serves as a special consultant to Queen District Attorney Thomas Mackell and performs in a special advisory capacity to the New York State Small Small Business Administration.

A beehive of activity these days is the striking 12-story building on the southwest corner of 45th Street and First Avenue.

Headquarters for the United States Mission to the United Nations, it houses George

Bush and a staff of 111 people now engaged in preparing for the fight on China scheduled this month at the UN.

Bush, the energetic politician turned diplomat, gets off to a running start each day arriving at his desk shortly after 8:00 a.m. before many of his lieutenants arrive on the scene he is well on his way planning the round of consultations with other UN Missions on the China questions.

"All we are trying to do here is to deal with realities," he says, "and we are trying to accommodate realities." The U.S. hopes to have the People's Republic of China seated at the UN this year with the Republic of China at the same time retaining its seat.

In the four weeks following Secretary of State William Rogers' announcement on dual representation, Ambassador Bush and his staff met and discussed the proposal with 94 of the 126 other member nations of the international body.

"I think we'll win," says Bush.

"Right now I can't back that feeling up with specific numbers because it's really too early for a vote count and many of these countries are going back to their capitals for instructions on how to vote. In some cases the Permanent Representatives are going home to take part in the conferences which will decide how their country will stand."

The Connecticut Yankee who became a Texan has learned a lot in the six months he has been on the UN scene. Veteran observers give him high marks for doing his homework and fitting into his difficult role as Permanent U.S. Representative. They say he has done well filling the void in foreign affairs in his background.

Son of former Connecticut Senator Prescott Bush, the 47-year-old member of President Nixon's Cabinet was schooled at Yale, following a World War II stint in the Navy. After college he went off to Texas hoping to make his fortune. He did. He then went from the oil business to politics serving two terms in the House of Representatives. Last Fall he lost in a hotly contested battle for a U.S. Senate seat from Texas.

"While the UN General Assembly, which starts on September 21st, will be dominated by the China question," says Bush, "there are other very serious problems facing this 26th session." Secretary General U Thant, he explains, has indicated he will not seek another term.

"That alone would be a major problem for the members of the United Nations to resolve," he says. "The Middle East no doubt will come before the Assembly also. There's no question we'll have a busy time of it."

Bush came to the United Nations as a critic. Though he says he has reinforced many of his attitudes, he admits the "UN's effectiveness has always been set by how much of its Members were willing to see it do." Within those limits he says the UN has achieved a great deal. He urges the U.S. and other member nations to join in realizing how much an effective UN is in their common interest.

As a former Congressman he is continually aware of political realities. He has invested a good amount of his time working on steps to streamline and make the UN more efficient in the functions of the Secretariat, the Assembly and the thousands and thousands of various meetings.

[From the Appleton (Wis.) Sunday Post-Crescent, Sept. 19, 1971]

AMBASSADOR BUSH STAYS PHYSICALLY TRIM

UNITED NATIONS, N.Y.—The way he tackles diplomacy, Ambassador George Bush doesn't really have to be an athlete in top condition. But it helps.

The former Navy flier who will pilot U.S. policy through the U.N. session starting this week finds that a 16-hour working day has become more rule than exception.

Evidently he thrives on it. His enthusiasm for the job seems to have infected his entire staff at the 12-story U.S. mission building across the street from the U.N. complex.

The session opening Tuesday will, among other things, consider the complex question of China's representation. In his first General Assembly appearance as ambassador, Bush has a tough assignment: to champion President Nixon's "two-Chinas" policy, which both Red China and the Nationalists on Taiwan reject.

How will it work out? Ambassador Bush says that if the two-Chinas policy does not succeed, it will not be for lack of trying on his part.

"Some people are saying the United States isn't really trying very hard to keep Taiwan in but if that's so, nobody's told me about it," he says.

Bush's remarks to an interviewer suggested two outstanding traits: loyalty and irrepressible optimism. He is loyal—some say to a fault—to President Nixon and frequently quotes him in conversation. And his personality is such that pessimism for Bush would seem next to impossible.

George Herbert Walker Bush is a self-made Texas oil millionaire. He had been transplanted to Texas, however, from New England, and he combines shrewd Yankee humor with Texas affability.

As a Republican congressman from Texas, Bush once was considered a strong possibility for the 1972 vice presidential nomination. Despite loss of a 1970 U.S. Senate race, he still looks to some Republicans like a prospective answer to the Democrats' acquisition of New York's mayor, John Lindsay.

At 47, he is handsome and has the engaging manner of a natural-born vote-getter.

DEMOCRATS WISH

"I sure wish he was a Democrat," a Democratic leader was once heard to murmur wistfully.

President Nixon noted the potential in a bantering way last February when Bush was sworn as ambassador. Nixon recalled how President William McKinley had lost an Ohio race and gone on to become president, "but I'm not suggesting what office you should seek and at what time."

What about political aspirations as of now? Bush grinned.

"In this job I am not a political person. I can't be. You can't indulge in political partisanship in this job. If you asked me could I conjure up a set of facts involved in the elective political process, I would have to admit that yes, I am still a political animal and keep my interest in elective politics. But there's no time here to think of such things.

"As a Cabinet member, of course I keep up with domestic affairs and would be prepared to discuss domestic and international issues. But I am a strong believer in the policies President Nixon is embarked on now in the United Nations, and he is entitled to total advocacy here."

The President gets it; Bush does not spare himself.

The ambassador rises at about 7 and switches to a news program which takes exactly 12 minutes. That's how long Bush stays on his exercise cycle.

"The exercise session is boring. Nobody wins, nobody loses, no competition, and I hate every minute of it, but I feel I ought to do it. I don't ever eat much breakfast and I leave my apartment at the Waldorf about 8, to be driven to the mission. I get here every morning about 8:10."

GREAT VIEW

The ambassador's 11th floor office commands a view of the U.N. complex. The walls have photographs of the President, vice president and secretary of state, the U.S. astronauts on the moon and various Bush family scenes. On a table near a window is

a bust of Abraham Lincoln, and near the desk is an old globe on a stand, which Bush calls "the antique."

For an informal conversation, Bush abandons his desk and seats himself in an easy chair. Recently back from a stay at a vacation retreat in Maine, he looks tanned and relaxed. But as he talks, the relaxed manner fails to hide the fact that he is a bundle of energy. Glasses pushed back on his head, he pops out of his chair, reaches the desk in a couple of long strides and fishes out his appointment calendar.

"First thing in the morning, my secretary, Mrs. Aleene Smith, brings me the morning's telegrams to read, and I have a session with my executive assistant, Tom Lias."

He thumbs the desk calendar and chooses a typical day. It includes the morning staff meeting, appointment after appointment with ambassadors and U.N. officials, luncheon engagement, receptions in the evening, and formal dinner. Invariably at least one dinner and one reception must be attended. Sometimes two or three diplomatic receptions occur on the same day and he must make all of them, somehow. He regards that as devotion "above and beyond the call of duty."

"I try to get to bed by 11:30 if possible, but often my calendar is so filled that I fall behind in my work and have to take it home with me."

He travels frequently to Washington for Cabinet meetings and other chores, to say nothing of speaking engagements around the country. So it helps to be physically fit, and Bush stays in shape. At tennis, he says, "I'm still pretty tough." He plays a lot of doubles, well enough to team often with top professionals.

"I love baseball," he volunteers. He was captain of his Yale team, playing first base, in its undefeated seasons of the late 1940s.

PING PONG VIEWS

What with China's Ping Pong diplomacy, a diplomat might do well to excel in that sport. How is Bush's Ping Pong?

"Well, I have to be modest about that," he replies with a grin. "I have been crushed by my kids at Ping Pong. I can handle them at tennis, except for my second eldest, who is captain of his university team, but all four of my boys play well. We are a very competitive family."

The eldest son, George Walker Bush, like his father, a Yale man and now an Air Force pilot has completed law school. The other three sons and a daughter are still in school.

George Bush was born June 12, 1924 at Milton, Mass. His father is Prescott S. Bush, an investment banker who served as U.S. senator from Connecticut in 1952-62. His maternal grandfather was George Herbert Walker, donor of the international golf trophy, the Walker Cup.

Bush's family moved to Greenwich, Conn., the year he was born. The ambassador remembers with a trace of awe the imposing figure of his tall and handsome father presiding as moderator over Greenwich's town meeting. Bush resembles his patrician-looking father, though without his father's stern exterior.

Bush still was in prep school at the time of Pearl Harbor. On the day he turned 18 he enlisted in the Navy and before he was 19 had his commission and wings as a Navy pilot. He flew torpedo bombers from a carrier in the Pacific and was shot down off the Bonin Islands. Luckily, he spotted a U.S. submarine and swam for it; "I set a new record for free style."

Bush left the Navy as a junior grade lieutenant in 1945, with a Distinguished Flying Cross and three air medals. He com-

pleted his education, emerging from Yale in 1948 as a Phi Beta Kappa with an economics degree. With his bride of 1945, the former Barbara Pierce of Rye, N.Y., he headed for Texas, made Houston his home and entered the oil-field supply business. Eventually he founded Zapata Petroleum Corp., an international drilling contract firm, and Zapata Offshore Co.

The "political animal" in him would not be denied. He ran successfully in 1966 and 1968 for Congress from Texas' 7th district. He was critical of rock-bound Republican conservatives, feeling that the party should be dynamic and not frightened of change.

"Would you consider yourself a sort of liberal conservative?" he was asked.

FRAGMATIST

"People in Texas used to ask me that in the campaigns," he replied. "Some even called me a right-wing reactionary. I like to think of myself as a pragmatist, but I have learned to defy being labeled. I don't object, particularly, but I feel labels mean different things to different people, and it's impossible to make them objective. What I can say is that I am a strong supporter of the President. If you tell me what he is, I can tell you what I am."

"I exercise some discretion, of course, but I would not exercise any that would conflict with the President's policies. If I did find myself in conflict with them, my conscience would dictate that I get out. If I couldn't support the President's policies with enthusiasm, vigor and energy, then the United States and its President would be under-represented here."

As ambassador, Bush must entertain extensively at his Waldorf Hotel suite, but the Bushes always have been enthusiastic hosts.

"Barbara likes it," he says—"We like people. We have a feeling of friendship and mutual respect when we deal with the various ambassadors."

In those encounters he likes to keep the atmosphere informal and avoid an atmosphere of diplomatic stuffiness. There's a place for protocol, he says, "but it can be overdone."

As ambassador, Bush cheerfully admits his lack of diplomatic background, but feels any critics on that score should withhold judgment until his first U.N. assembly session ends in December.

He admits he has changed his mind on some things, including the China question. Seven years ago he was quoted as saying that if Peking ever should be voted into the United Nations, the United States should get out.

"That was 1964, a long time ago," he observes. "There's been an awful lot changed since . . . A person who is unwilling to admit that changes have taken place is out of things these days. President Nixon is not being naive in his China policy. He is recognizing the realities of today not the realities of seven years ago."

FIRST DUTY

Bush approaches his job from the standpoint that his first duty is to his own country.

"If I became an international civil servant that would be wrong. What is going to make the United Nations stronger is its function as a melting pot for different viewpoints. The United States should be strongly represented and we should try to bring out what's good about our country, be prepared to stand up in behalf of our country whenever necessary."

At the same time he is an eager salesman for the U.N. ideal. He wants to stimulate interest in it around the world, possibly by means of a U.N. session once in a while in another country.

"For example, let's see what happens if a

U.N. session is held in a Communist bloc country. Why not let others see what the problems are, what it means? It could revitalize the whole organization. The costs would be high, but if the Olympic games, for instance, can be taken to Tokyo, why not the United Nations to another country?"

Approaching his first assembly session, Bush seems assured of enthusiastic support from his staff, who seem, by the large, to have become avid admirers of their new boss.

FREEDOM RETURNS TO BOSTON

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 20, 1971

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, on June 11, 1968, I called the attention of our colleagues to the dangers inherent in the Federal programs designed to insure "equal housing for all" and the inevitable flight of the white population to the suburbs. All of this social justice was to be done under the basic premise of appeasing the extreme left wing super-liberals who nurture the myth that future society must have a fixed ratio of black and white citizens equally distributed throughout the population.

On June 18, 1971, I pointed out to my colleagues that the Nixon administration was not content to destroy the cities, but was now going to force suburban housing patterns to conform to some unrealistic dream of "proper racial proportions." On that date I called the attention of the House to the fact that the Nixon administration had instituted suit against Black Jack, Mo., a white suburb of St. Louis, charging racial discrimination and demanding integrated housing. This suburb was begun in 1969-70 by whites who fled to the suburbs to escape the blackening inner city.

Today, I would like to call the attention of the House to the recent occurrences in Boston, Mass., that again illustrate the administration's obsession with achieving the impossible—forced integration of housing patterns.

The news story points out that a suburb of Boston was integrated under a Federal program that guaranteed loans to blacks of the inner city. What has occurred is that the white population of this suburb have fled to other locations where they could choose their neighbors and live without fear for their lives and possessions, leaving this previously white suburb 40 percent black in just 3 years. The article points out that the move of blacks from Roxbury to Dorchester has stimulated the drug addicts to hit the houses of the community. Crime is on the rise, and so is fear. The true impact of integration is now being forcibly brought home to our liberal Boston friends. Reality tends to destroy the liberal myth of the equality of man.

The lesson is obvious—forced integration of housing patterns does not and will not work. The experience of Black Jack, Mo., and Boston, Mass., is proof of this. The American citizen across the Nation

refuses to give up his right to choose his own society, including where he lives and works. Free men just refuse to be used as a statistic to appease politicians.

Can the administration accept reality and recognize that this is not racism—that this is freedom in action, that this is free men voting by foot, because their freedom has already been so intimidated they lack the courage to speak out? In utter despair, they flee from danger and the shock of reality.

History records the tragic flight of minorities fleeing the tyranny of the majority and the dangers of the onrushing horde. This played a major role in the settling of this country.

Now, we see the strange situation of a majority fleeing a minority because of the tyranny of unreasonable, unworkable, and dictatorial practices of its own government. How will history record the leaders of this era?

I insert a related news article in the RECORD at this point:

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 19, 1971]

ANATOMY OF A BOONDOGGLE: THE BLOCK-BUSTERS OF BOSTON

(By Robert C. Maynard)

BOSTON.—When Lewis Gilbert III, 7 years old and black, came home from school not long ago, he noticed a moving van across the street from his family's suburban-style, split-level home. It was one of many that have been on the streets lately in Boston's Mattapan section.

"Mommy," Lewis asked, "how come since we moved here so many people are moving away?"

His father recounted that story here last week. He shook his head, his eyes moist, and asked, "How do you explain to a kid? How?"

Lewis Gilbert Jr. was not the only person having trouble last week explaining how Mattapan, almost entirely Jewish a few years ago, is now well on its way to becoming almost entirely black.

Investigations are being conducted by a Senate subcommittee, the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the U.S. Attorney's office here to determine whether federal laws were violated in the process by which Mattapan has become 40 percent black in just three years.

The focus of their attention, ironically is on a federally backed program that was designed to help poor black families purchase their own home outside of grossly overcrowded Roxbury, where 90 percent of Boston's blacks now live.

The plan, begun in the post-racial tensions of 1968, called for 24 Boston banks to pool \$29 million to make federally guaranteed loans to about 2,000 Roxbury families for mortgages.

The Senate investigation established last week that the banks decided before granting any loans and without the knowledge of the public—to place a "blue line" around Mattapan and restrict virtually all of the loans for home purchases to that community.

Real estate speculators, armed with bank maps showing the blue line, moved in by the dozen and helped to set off a wave of panic selling by the middle class Jewish residents, who frequently sold at well below the fair market value for their homes. Many of the houses were mortgage free. They were then sold to blacks at prices well in excess of their value at interest rates of 8 per cent.

The FBI, although it is observing its usual reserve about the object of its investigation, is known to be asking a number of questions about a federal Housing Administration official whose son operates a real estate business in Mattapan.

A representative of the U.S. Attorney's office said he couldn't predict what—if anything—will be taken before a federal grand jury, but he added that, "you can be sure we aren't about to indict any bank."

An official of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, speaking in a voice of frustration, said he doubted any serious action would be taken either by the Justice Department or his department.

"There isn't any law that specifically covers what has been done to Mattapan," said the HUD official. "The most serious crime committed there is that they set black against white and have further poisoned race relations in this city. It's a shame but not a crime."

Chairman Philip A. Hart (D-Mich.) of the Senate Antitrust Subcommittee, which conducted three days of hearings here last week, said he wasn't sure whether any federal laws had been violated, either.

But he said that what he has learned here about the role of the banks and the federal government in Mattapan's transition has led him to a disturbing conclusion.

"Sooner or later," Hart said at the end of the hearing, "if we fail to remove the racial lines from our society, forces could be unleashed that would destroy us."

"UNBELIEVABLE PRICE"

Robert Fortes, friend and neighbor of Lewis Gilbert and former president of the interracial Mattapan Neighborhood Block Association, told Hart that the destructive process is already well on its way and that black people "are already paying an unbelievable price."

The plan under examination was designed to bring together the banks and the federal government in a new venture to provide low-income blacks with the opportunity to purchase their own homes.

It provided that 24 of Boston's largest savings banks under the title of Boston Banks Urban Renewal Group (BBURG, pronounced bee-burg) would commit a pool of \$29 million to providing mortgages for home ownership. The Federal Housing Administration agreed to guarantee the mortgages at the prevailing market rate of interest.

BBURG opened an office in Roxbury in 1968.

Boston's blacks have in recent years moved in a southerly pattern. For years they lived mostly in the South End, then moved south to Roxbury and from there to North Dorchester. Each time they replaced the Jews, who had before them replaced the Irish.

Following Blue Hill Avenue south on a map, Mattapan appeared to be the next area into which blacks might move. What was not known in 1968 is that the banks—as they later readily acknowledged—had drawn a line several miles south of Dorchester, designating that all BBURG loans would be made in or north of Mattapan. Less than 15% of BBURG loans are outside the blue line.

Joseph H. Bachellor Jr., chairman of the BBURG steering committee and retired president of Suffolk Franklin Savings Bank, was asked by Hart's subcommittee why the banks had made the bulk of their loans to blacks in Mattapan.

"We didn't always go inside the line," Bachellor said, but he conceded it was done in the overwhelming number of cases because, he said, it was a natural pattern.

Bachellor said the banks determined the line as a business—"not a social"—decision, mindful of how white depositors might react if loans were made in other sections.

THE "BBURG LINE"

Walter Smart, the relocation officer for the Boston Redevelopment Authority during the period when the BBURG home ownership program, was one of the first blacks in Boston to see a map showing what has since come to be known as the "BBURG line."

Smart testified that he complained frequently to his superiors about the line, arguing that it was unfair to restrict blacks to particular areas and that it would result in the "ghettoization" of Mattapan.

He wasn't the only person worried about that problem. The Jews of Mattapan were, by then, being deluged with telephone calls from real estate offices that had sprung up along Blue Hill Avenue.

"Don't get caught being the last white on your block," several witnesses before Hart quoted the real estate operators as warning. The operators also reportedly said that crime scares were sweeping through the community.

But Bachellor, whose group was providing the mortgages, told Hart:

"We who have been involved with the BBURG effort are proud of the contribution which we believe we have made toward retarding urban decay in the disadvantaged areas of our city."

Gibert, president of the Mattapan Neighborhood Block Association, said his group would like to call a temporary halt to mortgage lending for Roxbury blacks in Mattapan because the community is being victimized by speculators.

Some real estate records for Mattapan reflect instances in which speculators held a piece of property for less than a month, then resold it—to blacks—for profits of \$5,000 to \$10,000.

As Mattapan has become an unstable community, blacks like Gibert and Fortes are increasingly fearful that their investments in their homes will be lost if property begins to deteriorate. Signs of that deterioration are visible.

"A community," Gibert said, "is not a ghetto just because it's mostly black. But what is happening here is that the speculators are draining the lifeblood out of this community. They chase the whites out, they falsify the applications for loans and sell houses to people who can't afford them. Then the poor black defaults on the loan. One house in Mattapan at 72 Messinger St. has been sold three times in the last year by the same real estate man."

The move of blacks from Roxbury to Dorchester has stimulated the drug addicts to hit the houses of the community. Crime is on the rise, and so is fear.

When Lewis Gibert decided to take a brief vacation this summer, he first removed every valuable from his house that wasn't nailed down.

"We put all our winter clothing in the trunk of the car and carried it with us 900 miles to Ohio and back again," Gibert said. "We just couldn't afford to lose our clothing."

But last Friday, after the week of hearings and what Gibert described as the "strain and tumult," he drove his family to Cape Cod for the weekend without taking the same precautions.

"I got a call down there this morning," Gibert said yesterday. "My neighbor said, 'I have bad news for you. They got you.'" Items stolen include a color television set and a new watch Gibert's wife gave him for his birthday.

Blacks here are bitter about the BBURG program's role because they are convinced it could have been carried out another way with different consequences.

"Why did they have to insist that they would only loan money in one area of the city?" Fortes asked. "If they had spread that program all over the city, it would have had a very different result."

"Maybe after all is said and done," Forbes said, "it's what all of this does to your kids that hurts you the most. Black people are paying a terrible price for change. I'm not sure it's a bearable price."