

were on active duty at Pearl Harbor on December 7, 1941; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ARCHER:

H.R. 11071. A bill relating to compensation in the case of disability or death of marine petroleum workers; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BLACKBURN:

H.R. 11072. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act with respect to the duty to bargain, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BYRON:

H.R. 11073. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exclude from gross income the entire amount of the compensation of members of the Armed Forces of the United States who are prisoners of war, missing in action, or in a detained status during the Vietnam conflict; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts:

H.R. 11074. A bill to establish a Commission on Penal Reforms; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KYROS:

H.R. 11075. A bill to require the protection, management, and control of wild free-roaming horses and burros on public lands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. McCLURE:

H.R. 11076. A bill to incorporate Pop Warner Little Scholars, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PEYSER:

H.R. 11077. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase the amount of outside earnings permitted each year without any deductions from benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PRICE of Texas (for himself,

Mr. CAMP, Mr. COLLINS of Texas, Mr. EDMONDSON, Mr. FISHER, Mr. PASSMAN, Mr. RABICK, Mr. SEBELIUS, Mr. SHRIVER, and Mr. WARE):

H.R. 11078. A bill to provide a tax credit for expenditures made in the exploration and development of new reserves of oil and gas in the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SHIPLEY:

H.R. 11079. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide income tax simplification, reform, and relief for small business; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ULLMAN (for himself, Mr. ASPINALL, Mr. JOHNSON of California, and Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN):

H.R. 11080. A bill relating to the income tax treatment of just compensation received from the United States with respect to property taken under the act of the Congress which established the Redwood National Park; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VANDER JAGT:

H.R. 11081. A bill to establish a Commission on Penal Reforms; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin:

H.R. 11082. A bill to amend title IV of the Social Security Act to increase the amount of Federal reimbursement to States under the aid to families with dependent children program for the cost of locating and securing support from parents who have deserted or abandoned their children receiving aid under such program, and to provide that the State welfare agencies may utilize the services of private collection agencies and similar organizations and entities in locating such parents and securing support for such children; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CAMP (for himself and Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina, Mr. MEEDS, Mrs. DWYER, Mr. PASSMAN, Mr. SCHWENDEL, Mr. SKUBITZ, Mr. WIGGINS, Mr. EDMONDSON, Mr. BELCHER, Mr. STEED, Mr. CRANE, and Mr. JARMAN):

H.J. Res. 911. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim the week of April 2 through 8 of 1972 as "National Future Business Leaders of America and Phi Lambda Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POFF (for himself, Mr. FOUNTAIN, Mr. ABBITT, Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia, Mr. JONAS, Mr. LENNON, Mr. DOWNING, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. HENDERSON, Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. SATERFIELD, Mr. WAMPLER, Mr. GALIFIANAKIS, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. DANIEL of Virginia, Mr. MEZELL, Mr. PREYER of North Carolina, Mr. RUTH, Mr. WHITEHURST, and Mr. ROBINSON of Virginia):

H.J. Res. 912. Joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to an agreement between the States of North Carolina and Virginia establishing their lateral seaward boundary; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ST GERMAIN:

H.J. Res. 913. Joint resolution to assure

that every needy schoolchild will receive a free or reduced-price lunch as required by section 9 of the National School Lunch Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. RYAN:

H. Con. Res. 414. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that any individual whose earnings are substandard or who is amongst the working poor or near poor should be exempt from any wage freeze under the Economic Stabilization Act of 1970, as amended, and amendments thereto and regulations issued thereunder pursuant to Executive Order 11615; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H. Res. 633. Resolution providing for the printing of additional copies of the committee print entitled "Review of SEC Records of the Demise of Selected Broker-Dealers"; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin (for

himself, Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. BRINKLEY, Mr. BROWN of Michigan, Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina, Mr. BURLESON of Texas, Mr. FINDLEY, Mr. HANSEN of Idaho, Mr. HARVEY, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. LANDGREBE, Mr. MCCOLLISTER, Mr. MARTIN, Mr. MAYNE, Mr. MICHEL, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. MYERS, Mr. NELSEN, Mr. NICHOLS, Mr. PERKINS, Mr. PRICE of Texas, Mr. QUITE, Mr. SCHERLE, and Mr. SCOTT):

H. Res. 634. Resolution urging the President to press for U.S. agricultural trade rights with the European Economic Community; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin (for himself, Mr. SIKES, Mr. SHRIVER, Mr. SKUBITZ, Mr. TEAGUE of California, Mr. TERRY, Mr. THONE, Mr. VEYSEY, Mr. WAGGONER, Mr. WINN, Mr. ZWACH, Mr. CARTER, and Mr. ROBINSON of Virginia):

H. Res. 635. Resolution urging the President to press for U.S. agricultural trade rights with the European Economic Community; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin presented a bill (H.R. 11083) for the relief of the estate of William C. Kirsten, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

UNHOOKING ADDICTS

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, October 4, 1971

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS a serious article written by Mr. Jerry Finkelstein, published as an editorial in the New York Law Journal, and reprinted as a column in The New York Times on September 11, 1971. There is no more vital a domestic problem facing the American society than that of drug addiction and drug abuse. Mr. Finkelstein's proposal calling for a "Manhattan Project" to end the drug menace is one that deserves serious attention, and I am delighted that this talented man is putting his energies and

his mind to work addressing itself to that problem.

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

[From the New York Times, Sept. 11, 1971]

UNHOOKING ADDICTS

(By Jerry Finkelstein)

An astronaut, back from the moon, displays symptoms of an unknown disease. The disease spreads, killing many and permanently disabling most of those who contract it. What comes next?

Any science fiction fan knows that the President declares a national emergency and appoints a czar with plenary powers to meet the threat.

Men, money and materials would be co-opted.

Red tape would dissolve.

All who could conceivably contribute to solving the problems would do so, willy-nilly.

The Manhattan Project, the New Deal and the space program would be dwarfed by com-

parison. And the finest minds, backed by the resources and power of our country, would solve the problems. The threat would be overcome.

That is fantasy. But is reality better? We have our own mutating Andromeda Strain in the opiates, barbiturates, amphetamines and hallucinogens. Cocaine has re-emerged and laboratories are inventing synthetics and derivatives faster than they can be outlawed. Instead of infection we have addiction.

Our present Andromeda Strain did not come from the moon or outer space. It comes from the poppy fields of Turkey via the laboratories of Marseilles, the hemp fields of Mexico, the chemical laboratories of great universities and from dozens of other sources. It is spread by human rats and lice rather than more primitive vectors. It does not kill quickly and cleanly nor disable neatly and tidily. It also degrades.

It is unnecessary to dwell on the scope of the drug crisis. Anyone who needs to be convinced that there is a drug epidemic must be a newly trained translator in Peking.

What do we actually have to meet the drug

crisis? Piecemeal programs and minuscule financing. Temporizing statements and dangerous panaceas.

The lack of basic research is frightening. We know more about moon rocks than marijuana. Is it dangerous or not? Should we legalize it or class it with the hard drugs? Ironically, the only answer given as to why marijuana and other hallucinogens should not be legalized comes not from science but from history. Only two societies tolerated the widespread use of hallucinogens: the Arab, which then managed to turn the most fertile part of its world into a desert; and peyote-chewing tribes, whose noblest hour came as their hearts were ripped out as human sacrifices to foreign gods.

As to hard drugs, a current palliative is methadone, which, like heroin, is a derivative of opium. Even as a palliative, this is inadequate; and we must heed the nagging memory that the original use for heroin, as the authority Hindesmith notes, was "as a non-habit-forming substitute for opium or morphine or as a cure for drug addiction."

What is urgently needed is a strongly financed, well-coordinated mobilization of the nation's resources to develop a comprehensive program to put an end to this national disaster and disgrace.

The United States has attacked many difficult problems and found solutions through massive injections of money and talent. Drug abuse should be approached in the same manner.

Why haven't the obvious steps been taken? Cost should be no consideration. The Manhattan Project produced the atomic bomb—and radioactive isotopes are a mainstay of modern medicine.

The space program put men on the moon—and whole industries produce undreamt of products (including advanced prosthetics) as a result.

Can one conceive of the potential by-products of the war on addiction? Wholly apart from the heartbreak tragedies prevented, the crime and corruption uprooted, and the malaise of fear eliminated, we can predict priceless discoveries in biochemistry, psychology and many other fields.

Who would oppose any remotely reasonable steps taken?

Industrialists with billions lost annually from lowered productivity, absenteeism and theft?

Unions with their members fearful for their children?

Farmers with the infection now spreading to the most remote communities?

Churches?

Blacks?

Judges and lawyers?

Physicians?

Shopkeepers?

Liberals?

Conservatives?

Only organized crime would oppose a war on addiction.

How old are your daughters and granddaughters? I have two granddaughters and hope for more. I would revere any man who could wipe out addiction—and so would you.

Polio crippled, but it did not debase. Cancer kills, but it does not degrade.

We honored Drs. Salk and Sabin for conquering polio. A greater mantle awaits the conqueror of cancer.

Why has no one made a name for himself as Mr. Anti-Addiction? Is it because the job of making any serious impact is too great for anyone but the President of the United States?

The President has a unique opportunity. Already, with the freeze, he has established that he has the capacity for taking drastic action, together with the ability to accept ideas from others regardless of party. I pray that he will use his great powers against the

common enemy of mankind and start to vanquish addiction now. We can't wait.

## OPPOSITION TO WYLIE AMENDMENT, HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 191

HON. JAMES C. CORMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 4, 1971

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, in an effort to bring about a greater understanding of the dangers inherent in House Joint Resolution 191, I plan to submit statements daily in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by experts in the fields of religion, education, and constitutional law discussing their opposition to the Wylie amendment.

Today, I would like to direct the attention of my colleagues to a staff report from the Baptist Joint Committee on Public Affairs which was prepared for the Senate's consideration in 1967 when a similar amendment was being debated in the other body. I would like to commend this report to my colleagues' attention believing that the arguments it contains are applicable to the present House Joint Resolution 191, which is the current point of debate in the House.

The report follows:

### THE 1967 PRAYER AMENDMENT—SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 1

Senate Joint Resolution 1 of the 90th Congress is a proposed amendment to the federal constitution. Introduced by Senator Everett McKinley Dirksen (R., Ill.), it reads as follows:

"SECTION 1. Nothing contained in this Constitution shall abridge the right of persons lawfully assembled, in any public building which is supported in whole or in part through the expenditure of public funds, to participate in nondenominational prayer.

SECTION 2. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within seven years from the date of its submission to the States by the Congress."

This proposal is so different from the prayer amendment which the same Senator introduced into the 89th Congress that it needs special study, and the contrast between the two amendments helps point up the relationship between the two religion clauses of the First Amendment.

### AN ARGUMENT THAT THE PROPOSAL IS MEANINGLESS

The prayer decisions of the Supreme Court can be used to make an argument that Senate Joint Resolution 1 is meaningless. These decisions can be summarized as follows: The Supreme Court held that public schools may not sponsor religious exercises regardless of their voluntary nature and regardless of whether the exercises include state-written, nonsectarian prayers or Scriptural prayer and Bible reading. This prohibition rests on the meaning of the establishment clause of the First Amendment. (See *Engel v. Vitale*, 370 U.S. 421, 1962; *Abington School District v. Schempp* and *Murray v. Curlett*, 374 U.S. 203, 1963.)

These decisions dealt with the *power of governments*, not the right of persons. They interpreted only the *establishment clause*.

In contrast, the proposed amendment deals with the *right of persons*. Thus, it must be

considered an addition to, or an amplification of clarification of the First Amendment's *free exercise clause*.

In light of this difference of emphasis, a question arises: Can an amendment that touches the concerns of the free exercise clause produce a change in the meaning of the establishment clause? Obviously, there is a relationship between these two clauses both in law and fact. But the connection is subtle enough so that a good case can be developed against the utility of the proposed amendment by arguing that it does not affect the part of the Constitution that it is intended to affect.

Let us assume that the proposal were ratified as a part of the Constitution. Also, we will assume that some school board subsequently adopted a rule that its teachers begin each school day with a religious exercise for the pupils. We will make the exercise purely voluntary and nondenominational and assume that the teachers carry out the rule tactfully. Nevertheless, some persons take legal action calling the practice an unconstitutional establishment of religion.

Lawyers for the plaintiffs would cite the school board's rule and the school's practices. They would point out that in the 1962 and 1963 prayer cases the high court decided that governments had no power to engage in such practices.

Attorneys for the school board would cite the new prayer amendment. But what word or words, clause or clauses, in it could be said to give governments the powers the Supreme Court said they did not have in the prayer cases? Could not the lawyers for the plaintiff simply say the new amendment gives no new power to any government? The rulings of 1962 and 1963 stand.

Certainly that conclusion would be right if we consider only expressly granted power in the proposal. But does Senate Joint Resolution 1 imply a grant of power to government? Could not our hypothetical school board's attorneys argue as follows: The 1962 and 1963 prayer decisions were much criticized. The criticism centered in the idea that classroom prayer was both good and constitutionally proper. The criticism produced many proposed amendments including the one being discussed. That amendment must be interpreted in light of its history to imply a grant of power to government to conduct school prayers.

One can imagine that the Supreme Court could disagree or agree with that argument. It could disagree by saying that if those who proposed the amendment had wanted to add to government power, they would never have talked only about the right of persons. They would, rather, have used the sort of words used in the 1966 prayer amendment proposal which the Senate defeated. That amendment read in part as follows:

"Nothing in this Constitution shall prohibit the authority administering any school . . . or building supported . . . through the expenditure of public funds from providing for or permitting the voluntary participation by students or others in prayer."

Since that proposed amendment clearly gave governments power to provide and permit public school prayers, and since it was defeated, the Court might say that it could not assume that the newer amendment could be used to imply a grant of power which the Congress had rejected one year before.

The Court could buttress this line of reasoning by observing that it had taken up the relationship between the right of persons and power of government in connection with schoolroom prayer in the *Schempp* case. It will be recalled that the sole dissenter in that case, Justice Potter Stewart, had attacked the majority opinion because, he said, it deprived children of the right of free exercise of religion through Bible reading and prayer. But the Court had replied:

"... While the Free Exercise Clause clearly prohibits the use of State action to deny the rights of free exercise to anyone, it has never meant that a majority could use the machinery of the State to practice its beliefs. Such a contention was effectively answered by Mr. Justice Jackson for the Court in *West Virginia Board of Education v. Barnette* (319 U.S. 624, 638 (1943)):

"The very purpose of a Bill of Rights was to withdraw certain subjects from the vicissitudes of political controversy, to place them beyond the reach of majorities and officials and to establish them as legal principles to be applied by the courts. One's right to . . . freedom of worship . . . and other fundamental rights may not be submitted to vote; they depend on the outcome of no elections."

Could not the Court conclude that then as now forbidding governments the power to provide prayer does not deny the rights of free exercise to anyone?

The Court might well say that since its view on this issue had been public knowledge, any amendment passed to restore power to the machinery of the State to promote the practice of religious belief would necessarily have to say that it was doing precisely that thing.

Of course, if it took this line of argument, the Court would understand that its logic made the new amendment apparently meaningless. But this would not be novel. In a memorable decision of the past, the Supreme Court dispatched a supposedly crucial amendment as being only a repetition of what was already implied in the Constitution. It said that the Tenth Amendment "states but a truism that all is retained which has not been surrendered. There is nothing in the history of its adoption to suggest that it was more than declaratory of the relationship between the national and state governments as it had been established by the Constitution before the amendment." (*United States v. Darby Lumber Co.* 312 U.S. 100, 1941). Could it not argue that the new amendment similarly was only a reaffirmation of the religious liberty clause of the First Amendment?

However, if at some future date the Supreme Court's judges felt unsure about the wisdom of their past prayer decisions or if they wanted to avoid another "anti-prayer" decision for fear of a public relations storm, one can imagine that the judges could accept the argument that the attorneys of our hypothetical school board put forward. The acceptance would not be easy in light of the words used by the Court in the past and the words used in the proposed amendment, but men have ways with words that make the acceptance imaginable, at least.

#### WHY THE WORDS WERE CHOSEN

If the proposal is as uncertainly fitted to the purpose of undoing the 1962 and 1963 prayer decisions as we have just said, why is it worded as it is? Several answers suggest themselves:

First, it may be that the drafters did not understand the law and issues involved. This seems most unlikely. The Senator and his staff and the consultants on whom he can rely are very able and well informed.

Second, it could be viewed as an effort to get votes. Championing children's prayers and certain elements of our heritage is popular. Forcing opponents to appear to oppose children's prayers and cherished past practices is politically useful. Since the Constitution makes the amending process more or less a part of the regular political process of the nation, such political use of that process is inevitable.

Third, it could be viewed as a necessary compromise to get some prayer amendment proposal adopted even though the amendment was at best ambiguous. The 1964 Becker proposal which was expressly tied to the establishment clause and which clearly

implied grants of power to governments in religious matters could not get out of the House committee. The 1966 Dirksen proposal mentioned above with its governmental power to provide for and to permit prayer was defeated on the Senate floor. From these defeats it might have been concluded that if any prayer amendment was to receive Congressional approval, an indirect device would have to be found. Making the "right of persons" the center of that device.

This explanation of the words, of course, implies that the drafters felt forced to gamble that the Court, if it ever interpreted the amendment, might possibly use these ambiguous words to defend the constitutionality of classroom prayer. That is, the proposers of the amendment had been defeated where their purpose was clear, so they had to try a vocabulary that made their purpose unclear. But this attempt necessarily made the constitutional meaning of their proposal uncertain.

#### FREE EXERCISE AND THE ESTABLISHMENT CLAUSE

This discussion highlights one of the relationships between the free exercise and the establishment clauses of the First Amendment. The freedom of religion the courts will support does not include the freedom to participate in government organized devotions like those formerly held in many public schools. This statement must be qualified, because inaugurations and patriotic ceremonies include "devotions." It must be qualified also by noting the acceptability of worship services conducted by the chaplains.

For persons who believe that their religion requires government devotional exercises like those once held in schools, the unwillingness of the courts to allow such practices can be called a diminution of liberty. The number of such persons in the United States must be very few indeed. Does their interest outweigh the interest of those who believe that the use of government authority and resources for classroom prayers violates the establishment clause? We think not. But we can imagine that a religion could develop so tied to American nationalism that it would require regular government sponsored prayers and the teaching of prayers by government officials. This would alarm us, for it would make freedom of religion and separation of church and state incompatible. As presently defined in American law they are happily compatible.

#### OTHER ISSUES FROM THE PROPOSAL'S WORDING

1. *The limitation of "public building"*: The proposal discusses the right of persons in any public building supported by public expenditures. Some past religious liberty cases have related to public streets and parks. (*Cox v. New Hampshire*, 312 U.S. 569, 1941; *Kung v. New York*, 340 U.S. 290, 1951; *Niemotko v. Maryland*, 340 U.S. 268, 1951; *Fowler v. Rhode Island*, 345 U.S. 136, 1953.) In these cases, the right of persons to use these facilities for religious expression has been clearly settled, though some state controls will be allowed.

Would the phrase, "in any public building, possibly erode the present rights in other public places? That is, does the inclusion of one thing mean the exclusion of another? For some legal purposes it does.

The answer to the question of the impact of "public buildings" depends on how the proposal, if adopted, were interpreted to relate to the First Amendment. If it were called a clarification of the First Amendment, then it could limit present rights because of the specification of location. If it were called an addition to the First Amendment, then it would not limit present rights. We assume it would be called an addition to the First Amendment, but the use of the limiting phrase is worrisome.

Since the prayer cases that produced this proposal related to schools, it must be remembered that "public buildings" include much more: court houses, office build-

ings, police stations, Pentagon, White House, etc. Certainly, the law which makes for the ordered use of these buildings would not be undone by the amendment, but it might be modified by it.

2. *The meaning of "lawfully assembled"*: Several decisions in American law have had to relate lawful assembly in public places to free religious expression. The cases referred to in the previous paragraph are illustrations. In the decisions concerning streets and parks courts have noted that in democracies these places have historically been available for the ventilation of ideas. Lawful assembly on a public street or in a park may require a parade license or meeting permit, but the license and permit must be awarded in ways which give the awarding authority no discretion to limit free expression. We know of no cases which have related lawful assembly in public buildings to religious freedom, though at the state level of government some may exist. Certainly, a "pray-in" occasioned by the civil rights movement could raise the question.

The standards of lawful assembly in a public building must be somewhat more exacting than for lawful assembly in a public park or public street. Picketing can be barred from the former while it is permitted in the latter. We know that an unlawfully assembled group may be dispersed at the present time, even if it is saying prayers. Thus, the need for the phrase is not apparent.

Perhaps the phrase, "lawfully assembled," is only intended to quiet fears that the proposal might be used as a means to protect an unlawfully assembled group from expulsion from a public building. One can imagine that some groups would oscillate between causing trouble in a public building and praying when the time of their expulsion drew near. But, certainly, this can be handled under present law.

3. *The meaning of "non-denominational prayer"*: Persons now have a right to pray under American law. No decisions limit their right to pray in public buildings. To be sure, one can assume that some limits circumscribe that right as they circumscribe all rights. If the prayer were public and if it contained obscene attacks on public officials in its language or if it interrupted a normal public function, a court might forbid it. In *Chaplinsky v. New Hampshire*, 315 U.S. 568, 1942, the Supreme Court refused to allow public swearing at an officer of the law as a right of free expression.

The proposed amendment ties the right of persons to "non-denominational" prayers only. Would this mean that if a group of Baptist students got together at lunch in a public school to pray, the location of their prayer would determine that it had to be "non-denominational"? That is, does the proposal limit present rights?

Since the proposal would, if adopted, stand alongside of the First Amendment, the answer to that question would depend on whether the courts viewed the newer amendment as explanation of what the First Amendment meant or as an addition to it. Just as in the case of the meaning of "public buildings," if the proposal explains the First Amendment, then the word "non-denominational" could be viewed as a limit. If it is an addition to the First Amendment, then the word would not seem important for that kind of prayer and denominational prayers, as well, are not forbidden now to private persons or voluntary groups.

In any case, the meaning of "non-denominational" must be treated as less than clear. Federal courts have not defined that term to our knowledge. State courts have treated property problems where the word "denominational" was an issue. These property cases would not be very helpful in determining what a "non-denominational" prayer was. Judges would be forced to sail on legally uncharted seas.

## CONCLUSIONS

The staff of the Baptist Joint Committee on Public Affairs remains convinced of the adequacy in law of the First Amendment to maintain free religion. That amendment gives ample religious rights to persons. Since it has been interpreted in many cases, its meaning has been subject to legal interpretation known to all.

Senate Joint Resolution 1 is ambiguous at its core, for it tries to affect court decisions based on the establishment clause with words appropriate to the free exercise clause. The resolution could be easily interpreted out of existence if it were adopted. We think that amendments to the basic law charter of our liberties should be more clearly drawn to achieve their announced purposes, and then they should be the subject of extensive public discussion.

We further find that the proposal's wording touches on other matters, i.e., the meanings of "public buildings," "lawfully assembled," and "non-denominational," in ways that raise problems now not raised by the First Amendment as interpreted. This reinforces our resolve to maintain that the First Amendment is all we presently need to preserve our broad religious liberties.

#### HEAVY POWER TRANSMISSION EQUIPMENT INDUSTRY CONTINUES TO FACE UNFAIR FOREIGN COMPETITION

### HON. RICHARD S. SCHWEIKER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, October 4, 1971

Mr. SCHWEIKER. Mr. President, in October of 1970, I joined other Members of Congress in writing to the President about the serious situation which then faced the heavy power transmission equipment industry in this country. Regrettably, the situation has not improved; in fact, it has become even more serious.

The senior Senator from Pennsylvania, HUGH SCOTT, and I have just recently joined in again urging the President to take affirmative steps to end the unfair foreign discrimination against American products and to save the jobs of many American workers in this industry which are today in serious danger of being wiped out.

On March 11, 1970, or over 18 months ago, Westinghouse Electric Corp. requested that the Bureau of Customs investigate their complaint that foreign manufacturers of this kind of equipment were dumping their products on the American market. The Treasury Department is now attempting to complete such investigations within a period of 1 year, but in this case the investigation has taken considerably more than 1 year. I have strongly urged that the Treasury investigation be concluded at the earliest possible date. In addition, I am again recommending that the administration set a time limit on the period within which antidumping findings must be made.

Another factor in this matter is that Government-owned utilities such as the Tennessee Valley Authority, the Bonneville Power Administration, and the Bu-

reau of Reclamation have been purchasing about 95 percent of their power transformers from foreign countries. I suggested in October of 1970, and again recommend, that such buying be stopped immediately. These utilities should adopt a moratorium on the purchase of foreign-source equipment pending the elimination of the inequities in foreign trade of these products.

Third, I recommend that the price differential between foreign and domestic bids under the Buy American Act be increased to a level which would exclude foreign suppliers from countries which now effectively prohibit American manufacturers from selling in their markets.

It is urgent that we come to grips with this serious problem as soon as possible. Further delay would only serve to weaken our domestic industry and further imperil the jobs of American workers.

#### INFORMATION FOR THE CONGRESS

### HON. JACK BROOKS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 4, 1971

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, title II of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970 contains a key to vastly improved congressional access to policy-relevant information in the executive branch.

This title, in sections 201-2, calls for standardization of the Executive's budgetary and fiscal data systems in a manner that will meet requirements of all branches of the Federal Government.

The Office of Management and Budget and Department of the Treasury are directed to establish and maintain the standardized system in cooperation with the Comptroller General, acting as the agent of Congress. The close working relationship between the Executive and congressional agencies was designed to insure that development of the system moves forward as rapidly as is consistent with effective planning—and that it fully meets the needs of Congress for budgetary and fiscal information and data.

In short, the proper and efficient implementation of these sections of the act is vitally important to Congress. The work now under way on this project will affect future congressional capability to formulate new programs, to evaluate administration proposals, and to review existing programs and executive activities.

At present, executive branch study groups are developing standard classifications for Federal programs, activities, receipts, and expenditures. The Comptroller General's staff is surveying the fiscal and budgetary information requirements of congressional committees and individual Members of the House and Senate. The survey results will be conveyed to the executive study groups and will serve as the basis for reporting to the Congress—and assessing—standards proposed by OMB and the Treasury.

If the future budget and fiscal data

system is to serve the policymaking and oversight functions of Congress and if the information it produced is to be accumulated and made available in support of congressional needs for adequate data and analysis, it is essential that Members and committees assist the Comptroller General in his effort to define congressional requirements.

Interviews with committee staff employees are being conducted now. The Comptroller General has advised me that individual Members or their staff employees may participate in the survey by calling Capitol extension 58038 and arranging for the GAO interviewers to meet with them.

The Joint Committee on Congressional Operations is following implementation of sections 201-2 of the 1970 act closely and will continue to do so. As chairman of the Joint Committee, it is my hope that all Members and committees will cooperate to the fullest extent possible with the staff of the Comptroller General so that he, in turn, will be prepared to express and defend congressional interests in the development and operation of this information system.

For the convenience of Members, I am inserting at this point in the RECORD a fact sheet on the standardized budget and fiscal system prepared by the General Accounting Office and a letter from the Comptroller General dated September 28, 1971, describing the latest developments in this program:

#### QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS REGARDING THE BUDGET AND FISCAL INFORMATION PROVISIONS OF THE LEGISLATIVE REORGANIZATION ACT OF 1970

##### WHY IS IT IMPORTANT TO THE CONGRESS?

The majority of congressional budgetary and fiscal information needs must be filled from the executive branch's information systems. If these systems are designed to provide the types of information the Congress wants, the Congress will be able to get timely, relevant, and reliable information in the forms desired. Last year the Congress directed that its needs be considered in the development of a standard system and standard classifications. The first step toward developing the standard system is to get everybody using the same language (standard classifications). The executive branch has formed task groups to develop the standard classifications. It is essential that the Congress define and communicate its requirements to these groups. The General Accounting Office is the action agency of the Congress for ensuring that the congressional needs are met.

##### WHAT DOES THE ACT REQUIRE?

Standardized information and data processing system for budgetary and fiscal data. Standard classifications of Federal programs, activities, receipts, and expenditures.

The Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970 requires the development of a standardized information and data processing system for budget and fiscal data. To serve adequately the needs of decision makers and other users throughout Government, that system must have the ability to accumulate and compare data on Federal activities and programs within individual agencies and also those that cut across agency lines.

As recognized in the act, achievement of this desired goal will require the development and maintenance of standard classifications for programs, activities, receipts, and expenditures of Federal agencies. These classifications and the data processing system will have to be highly versatile so as to pro-

vide information needed by those concerned with all aspects of Government—program development and authorization; revenue estimation, legislation and collection; budgeting and appropriations; Government operations and program evaluation; and general economic and social analysis and evaluation. The "initial classification" is to be established on or before December 31, 1971.

The Office of Management and Budget and the Department of the Treasury are required to develop and maintain the system "in cooperation with the Comptroller General." The Comptroller General's role, as the agent of Congress, is to ensure that the needs of the Congress for budget and fiscal data can be met by the system so developed.

**WHAT ARE SOME OF THE PROBLEMS REGARDING BUDGETARY AND FISCAL DATA WHICH NEED SOLVING?**

Data may not be obtainable.

Data often not compatible.

Data often coded differently in different agencies.

Those who use budgetary and fiscal information for decision making and program evaluation occasionally become frustrated over the inability to obtain, compare or correlate data from several sources.

Sometimes data on a function (such as oceanographics) in which more than one agency may be engaged is available from one agency, but not from another.

Sometimes the comparison or aggregation of data is meaningless because of the different definition or collection procedures used by the agencies. For example, the definition of a "poor family" used by one agency may be different from that used by another agency.

Sometimes data is available and useable except that each agency may have used different coding for classifying the information. For example, the number and location of hospital beds in Federal hospitals may be coded one way by one agency and another way by a different agency, thus complicating the comparison or combining of the two.

The development of the standard classifications and a standard data system is to be directed toward eliminating all three data problems. Thus, information needed by congressmen, administrators and evaluators will be available from all relevant sources and all sources will be using the same definitions and coding schemes.

**WHAT IS GOING TO BE DONE?**

The Comptroller General, as agent of the Congress, will undertake to determine the legislative branch needs and review proposed classifications and data system to ensure that they meet these needs.

The Office of Management and Budget and the Department of the Treasury are to develop and maintain the classifications and data system. They are studying current budgetary and fiscal classifications and determining the executive branch needs.

A General Accounting Office task group will meet with Members of Congress, their staffs, and committee staffs to (1) inform them of the actions taken by the Office of Management and Budget and the Department of the Treasury since the law was enacted and (2) explore the possible budgetary and fiscal data classifications in relation to each committee's operations and needs and desires for such data. If useful data is to be obtained, it is very important that the technical people who will influence the nature of the classifications have a broad understanding of the interests of the information users. Interviews will be started early in September.

Along with the requirements determination, the present classification structures will be studied. Federal departments and agencies are furnishing copies of the various classifications they use. Executive branch task groups are to (1) sift this material to

find out the extent of compatibility, (2) identify opportunities for making improvements, (3) define what classification can be developed by December 31, 1971, and (4) develop proposed standard classifications. The task groups will reconcile the needs of the various branches of the Government. Some of the factors that will have to be considered in reconciling the needs and formulating the standard classifications are: (1) the benefits to be derived from having the information, (2) the feasibility of obtaining the data, (3) the cost of collecting, storing, and processing the data, and (4) the flexibility to meet changing requirements.

**HOW LONG WILL IT TAKE?**

The intent is that the initial classifications due December 31, 1971, will show tangible progress and that substantial additional classifications will be completed prior to the September 1, 1972, report. Beyond September 1972, the classifications will continue to be revised and changed to meet new needs and better serve all users.

Development of the standardized information and data system will begin in 1972. It will take many years to complete the development and implementation throughout the Federal Government.

**COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES,**

*Washington, D.C., September 28, 1971.*

HON. JACK BROOKS,  
Chairman, Joint Committee on Congressional Operations, Congress of the United States.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This letter is in response to your request to be kept advised of our efforts to carry out our role in the implementation of Title II of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970.

We have begun the interview phase of our study of the congressional needs for budgetary and fiscal information under Title II of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970. We are following the basic plan mentioned in our August 13, 1971, letter to you.

On August 31, 1971, I wrote to all committee chairmen requesting interviews with their staffs. Enclosed is a sample of these letters. Interviews of the committee staffs are now under way.

Within the next few weeks we will be making arrangements for discussions with individual Members or their staffs regarding their needs for budgetary and fiscal data. They will be requested to contact my staff on Capitol extension 58038.

The results of these interviews will provide the basis for our initial recommendations to the executive branch on the congressional needs and the basis for our review and comments on the initial classifications required by the Act to be developed by December 31, 1971. Our efforts, of course, must be of a continuing nature since it may be several years before the ultimate goals can be attained.

We have prepared the enclosed questions and answers regarding our project in the hope that it will be helpful in communicating the importance of congressional involvement in the process.

On September 1, 1971, the Office of Management and Budget and the Department of the Treasury submitted their first annual report under Section 202(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970. Enclosed is a copy of the annual report.

We shall continue to maintain close liaison regarding our efforts under the Act with you and the Joint Committee Staff. Cooperation among all elements of the Congress is essential for successful implementation of Title II of the Act.

Sincerely yours,

ELMER B. STAATS,

*Comptroller General of the United States.*

**SENATOR HUMPHREY STRESSES IMPORTANCE OF WATER RESOURCES IN RURAL DEVELOPMENT**

**HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH**

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Monday, October 4, 1971*

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, in March 1970, the President's Task Force on Rural Development issued a report in which it asked the following rhetorical question:

Do we need remind ourselves more forcefully that when people and industry are jammed together, it brings on the four plagues of compaction: pollution, transportation paralysis, housing blight, and a crime-infested fractured society?

It would seem, Mr. President, that the ills of compaction would by now be so obvious as to be almost a cliché. And yet, we as a nation have been extremely slow to adopt policies and programs which provide an alternative to these "four plagues of compaction."

The only real answer, in my strong opinion, is to achieve a better population balance between rural and urban areas. If we can end the compaction, we can go a long way toward ending the plagues of congestion, crime, transportation paralysis, and housing blight.

The Senate and the Nation are extremely fortunate, Mr. President, to have an articulate and energetic spokesman in this effort to achieve rural revitalization and population balance. As chairman of the Senate Agriculture Subcommittee on Rural Development, the distinguished junior Senator from Minnesota (Mr. HUMPHREY) has provided outstanding leadership. His subcommittee has already come forward with innovative new proposals to stimulate rural growth.

I have long advocated rural development, and as one who has long been associated with this Nation's water resources program, I know that water projects can and should be a major instrument in developing our rural areas. These programs have proven time and time again that they can form the base for economic and social development of less populated areas.

That is why I was extremely pleased to read the speech which the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. HUMPHREY) delivered to the recent joint annual meeting in St. Paul, Minn., of the National Waterways Conference, Inc., and the Upper Mississippi Waterway Association.

As the Senator so eloquently phrased it, Americans will never be able to enjoy the "good life" and overcome these plagues of compaction until we restore the "freedom of residence." That freedom does not exist today, because most people are forced to live in huge metropolitan areas for reasons of economics or shortsighted public policies.

We must, as the able Senator pointed out, provide jobs, opportunities, and a healthy environment in rural areas. We must give the people a choice as to where they want to live. I would hate to think that succeeding generations are doomed

to live in urban areas without even the freedom to choose another place of residence.

As the Senator from Minnesota stressed in his speech, water resource programs and other public works projects "are uniquely suited for rural revitalization. With the exception of urban water supply and flood control, most water resource projects are located in Rural America."

The Senator also exploded another myth when he said:

Public works projects can and do create jobs—that has been recognized for many decades. And they are not dead-end jobs, as some have claimed.

Once again, I congratulate the former Vice President for a far-sighted and meaningful expression of what I consider to be one of the Nation's most urgent needs. And as chairman of the Committee on Public Works, I pledge my efforts to work with the Senator to achieve this worthwhile and absolutely essential revitalization of rural America.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the speech by the Senator from Minnesota be printed in the RECORD.

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

#### FREEDOM TO LIVE THE GOOD LIFE

(By Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY)

If the average American were asked to list some of the freedoms he enjoys in this country, I'm sure he or she could come up with an impressive list: Freedom of press; freedom of speech; freedom of religion; freedom to vote and belong to the political party of your choice; and even freedom to protest against actions of the government.

All of these are cherished freedoms, and we constantly must be on guard against their erosion. We must remember that unless these freedoms are extended to all persons, they potentially can be denied to everyone. So our freedoms must be indivisible and universal in their application.

Today, however, I would like to talk with you about a growing list of freedoms that the average American is just beginning to articulate and demand. These new demands might be summed up as the Freedom to Live the Good Life. Just what do I mean by this expression?

Perhaps the most elementary aspect of the Good Life is the right of personal security and safety in your everyday activities. This is a freedom that most of us took for granted when we were growing up, and it has only been within the last few years that the freedom of personal safety has come under attack.

What kind of life is it to live in constant fear that your children may come under the influence of drugs? Yet, when we look at many of our big cities today, we see just that kind of fear stalking the streets. We read that apartment buildings, schools, and even private homes are becoming virtual armed fortresses.

We add more policemen, but the crime rates continue to go up. Raid after raid and arrest after arrest fails to stem the flow of drugs into our large urban centers, and our children become the victims.

Certainly our citizens cannot have the freedom to live the good life unless they can live in safety, but in recent years neither government nor society seems able to provide that guarantee of freedom.

A second "right" being demanded by our citizens is the freedom to enjoy a quality environment. They are tired of polluted rivers and streams; they are literally sick of polluted air; and they are fed up with noise, traffic jams, and the rush, rush, rush

of everyday life. But how many of our major metropolitan areas can offer an environment free of noxious pollution? Not many, I can tell you.

In a great number of our cities—thank goodness Minneapolis and St. Paul are not yet among them—pollution has become a way of life. Americans in these cities do not wake up to the sunrise; they wake up to haze, fog, and smog. Those of us in Washington often experience days in which you can hardly see the dome of the Capitol because of pollution. Noise levels and traffic jams seem to be on the increase almost everywhere.

I don't think many people would include pollution, noise, and congestion as elements of the good life. Yet fewer and fewer Americans live in an environment free of such things.

Going hand in hand with the demands for a good physical environment is a desire for what might be called psychological freedoms. I have already mentioned the freedom from fear. But we would also like to have neighbors and be neighbors, in the true sense of the word. We would rather not be treated rudely on the streets or the sidewalks. We would rather not be crowded, congested and rushed all the time. We would like to live in an atmosphere of mutual trust and friendship.

But do you find this kind of atmosphere in our big cities? Not very often. People either don't have time to be friendly, or they are afraid that if they extend the hand of friendship they will be betrayed. It has reached the point that people have actually been murdered in broad daylight while passers-by stand around and watch—afraid to get involved. This kind of psychological fear and distrust breeds on itself and can eat away at the very fibre of the Nation.

So our citizens are demanding relief from those terrible psychological stresses and fears which prevents the freedom to live the good life.

More and more Americans are demanding the traditional—but often ignored—freedom of economic security which I suggest is directly tied to yet another freedom—namely—freedom of residence.

The current recession has reminded us once again that "unemployment" and "under employment" are not simply terms in the jargon of economists; they are very real facts of life for millions of our fellow citizens today.

Today's recession has merely compounded the already worsening situation of job opportunity dislocation in our Nation.

Welfare rolls in our big cities have grown to such an extent that welfare now consumes a major portion of the budgets of cities like New York, Washington, D.C., Atlanta, Los Angeles, Detroit, and Chicago. Many of those on these welfare rolls are rural migrants or children of rural migrants. Many of these people simply cannot find work in either their rural communities of their origin or in the big cities to which they have migrated.

Such movements of people have exacerbated the problems of crime; psychological stress and environmental pollution in our larger cities and have stripped our rural countryside of both its potential and its promise.

Add all of these things together and you have anything but the good life. You have something more akin to a life of trial and tribulation. So if we are going to restore the freedom to live the good life, how shall we go about it? Where do we start?

You have no doubt noticed the association I have made between the demands for a good life with what is popularly called the urban crisis. This is no accident, because in most cases the loss of those freedoms which contribute to the good life can be traced directly to the urban crisis.

Many of you here today, who like myself grew up in rural areas or small towns, can remember a time when people thought nothing of leaving their doors unlocked

while running errands or going downtown. Some can probably even remember times when your family occasionally slept with the doors unlocked.

When I grew up in South Dakota a big crime was chicken stealing—not mugging. We knew all our neighbors and worked and played together. We helped each other out in times of trouble. We had our hardships, especially during the depression, but we never turned on each other. We remained good neighbors.

Life was not congested, crowded, nor forever rushed. And the word "pollution" was not even in our vocabulary. We experienced economic insecurity, but there were always friends and family to help out in times of need.

Perhaps some will think I am a romantic who dwells on the "good ole days." That is not my purpose. I am a realist; I know we cannot go back to the "good ole days." We cannot eliminate our cities, nor people's desire to live in them. We cannot indiscriminately close down factories that provide jobs, simply because they create some pollution. Nor can we eliminate crime and drugs merely by wishing they would go away.

No, my friends, these are real problems we are dealing with—and there are no "instant solutions" to them.

But being a realist, I also know there are alternatives to these huge megalopolises which are sprawling so many of the problems inimicable to the good life.

The alternative I want to talk about today is rural development and balanced national growth. Most everybody is familiar with the tremendous migration from our farms and smaller communities to our large cities which has taken place during the last three decades—30 million people in just 3 decades. Many of us in this room were part of those migrations. We have gone from a Nation in which 60 percent of all Americans lived and worked in rural areas at the turn of the century to a time when the rural population makes up less than 30 percent of the population.

Seventy percent of our population lives on less than 2 percent of the land. Demographers tell us this situation is likely to worsen due to projected natural population increases that are expected in our urban areas, plus continued immigration and a continued migration of rural young people to our Nation's large cities.

If our huge metropolitan areas in 1971 no longer provide the freedoms necessary for the Good Life, what will they be like in the year 2000? I almost shudder to think of a situation in which all the job opportunities are limited and further concentrated in our huge metropolitan regions. When we reach that stage, the Good Life will be impossible.

The American people—who often seem to be ahead of the Government in realizing the cause of problems—are very much aware of the connection between overpopulated cities and the problems of crime, drugs, pollution, congestion and psychological stress. As long ago as 1968, a Gallup poll showed that 56 percent of all Americans would prefer to live in rural communities, with 18 percent preferring city life and 25 percent the suburbs.

In a recent poll taken in California, 29 percent of that State's population indicated they would like to leave that State. Of those people who have been there less than 8 years, almost half said they want to live elsewhere.

In the 1970 Agricultural Act and the 1970 Housing and Urban Development Act Congress stated that revitalization of our rural areas and pursuit of a balanced national growth strategy are "essential to the peace, prosperity and welfare of all our citizens" and that they must be given the "highest priority." President Nixon in his 1971 State of the Union Message made a commitment to a national growth policy that would "not

only stem the migration to urban centers but reverse it."

So both the legislative and executive branches, and most importantly a majority of the American people, are on record as favoring a policy of rural development and balanced national growth.

This being the case, I think it is time we stopped giving lip-service and endorsements to these important pursuits and actually start to do something about them. Rhetoric comes cheap, but action is the true test of one's commitment.

To that end, the Senate Subcommittee on Rural Development has recently developed legislation that will provide some of the mechanisms through which we can begin to accomplish these stated objectives.

The Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act which I have introduced—and which 50 other Senators have also co-sponsored—would do two things: 1) It would extend the authority of the Department of Agriculture to extend credit for farm and non-farm rural development programs; and 2) it would establish a system of regional rural development credit banks to provide additional credit to private and public borrowers for rural development purposes.

The legislation states that one of the primary purposes for these loans would be "The conservation, use and control of water." This specifically includes water and sewer projects, water conservation projects, water transportation systems, and many other public works development projects—which are of great interest to the National Waterways Conference, Inc., and the Upper Mississippi Waterway Association.

I believe water resource programs can and should play a major role in the Nation's rural re-development. One factor that our Subcommittee has discovered is that water programs are uniquely suited for rural revitalization.

Water is an essential ingredient for every aspect of man's life: He depends upon it for life itself. It is older than the wheel, or even fire. It serves man in many different and wondrous ways.

Water serves as a primary source of energy.

Water serves as one of our oldest and most reliable conveyance of transportation.

Water nourishes our agricultural crops, livestock and aids in the processing and manufacturing of most non-agricultural products.

Water provides us with some of our most beautiful and scenic vistas.

Water provides us with some of our most enjoyable recreation opportunities.

It serves as our most important means to cleanliness and safety.

And, water, and waterways, have provided our nation with much, if not most of the stimulus for economic growth and development, including the development of our urban way of life.

Let us look for a minute at what our own public investments in waterway development have provided our nation.

Water supply projects constructed by the Corps of Engineers and Bureau of Reclamation provide water for over 19 million people today.

Water borne commerce has increased from 163 billion ton miles in 1950 to 265 billion ton miles in 1966—a 62% increase in 16 years.

Although total public expenditures for flood control to date has reached \$6.8 billion, damage prevented by this program is estimated at \$22 billion.

Hydroelectric power investments now generate over \$1 billion annually in federal revenues in addition to the power they generate which has been essential to our nation's growth and development.

In 1965, 2.8 billion activity days of recreation were enjoyed by the American public on

all our nation's waterways. The year 2000 waterborne recreation is expected to reach almost 8 billion activity days.

Waterborne tonnage is expected to increase about 6 times in the next 50 years within the U.S. In 1971 it is estimated that 300 billion ton miles of goods and cargo will move over U.S. waterways.

The 207 Bureau of Reclamation river projects provide water to irrigate almost 9 million acres of agricultural lands with a crop value of almost \$2 billion. Federal income tax payments generated by these projects since 1940 estimated at almost 10 billion dollars—\$2 billion more than all federal expenditures for reclamation since 1902!

These are the kind of public investments that have contributed so much to our nation's phenomenal growth and development. Therefore you can understand why I have so little time for those who talk of such public investments as "pork barrel" or too costly for government to underwrite. And we need to do more. Further development of our waterways and our other natural resources in a manner consistent with their protection and concern for our environment should always remain as an important national goal. And as far as money is concerned we must—as our forefathers did—be willing to think big. With a trillion dollar economy today, this means we must think in 10 and 100 billion dollar terms.

The existence of non-polluted water supplies will to a great degree determine what areas of rural America experience redevelopment. One thing is certain, you cannot develop an area without water.

Another factor which makes water programs attractive is that most water projects are located in rural areas. This is in stark contrast to so many Federal programs in which projects are located in and around major urban areas which are already overcrowded. This not only contributes to the congestion, but it also creates a "snowball" effect that draws in more and more people—continually compounding the problem.

I think the Federal government, if it believes what it says, must make a conscious effort to locate more of its projects and installations in less densely populated areas, which, I might add, is now required as a result of Title IX of the Agricultural Act of 1970.

That is the advantage of water programs. With the exception of urban water supply and flood control, most water resource projects are located in rural America. In fact, one noted political scientist (Professor Lyn-ton K. Caldwell of Indiana University) testified before the Senate Commerce Committee that water programs are the only major Federal undertaking which tends to disperse rather than concentrate the population.

This is vividly borne out in a Tennessee Valley Authority study of industrial growth that occurred in the Tennessee Valley after its river development program. This study showed that 52 percent of all waterway-created jobs in the Tennessee Valley have been located in 133 rural counties with no major cities. Twenty-five percent were located in medium-sized counties, and only 23 percent in metropolitan counties.

On one of our Subcommittee field trips, we toured the Tennessee Valley and I was quite impressed with the City of Decatur, Alabama, which is a rapidly growing community of some 40,000. Before the Tennessee River improvement program, Decatur was just another struggling rural community. Now it is a vital, bustling regional growth center. Growth like this is taking place all along the Tennessee River—but not in major urban areas that are already crowded to capacity.

This leads me to yet another aspect of water resource programs. They can be quite instrumental in helping produce the economic base for rural growth and development. Certainly that has occurred in the

Tennessee Valley. The same thing, I understand is happening along the McClellan-Kerr Arkansas River Navigation Project which we had an opportunity to fly over during one of our Rural Development field hearing trips to Oklahoma earlier this month. Relatively small communities like Muskogee, Oklahoma and Ft. Smith, Arkansas are becoming new growth centers as a result of this project.

Those of us who have grown up along the Mississippi River know what that river means to rural areas. It provides a transportation system that enables the Midwestern farmer to get his products to market cheaply so that he can compete in domestic and world markets.

Without low-cost water transportation, it is doubtful that Midwestern grain would retain its competitiveness and many of our farmers would end up migrating to the big cities.

In Minnesota we are doubly fortunate. We are at the head of navigation on the Mississippi River and we also have access to the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Seaway System. To give you an idea of what this means to my State, I would cite the results of a study conducted by the Minnesota State Planning Agency in 1969 (Economic Significance and Outlook of Minnesota Waterborne Transportation).

This study concluded that port area incomes in Minnesota from water transportation and related port activities, including overland shipping within the State to and from ports, generates incomes "probably in the general neighborhood of \$200 million per year." The agricultural economy is the benefactor.

Without the availability of low-cost water transportation on the Mississippi and the Great Lakes, Minnesota farmers could be at a severe disadvantage. Our state is located hundreds of miles from major domestic markets and a thousand miles from seaports along the coasts. Barges on the rivers and bulk carriers on the lakes help to keep our farm products competitive. We are able, therefore, to sell more, and our farmers get more for what they sell. As most of you probably know, savings in transportation costs mean more money in the farmer's pocket.

For these reasons I am quite skeptical of proposals for higher tolls on the St. Lawrence Seaway and the prospect of user charges on domestic water routes like the Mississippi. Such charges would not only curtail the agricultural economy; they would limit the ability of water projects to sustain industrial growth and job development.

I also believe the President was extremely short-sighted when he vetoed the public works acceleration program passed earlier this year by Congress. Public works projects can and do create jobs—that has been recognized for many decades. And they are not necessarily dead-end jobs, as some have claimed. There's nothing dead-end about the jobs associated with the Port of Saint Paul or the Port of Duluth, I can tell you that.

I would be remiss, however, if I did not admonish the Nation's water planners to make sure that their use of water resources does not result in the pollution of our rivers, lakes, and streams. In re-building rural America, I believe we can do it without making many of the mistakes that have been made in our urban centers. We can do a better job of planning; we can and must guard against all kinds of pollution; and we can produce orderly, uncongested growth patterns.

So I would encourage your two organizations to get behind and vigorously support rural development programs. I know that the Senate Subcommittee on Rural Development will welcome your suggestions and help when our bill comes up for hearings later this year. As I said, water programs have a major contribution to make in this area and we are counting on your support.

As I said in a recent Senate speech, rural revitalization is more than just a program for Rural America; it is a program for the entire country. It will help not only the farmers but also America's small towns, its villages, and its growing communities that can serve as centers of growth. And just as significantly, it is a program to help relieve the urban areas of over-congestion and its attendant problems of pollution, crime, and congestion.

And returning to my original theme—which is akin to the theme of this convention—rural renewal is a program that can help restore the "Freedom to Live the Good Life"—a freedom that should be the birthright of all Americans.

**HON. JOHN A. VOLPE ADDRESSES  
THE CHRISTOPHER COLUMBUS  
DAY BANQUET IN LANSING, MICH.**

**HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN  
OF MICHIGAN**

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 4, 1971

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, last Saturday night our distinguished Secretary of Transportation, the Honorable John A. Volpe, addressed the Christopher Columbus Day Banquet given by the Italian-American Club of Lansing, Mich. In honoring the great explorer and discoverer of our country, the Secretary suggested we would do well to pause and reflect upon the legacy left us by this man of such faith and determination—a legacy which comes down to us in the high and unfaltering concepts of God, homeland, and family. I found the Secretary's call to renew these basic ideals underlying the strength of our Nation particularly inspiring and pertinent to the challenges of our time, and I would like to call them to the attention of my colleagues of the House as we celebrate the first national holiday in honor of Christopher Columbus, for his adventure has truly been a legacy that has formed the spirit of our land.

The address follows:

ADDRESS BY SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION  
JOHN A. VOLPE

We are gathered this evening to honor a man who—479 years ago—set out across uncharted seas toward an unknown horizon. We gather to honor the memory of Christopher Columbus, the great Genoese navigator, the Admiral of Ocean Seas.

I am sure all of you here feel a great sense of satisfaction over our success in having Columbus Day made a national holiday. Now all America will have a chance to pay tribute to the courage and skill of the great Christopher Colombo.

I think the words of President Nixon's Proclamation on Columbus best give the worth of the great hero. Our President has described Columbus as "An intrepid explorer, a supreme navigator, but above all a man of unshakable faith and courage. This son of Italy sailed in the service of the Spanish crown on a mission that forever broadened man's hopes and horizons."

Only two national holidays have been set aside to honor individual men—one is George Washington—and the other is the discoverer of our land. This is a tremendous tribute to the man who—after weeks of hope, uncertainty, prayer and promise—saw first the islands of the new world through the haze of the Caribbean dawn.

The determination of this man—sailing where none had ventured before—is a legacy that serves us well in our own times.

I say the legacy of Columbus is reflected in organizations such as yours, the Italian-American Club of Lansing.

Columbus sailed westward with an unflagging faith in his Creator. He sailed with the heritage of his homeland. He sailed with the birthright of his forebears. And this legacy comes down to the present day—to the words "Dio", "patria", and "famiglia". God, homeland, and family.

We need a re-affirmation of these ideas today. We have today a greater need for re-dedication to these noble ideals than ever before.

Our President has called on all Americans to renew within ourselves the original spirit that made this Nation great—the spirit of challenging the unknown frontiers, the spirit of innovation, the spirit of responsible adventure.

And I know that the sons and daughters of Columbus—the ethnic descendants of the man who discovered our great continent—are more than prepared for such a re-dedication. We have, in our heritage, precisely the spirit and the determination that our President has called for.

Any renewal of national virtues must begin with a renewal of the strength of the family. Here we are fortunate. Strong family life is at the very core of our Italian heritage. It was as members of a family unit that we learned of the value of discipline, the virtue of sharing, the demands of loyalty, and the dignity of hard work.

And while the vast majority of young people in this Nation are fine people—youngsters we can and should be proud of—you know and I know that if those who do cause trouble had had the kind of family upbringing you and I had, there would be a lot less juvenile delinquency in this Nation today!

We need, too, a new appreciation of "patria"; a new appreciation of our homeland here in the Western hemisphere. We need a renewal of love of country, a re-birth of patriotism. At this Columbus Day celebration let us remember the hundreds of thousands of other "Columbuses"—brave young men and women who in the final decades of the last century and the first half of the 20th century had the courage to leave the villages and cities of Italy for the promise that was the adventure of the new world. They lived with hope, and God bless them, hope never deserted them. America was the dream—if not for them, then for their children after them. How many times were we reminded that to be born in the United States of America was one of the greatest fortunes a person could have!

Yes, we were born in the promised land, and the promise of America still lives! In what other nation could your speaker tonight have risen from humble origins to become Governor of his State, and then a member of the President's Cabinet? This could happen, only here in our Nation. Only here in the very great United States of America!

Then there is the third source of inspiration—our divine faith. The prayers that we learned as youngsters—in Latin, in Italian, in English—have guided all of us throughout the years. The faith that sustained Columbus is faith that can sustain us all. The faith that was instilled in us accompanies us in our daily lives—as Americans—as citizens of a Nation whose very coins bear the words "In God We Trust."

Let me read to you the words of the French writer Alexis De Tocqueville who visited America more than a hundred years ago.

"I sought for the greatness and genius of America in her commodious harbors and her ample rivers, and it was not there; in the fertile fields and boundless prairies and it was not there; in her rich mines and her vast world commerce, and it was not there.

Not until I went into the churches of America and heard her pulpits aflame with righteousness, did I understand the secret of her genius and power. America is great because she is good, and if America ever ceases to be good, America will cease to be great."

My friends, let us here tonight reaffirm that America—discovered by the great man we honor on our new national holiday—shall never cease to have faith. With such re-affirmation we can rest confident that America will never cease to know glory.

Before concluding my remarks this evening, I'd like to say a few words about some of the critics of the President's new economic policy. I bring it up at this time because it seems as though not a day goes by without someone out on some campaign trail, far from Washington, leveling a blast at the President's economic policies.

In the first place it is my view, and I'm sure the President's as well, that the far-reaching measures he has proposed deserve the closest scrutiny and constructive analysis. Our system of government never meant for Congress nor the public to be mere rubber stamps of any President's programs. This is particularly true in the present instance where we find ourselves in a very difficult economic crisis brought about by the longest war in our history and its resulting strain on the economy. The goal of a full generation of peace, with prosperity and without inflation is a difficult one, entitled to the most careful and determined attention of all of us.

It is one thing to offer responsible criticism before the House Ways and Means Committee in Washington, which is currently considering the tax aspects of the new economic policy. But it is quite another to irresponsibly blast the President's program at political campaign fund raising parties far from Congressional committee hearing rooms.

Some people have delivered incessant criticism from everywhere but the halls of Congress. Such assaults are irresponsible because they are largely intended to produce generous campaign contributions and local publicity rather than constructive alternatives to the new economic policy. Such attacks have kept up, despite the fact that the President has called upon all Americans to sheathe the sword of partisanship until we get over the current economic crisis.

Most Americans have joined in supporting the President by adding political rhetoric to the list of items presently covered by the wage-price freeze. The enforcement of the freeze, contrary to the pessimistic predictions of many, has worked effectively, mainly due to the voluntary cooperation of the public. To say that some politicians are misjudging the sentiments of the American people is to understate the case. The revitalization of the American economy is too important a task for counter comment. Absentee criticism is wholly inappropriate to the situation at hand. To succeed, we need full participation in Congress—not on the road.

We will never achieve the great goal of a peaceful prosperity so long as the criticism of the President's programs is purely political. Campaign-trail rhetoric in opposition to the President's economic initiatives impedes thoughtful consideration of America's most serious problem. I ask you to join me in calling upon those who criticize and condemn, to do so responsibly and in the spirit of the national interest. The challenge is too great to permit anything less.

Let me conclude my remarks by telling you a story.

I was privileged to join with the Executive Committee of the Order of Sons of Italy in a visit to the White House one afternoon a little more than a year ago. The President's schedule called for a 10 to 15 minute courtesy call, and we were delighted that the time had been made available.



But President Nixon found himself with people he liked, people he understood, people who embodied the very virtues he hopes for in all Americans. These were men who love their country, men who are proud they are American citizens, men who are deeply concerned with keeping family life strong, men who know the strength of divine faith. These were the President's kind of people.

That so-called "courtesy call" wasn't limited to 10 or 15 minutes, my friends. The President kept the group for an hour and a quarter! Believe me, there are very few groups who are permitted that much time with the President! He listened and he learned. It was one of the most encouraging and yes—inspirational—moments of my life.

And so on this October evening—here in the heartland of a Nation that was wilderness unknown to civilized man in the year 1492—we celebrate the discovery of America and we renew our pledge to keep brightly lit the dream of Columbus the navigator.

On this—the first national celebration of Columbus Day—we do well to renew our dedication, our spirit, to God, to homeland, and to family.

May God bless you all, and may the spirit of this great holiday be expressed throughout our Nation with the enthusiasm and vigor you show here.

Thank you.

#### DEPENDENCE OF UNITED STATES UPON SOVIET UNION FOR CHROME ORE

**HON. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.**

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, October 4, 1971

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, the Tucson, Ariz., Citizen of September 7 contains an excellent editorial on the dependence of the United States upon the Soviet Union for chrome ore.

The editorial rightly commends the Senators from Arizona (Mr. FANNIN and Mr. GOLDWATER) for sponsoring legislation which would end our dependence upon Russia.

The present situation is dangerous to the United States and in addition creates a severe economic disadvantage for this country.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial entitled "Russian Chrome," be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

#### RUSSIAN CHROME

Should the United States be dependent upon the Soviet Union for a material vital to our national defense?

Arizona Sens. Paul Fannin and Barry Goldwater think not, and they are right. That is why they are co-sponsoring with Sen. Harry F. Byrd, Jr., D-Va., legislation that would correct this undesirable situation.

The material in question is chrome ore, essential in jet aircraft, missiles and nuclear submarines. There is no domestic production of this strategic material and for many years the United States relied for its supply principally on Rhodesia.

Rhodesia hasn't run out of chrome but, following the lead of the United Nations, President Lyndon Johnson slapped an embargo on trade between the United States and Rhodesia.

We then turned to Russia, the next largest chrome ore producer. Since becoming our

prime source, the Russians have raised the price per ton of this ore from \$25 to \$72.

The price increase is a disadvantage to the United States, but not nearly the disadvantage of having to depend in a time of national emergency on the Soviet Union for a critical defense material.

The Byrd-Fannin-Goldwater proposal to permit us to buy chrome ore from Rhodesia deserves favorable consideration by the Congress.

#### THE PENDULUM IS SWINGING

**HON. GLENN R. DAVIS**

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 4, 1971

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, Richard G. Capen, Jr., vice president of Copely Newspapers, recently delivered a sense-making speech before the Rotary Club of San Francisco, in which he drew upon his experience as Assistant Secretary under Secretary of Defense Laird. Mr. Capen said some things that are worthy of our attention and our thoughts. I commend the reading of his remarks to my colleagues:

#### THE PENDULUM IS SWINGING

This is my first speech in the Bay Area since returning to California after serving two and a half years as an appointee in the Department of Defense.

Like my associates at the Pentagon, I was proud and honored to serve under the dynamic leadership of Secretary of Defense Melvin Laird. President Nixon could not have selected a better prepared, more dedicated or more effective leader for that demanding post.

It takes much more than computers to run the wide-spread Defense Department, as complex as it is. Secretary Laird inspired a teamwork approach and dedication to service unmatched in the Pentagon's history.

His understanding of key defense issues, his ability as a persuasive communicator, and his style of leadership have contributed significantly to improved understanding of critical national security issues—particularly those beyond Vietnam.

And, all this has been accomplished at a time when the Defense Department has been under constant criticism—some constructive, much of it irresponsible.

From the outset, the Nixon Administration made it clear that it would avoid debating whether the United States should have gone into Vietnam in the first place, or once doing so, whether our professional military leaders were given proper authority to execute that war as promptly and successfully as our capabilities would have permitted in the early 1960s.

President Nixon's goal was to conclude American presence in Southeast Asia. That objective is rapidly being met as we move toward a generation of peace.

I believe President Nixon and Secretary Laird have been imminently successful in terminating our country's involvement in Vietnam—given the rather sad circumstances they inherited in January 1969.

What were those circumstances? First, there was no plan for ending the war other than through negotiations. No one understood that reality better than the enemy, and the pathetic record in Paris is testimony to the other side's lack of incentive for serious negotiations.

By January 1969 we had cashed in a key military chip when President Johnson halted the bombing of North Vietnam—just four days before the 1968 Presidential

election—with little in return from the enemy.

When President Nixon came into office, the American troop ceiling in Vietnam was 549,500, and increasing rapidly. As many as 500 Americans were dying each week and the war was costing in excess of \$28 billion a year.

These were the sad realities in January 1969. The options to President Nixon were extremely limited, to say the least. But what has happened since that time?

First, we are getting out of Vietnam. By this fall, more than 365,000 Americans will have been withdrawn, a figure representing more than two-thirds of the American troop strength that existed when President Nixon took office.

At the same time, U.S. casualties have been cut from some 500 a week to less than 15 a week. Even one casualty is too many, but I believe this progress is significant.

With these substantial troop cuts the cost of the war has been reduced by 75 per cent thus permitting a reordering of priorities at home.

Today, national pools indicate that the war is fading rapidly as an issue in America. Unfortunately, those who have built their national reputations as obstructionists, linger on the sidelines, trying to keep the war issue alive for their own selfish goals. Tragically, their only result has been to give aid and comfort to the enemy.

Congressional critics meet with the other side in Paris, issue reports on alleged conditions for peace, only to have them immediately rejected by the enemy.

It is a simple matter to pass resolutions, to make sweeping pronouncements, or to write editorials calling for more rapid withdrawal rates and fixed deadlines.

Certainly, it is easier to demagogue national policy from the sidelines, but it takes real courage to face up to reality with constructive solutions that will contribute to lasting peace, not political expediency.

Time and again President Nixon and Secretary Laird have shown that courage.

How ironic it is that some of those who have led the criticism of President Nixon's Vietnamization program were the very policy makers who got us into the war, who did not have a program for ending it while they were in office, but who now expound all the answers from the privacy of their law offices or from some far-off campus.

In the early 1960s our country had the tools to win the war decisively. But our elected leadership was unwilling to generate the national will to do so.

We fought that war on a "business as usual" basis, building up huge deficits each year because our government was unwilling to establish national spending priorities. Many of today's economic problems are a direct result of that policy of the mid-1960s.

At this point history will judge those who got our country into Vietnam. Just as that history will also judge whether the Nixon Administration took the responsible course to get us out.

In either instance, the ultimate responsibility must be assumed by our elected civilian leadership, not by our armed forces. Our military leaders implement national policy, not set it. For too long the man in uniform has been made the scapegoat for decisions made by civilians.

Our dedicated men and women in uniform provide the backbone of our national security and they deserve our respect.

Only through sufficient military strength can we hope to deter reckless acts by potential adversaries. They must clearly understand and respect that we have the will to win and the tools to do the job. It is pure folly to believe that once the last American has left Vietnam, our problems are over and further cuts in defense spending possible.

Despite what some suggest, we cannot legislate peace by unilaterally crippling our de-

fense posture in Congress. Why? Because our adversaries are moving in exactly the opposite direction.

Today, the Soviets are moving ahead of us in virtually every category: missiles, aircraft, ships, military research and conventional forces.

While we were bogged down in Vietnam—at a total cost of \$125 billion—the Soviets were able to sustain North Vietnam for something less than \$12 billion. They did not use that ten to one difference, however, to fund domestic programs in Russia. All during the 1960s Soviet military budgets were roughly at the same level as defense spending in America which included the burden of Vietnam. Just look at the record.

The Soviets increased their submarine force by more than 400 percent. They have increased ICBM launchers by over 500 percent and are currently 45 percent ahead of the U.S. in total number of ICBM nuclear launchers.

They built a modern Navy that now shows the Soviet flag in the Mediterranean, the Indian Ocean, off our Atlantic and Pacific coasts, in and out of Cuba, and around Hawaii.

In the Mediterranean, for example, the Soviet Navy will steam some 18,000 ship days this year. In 1966 they were present a total of 750 days.

In military research and development, the Soviets are spending at about twice the rate as we in the United States. This trend should be of grave concern to all Americans because it measures the importance the Soviets place on reducing our technological lead within the next five to seven years.

Even while the Soviets push this military and political expansion policy, the U.S. moves to curtail its overseas commitments, partly as a result of our national weariness over a long and costly war.

The Nixon Administration is facing up to this disturbing Soviet military buildup by insisting on sufficient funding of defense programs while insisting that our allies contribute more to their own national security requirements. The latter philosophy is part of the Nixon Doctrine whose goal is a generation of peace through partnership, strength and a willingness to negotiate.

The United States can no longer serve as policeman of the world. Our needs at home are too high and the demand for our material resources too great.

Since the end of World War II we have operated on the philosophy that the United States could do more for its allies than they could do for themselves. We have literally rebuilt economies of the victorious and vanquished alike. We have given billions of dollars in foreign aid and have sent thousands of troops in scores of countries around the globe.

Through the Nixon Doctrine we have insisted that our allies assume more of these mutual security burdens, particularly in the area of military manpower.

As a result of this philosophy, more than 400,000 American troops have been withdrawn from overseas. The bulk, of course, have come from Vietnam. But, the Nixon Doctrine has been applied elsewhere as well.

In Korea, U.S. troop strength has been dropped by over 20,000 men. This is a reversal of a commitment to that country where we have maintained more than 60,000 Americans for some eighteen years.

Likewise, reductions in U.S. forces have been carried out in Japan, Thailand and the Philippines. In NATO the concept of burden sharing is being developed, again on the principle that our allies must assume a greater defense responsibility.

An important element of the Nixon Doctrine has been a willingness to negotiate, doing so from a position of sufficient strength. Again, the record of accomplishments has been impressive.

The United States is pursuing a delicate course of negotiation in the volatile Middle

East crisis. We have negotiated the turnover to Japan of Okinawa, a most sensitive issue for the Japanese.

The President has proposed new treaty provisions to prohibit the placement of nuclear weapons on the ocean floor. He has carried the nuclear non-proliferation treaty through to ratification and he has renounced the use of biological weapons.

In addition, the Nixon Administration is vigorously pursuing a successful conclusion to the SALT talks. The goal of these important negotiations is to curtail the arms race which as I indicated earlier has been rapidly accelerated by the Soviet Union.

And most dramatically, in this spirit of negotiations, the President has moved forward to revive our country's relationships with Mainland China, an area involving one-fourth of the world's population.

Certainly we hope for success in these diplomatic efforts to limit the arms race and to improve relationships with our potential adversaries. That success will come, however, only if those who oppose us respect our national determination to remain strong militarily.

I believe most Americans not only support a strong U.S. defense posture but will insist upon it in the years ahead. However, our voices must be heard.

That is not to say the strength of the United States depends solely on its men in uniform or on its weapons, as important as those capabilities are. I believe the strength of our nation in the 1970s must be based also on the wisdom of our foreign policy, on the strength of our economy, and on the will of our people.

The day is past when we can hope to provide most of the defense for our allies. They must share in this burden.

The day is past when we can afford to assume the primary role in solving all of the problems of the Western World. That responsibility also must be shared more equally with our allies.

This does not suggest that we can afford to build a wall around our country, withdrawing from the competition and security needs of the world. Those who clamor to bring all American troops home forget that their very presence abroad has not caused war but rather has helped to maintain peace.

During my service in Washington, I was involved in some of the most complex, difficult problems faced by this country. But it was a source of inspiration to be surrounded by those who were confident in their course, and who respected a higher national priority extending beyond any temporary expediency.

The negative thinkers have had their day. They have marched in the streets. They have built false hopes. And they have comforted our detractors at home and adversaries abroad.

Those who have built their national image on such obstructionist attitudes are finding it difficult to shift away from the tired, divisive approach of the past.

Young people today cry out for constructive leadership in an atmosphere of optimism. They seek positive approaches and personal involvement in efforts to build a better America.

Like you and me, they resent the tarring of all America because of a few shortcomings. How ridiculous it is, for example, to charge—as one senator recently did—that all America is sick because our prisons are sick. We have had too much of that destructive approach in the past.

One of our greatest national strengths is our ability to face up to problems openly and candidly. We banner our shortcomings across our newspapers and TV sets for the whole world to see.

Our critics at home and abroad delight in exploiting these weaknesses as a symbol of a crumbling America.

What these critics forget, however, is that as we identify a problem, as we debate it

publicly, we work to solve it—and succeed in doing so. As a result, we have built, on balance, the best and most successful way of life ever known to man.

We have been confident that our problems could be corrected; that dreams could be embodied in action, and that a better life would be achieved. But we have always known, as we do today, that we would have to work for it.

Over the years, we have been successful, not by thinking we would lose but rather by believing we would win. Too often we have sold our country short with an almost national guilt complex.

I have little tolerance for those who thrive on self pity or who drop out of society in protest against problems they say they did not create.

Dreams of self fulfillment cannot be found through heroin, in a commune or on a wrecking crew. Most young people know that.

Today's young generation no longer lives in an overwhelming atmosphere of war and violence. Our task is to capture their imagination and involvement in our endless search for a better America. There are new goals to set, new records to break, new problems to solve. A new day is dawning and America's optimism to meet those opportunities is building.

Yes, the pendulum is swinging.

#### THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, October 4, 1971

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, an editorial writer for the Washington Daily News wrote recently that one of the best-kept secrets in Washington is the existence here of an institution of higher education which has—

More students—19,000—than there are undergraduates at any of the City's major universities—George Washington, Georgetown, Howard, American, Catholic, or FCC.

The institution is the Graduate School of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is celebrating its 50th birthday anniversary this year.

The Graduate School opened its doors in September 1921, with nine courses, eight teachers, and 319 students, all employees of the Department of Agriculture. Today the Graduate School, supported entirely by its fees, annually enrolls more than 21,000 students, offers 600 courses, and has a faculty of 750.

In the 50 years since 1921, some 354,000 men and women have enrolled in the Graduate School. Thousands of others have shared the knowledge from its public lectures, publications, counseling services, television programs, and referral services. In 1969, it was my pleasure to join the distinguished junior Senator from Wyoming (Mr. HANSEN) and Mr. Robert Merriam, former Deputy Director of the Bureau of the Budget, in a panel discussion, a part of the Graduate School's lecture series, on the subject "Federalism Today."

Although a majority of today's students and teachers in the Graduate School are Federal employees, many of the students are not, and an increasing number of instructors come from busi-

ness groups, universities, and foundations. The Graduate School does not confer degrees, but the Civil Service Commission accepts its credits for examination and qualification purposes on the same basis as those from accredited colleges and universities.

The name "Graduate School" was appropriate 50 years ago, when the primary purpose was to give graduate-level training. Since then, the words "a center for continuing education" have been added to the name. These latter emphasize the fact that the school now offers courses for everyone, regardless of his educational background.

Among those who have attended graduate school courses are congressional employees, who have signed up for the regular courses ranging from shorthand to photography, from mathematics to ecology. This past year 478 congressional employees were registered in evening classes at the graduate school.

They also have had courses tailored to their specific needs. For nearly 25 years, the graduate school curriculum has included a course in Administrative Operations for Congressional Assistants. It is what I would call a "nuts and bolts" course for congressional staff members—a once-over-lightly on such subjects as services and allowances, office routine, newsletters and news releases, the use of House and Senate documents, and the like. Since the spring semester of 1969, this course has been taught by my administrative assistant, Brit Englund. A few years ago, at the request of Representative ZABLOCKI, of Wisconsin, the graduate school set up a class in speed-reading for Senators and Representatives. There is also a course in congressional procedures, taught by Keith Edward Hall, legislative assistant to Representative QUIE, of Minnesota.

Mr. President, the Washington Daily News is not the only publication to join us in wishing a happy birthday to the U.S. Department of Agriculture Graduate School. Similar editorials were published also in the Washington Post, the Sunday Star, and the Federal Times. I ask unanimous consent that the editorials be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Washington Daily News, Sept. 1, 1971]

#### THE CAMPUS ON THE MALL

One of the best-kept secrets in Washington must be the existence here of a college with more students (19,000) than there are undergraduates at any of the city's major universities, including George Washington, Georgetown, Howard, American, Catholic, or FCC.

#### Give up?

It's the Graduate School, U.S. Department of Agriculture, a college of such becoming modesty that hardly anyone except its students, enrolled in 500 different courses taught by 750 part-time teachers in classrooms spread thru 50 buildings here, knows of its existence, let alone the fact that it has been in operation for 50 years as of today—at no cost to the government. It pays for itself.

Most of the 19,000 "Graduate School" students are Federal employees or their wives and sometimes children. But, in practice, any "qualified" person is eligible, the criteria for eligibility being largely one's motivation

which, in this remarkably relaxed and open-minded school, tends to run very high.

Tuition is pleasantly low: \$22 for a semester hour.

Except for a relative handful taking courses by correspondence or enrolled in special field programs, the bulk of the student body goes to class at night in various downtown federal buildings, collectively known as the "Campus on the Mall."

Among the 500 courses offered are some 26 in math, 37 in foreign languages (including Swahili and Mandarin Chinese), 20 in office operation, 48 in automatic data processing, plus something in almost any field a reasonable man would want to explore—physics, chemistry, mushrooms, fungi, insects, birdlife, spelling, speaking, grammar, rhetoric, rocks, fossils, coniferous forests, modern drama, oceanography, official writing, practical English usage, etching, sculpture, pottery, African art, great books and the great outdoors.

That's for practical scholars. Dreamers can take Robert L. Birch's noncredit course in Poems, Puzzles, Puns and Paradoxes, of which the catalog says:

How to shape words to hook an idea into the mind to let it germinate and take root. Hooks: Czar Donyk paradox; isms and wasms. Do-it-yourself thinking kits. One-Tooth Rhee and 1-2-3. M. Zero Milestone's brother. Reverse English and Grin-ish. Logopolitition and info-mudcat indexes and burro-cratik folklore. Pedro. Can a bee resting?

The idea of all this exciting academe is what is generally regarded to be the great bureaucratic wasteland of government is to improve the federal service by giving its employees a chance to improve themselves.

The Agriculture Department has always been in the teaching game. The statute which set it up in 1862 provided that it was to "disseminate agricultural information in the broadest sense of the word." It has simply picked up this challenge and run down the field with it.

The Graduate School's director for the past 13 years is John Holden, a mild-mannered man with the look of a small-town pharmacist until one realizes the magnitude of the experiment in Adult education he has undertaken here. And his success with it.

There is nothing fancy about Dr. Holden, just as there is nothing fancy about his "Campus on the Mall."

The school gives credits for courses taken, but it grants no degrees. "We'd rather be a first-class continuing education program than a fourth-class, degree-granting institution," Dr. Holden says. "Our students—most of them high school graduates, but there are exceptions to that—pay a little fee and work very hard. Our faculty members get little pay and work harder. Our full-time staff get a full salary, but they have to work even harder still. And everybody benefits."

The Washington Daily News takes particular pleasure in saluting a school which started the same year we did (we'll also be 50 this fall) and in lifting, a little, the bushel beneath which it hides its light.

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 6, 1971]

#### AT 50, STILL A UNIQUE SCHOOL

One of the most successful institutions of higher learning around town celebrated its 50th birthday last week—an impressive milestone for a school with more than 21,000 students but no endowment, no federal appropriation, no degrees and no campus. In fact, even its name is somewhat misleading, for the Graduate School of the U.S. Department of Agriculture is not really a graduate school, but a center of "continuing education" for all adults, and its main connection with U.S.D.A. is simply that the department provides office and classroom space.

The school isn't concerned with all the trappings of the degree-granting business,

concentrating instead on offering interesting and useful courses—more than 600 classes in everything from Swahili to space science, urban economics, art, psychology and juvenile delinquency.

Though the school was originally established to train scientific workers at U.S.D.A., both its curriculum and student body have expanded to the point where agriculture employees make up only a fraction of the 3,300 student enrollment.

In saluting the Graduate School, U.S. Commissioner of Education S. P. Marland Jr. noted that rather than offering degrees, the institution offers fulfillment. "This seems to me to say you are more concerned with teaching and learning than with symbols or academic trimmings." Don Paarlberg, chairman of the school's general administration board and John B. Holden, director for the last 13 years, agree that education should be "a consumers good as well as a producers good . . . for pleasure as well as for sharpening of the intellect and for the earning of income."

Registration for the fall term will be conducted from September 11 to 18. Anyone interested in finding out more about courses may call the school at 388-2077.

#### HAPPY BIRTHDAY!

Educational success stories are so rare these days that any that crops up merits note. When the success occurs in our own backyard, so much the better. And when the public service performed is as valuable as that of the Graduate School, U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is celebrating its 50th anniversary this month, a heartfelt salute becomes a distinct pleasure.

This extraordinary enterprise was begun in 1921 mainly to help a handful of Agriculture Department scientists. By now it enrolls more than 20,000 students (many with no governmental connections) in more than 600 courses that range from the ecology of the Potomac River through Mandarin Chinese to the intricacies of budget accounting. The classes, mainly at night, are spread all over town. There is a faculty of 750, paid by enrollment fees. The goal, stated quite simply, is to advance any student as many steps up the ladder toward his objective as he wishes to go, whether the objective is professional achievement, economic advancement or personal fulfillment. And the most amazing thing of all is that a healthy segment of our population—to their positive detriment, it seems to us—are unaware that this great storehouse of educational resources even exists.

At a birthday dinner the other night, an official of the school summed up all this in a few lines worth repeating. The Graduate School, he said, "has no campus, no endowment, no football team. It receives no appropriated funds and it grants no degrees. Yet, over its 50 years, it has provided the increments of learning and enjoyment that have enriched the lives of more than a third of a million students."

Well said, well done, and best wishes for the future.

[From the Federal (D.C.) Times, Sept. 15, 1971]

#### ANNIVERSARY

Congratulations to the Graduate School of the Department of Agriculture on reaching the half-century mark.

The school draws its faculty and students from every branch of the federal government and virtually every agency within every branch.

In the past 50 years more than 300,000 government workers have received training through the program. Thousands of others have benefited from its public lectures, publications, and counseling services.

It took men of great vision in 1921 to foresee the need for providing a means by which

government employees could be encouraged to further their education. The success of the program since that time shows how right they were.

In addition to serving as a communications link within the government family, the programs give employes a chance to raise their earning power, increase their efficiency, and improve the quality of their service.

### HOSPITAL COSTS RISING FOR MEDICARE RECIPIENTS

**HON. JAMES A. BURKE**

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 4, 1971

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, when the medicare program was conceived, it was hoped that the program would relieve many families and individuals of the anxiety and burdens that accompany the costs of required doctor and hospital services.

It is disconcerting then to take notice of the announcement this weekend by Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Elliot Richardson, that effective January 1, 1972, medicare recipients who are hospitalized are responsible for the first \$68 of their hospital bill, instead of the present \$60. This announcement by Secretary Richardson at a time when the President has in effect a wage-price freeze runs counter to the administration's whole economic stabilization program. What particularly concerns me is the fact that Secretary Richardson on Saturday acknowledged the fact that hospital costs are rising substantially and we must—

Put a brake on hospital cost escalation— it is of great concern to the Administration.

I am sure that the problem worries the administration. Therefore, what would be a more effective way of demonstrating this would be through, not only a cost control program for hospitals, in phase II of the administration economic game plan, but also for the consumer.

Aside from the immediate freeze on medicare deductible costs and also the upcoming review of the part B medicare premium rates, I strongly urge that the President recommend to the Congress a review of the present policy that dictates that the health cost increases be passed onto the consumer, in this case the elderly with fixed incomes.

The success or failure of the administration's price freeze program obviously rests in the end on public support and confidence. Like so much else about what makes an economy healthy or ill, psychological considerations must, of necessity, be a key consideration. Without the right psychological environment no administration economic program can possibly succeed. This is the aspect of Secretary Richardson's announcement that troubles me the most in terms of the consistency of the administration's program. If in the weeks ahead we have many more announcements like this about price increases for services once the price freeze is lifted, then whatever gains will have been scored by the program during the 90 days it is in effect,

will be largely wiped out in a rush to raise prices.

The Federal Government should be giving the lead, setting an example to the rest of the economy. I think this is a poor example indeed. Looked at on a percentage wide basis this \$8 increase is a 13½-percent increase in the cost of medical service. To someone living on social security benefits who is used to watching percentage increases in cost of living very carefully, this is a significant increase. A 13½-percent increase in services in one sector of the economy—the result of a Government announcement—is a bad example for the rest of the economy.

Quite apart from the real effect of this increase on the consumer and psychologically on the success of the wage-price freeze program, there is the further symbolic impact of this announcement that we must consider. The elderly are getting a message from the President and I do not like the message. It is distressing to me to witness the ongoing cuts in the medicare program. Just recently we in the House Ways and Means Committee received the administration request to reduce from 60 to 15 days the period during which a medicare hospitalized beneficiary would receive cost-free hospitalization. This, of course, would place the burden of rising medical bills on the shoulders of those least able to pay—elderly patients with long- or medium-duration hospital stays. It is a test of logic to understand why medicare recipients are penalized by increasing their hospital costs in direct relation to their illness. In the end, the number of days covered was raised in H.R. 1 to 30 days, but this is still not sufficient. Current law makes no provision for payment until after the 60th day.

### SENATOR BILL BROCK'S APPEAL TO PARENTS SETS TONE FOR OB- SERVANCE OF DRUG ABUSE PRE- VENTION WEEK

**HON. LAMAR BAKER**

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 4, 1971

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, as we observe the second annual Drug Abuse Prevention Week, I feel it is important for all of us to realize the primary role we, as parents, play in effectively dealing with the menace of drugs in today's society.

Senator BILL BROCK has outlined the dimensions of the problem we face and the responsibility parents have in meeting it in his weekly news column, Outlook. His appeal to parents should be emphasized time and time again, not only during Drug Abuse Prevention Week, October 3-9, but throughout the months ahead as we eradicate this blight from the national scene.

Senator Brock's Outlook column follows:

#### OUTLOOK

(By Senator BILL BROCK)

October 3, 1971, marks our second annual Drug Abuse Prevention Week, under Presidential proclamation.

Drug abuse has become a paramount problem, not only for Tennesseans (where heroin addiction has doubled in the past 10 years), but for our entire nation. It has always been easy to regard the tragedy of drug abuse as "someone else's problem." But in recent years we have seen this tragedy brought—often literally—to all Americans.

We have learned that "drug abuse" refers not only to the crime-prone heroin addict, with over 1,000 heroin fatalities annually in New York City, but also it refers to the suburban housewife dependent on tranquilizers or diet pills; to the truck driver over-reliant on pep pills; to the student leaning on amphetamines to help him cram for exams; even to preteens sniffing glue.

What does a nation with phenomenal technological advancement and material wealth gain when that same abundance would permit millions of its people to drift into a chemical modification of mind and mood at grave risk to their health?

What can a nation profit when even a portion of its members lose their God given freedoms to a drug dependence which controls the bodies and warps the minds of men, women, children, and even the unborn?

President Nixon has called upon officials of the Federal Government under the leadership of the new Special Action Office for Drug Abuse Prevention, to join with educators and the medical profession in intensifying programs to prevent and reduce drug abuse among the young and all Americans.

I would make a special appeal at this time to those of you who bear the special trust of parenthood—that we may rededicate ourselves responsibly to the well-being of America's youth; that we may so teach them, so guide them, so reach out to them in understanding and compassion, as to help them avoid the problems that arise from abuse of drugs and help them to attain the full promise of their maturity.

### THE IDEOLOGICAL TURMOIL OF THE SIXTIES

**HON. EARL F. LANDGREBE**

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 4, 1971

Mr. LANDGREBE. Mr. Speaker, this summer I was privileged to associate with 13 college students from Indiana, who worked as summer interns in my office here. I was greatly impressed by the intelligence, hard work, and mature judgment of all of these fine young men and women.

Recently, it came to my attention that one of these students, Robert H. Clark, a senior at Hanover College and a resident of Hanover, Ind., was awarded a fourth prize in an essay contest sponsored by Young Americans for Freedom. His essay, "The Ideological Turmoil of the Sixties," is one of the most eloquent treatises I have ever seen on the liberal-conservative debate.

Rather than engaging in abstract theorizing, Robert Clark has followed the pragmatic course of judging the merits of the two ideologies by their fruits. While the conservative-influenced 1950's were a decade of prosperity and tranquility, the liberal-dominated 1960's brought this country to a grief for which we are still paying in the decade of the 1970's.

Mr. Speaker, I commend this excellent essay to the attention of my colleagues

and to the world. I ask consent to insert the essay at this point in the RECORD.

The essay follows:

**THE IDEOLOGICAL TURMOIL OF THE SIXTIES:  
HAVE THE EVENTS OF THE PAST 10 YEARS  
VERIFIED THE SUBSTANCE OF CONSERVATIVE  
THOUGHT?**

If in retrospect, at least, the 1950s appear to have been relatively tranquil, so the recently concluded decade seems to have been anything but that. The "conservatism" and "apathy" of the Eisenhower years gave way, we are told, to the "bright idealism" of the New Frontiersmen. The victory of John Kennedy in the 1960 elections, we are told, heralded a new era of concern for getting the country moving again.

A brief glance at the story of the election returns tells something about the decade's ideological turmoil—Senator Barry Goldwater's defeat in 1964, the Republican resurrection in 1966, and Richard Nixon's election two years later. Liberalism won its greatest victory in 1964 (inadvertently, perhaps, since many considered Senator Goldwater a radical and Johnson a middle-of-the-road candidate). Since then, however, liberalism has faltered, not so much because of the fickle nature of the American electorate, but because of its own weight and legacy. Viewing his election as a mandate for liberalism, President Johnson initiated a "Great Society" which he felt confident would solve America's problems—and quickly.

Over ten years have passed since Kennedy's inauguration, and today we can look back with at least a measure of historical objectivity to analyze and evaluate the performance of liberalism and the promise of the conservative alternative.

Liberalism did indeed get the country moving again. It moved us to the Bay of Pigs and into Vietnam. It gave us a series of deficit budgets that increased inflation and ate away at the salaries and purchasing power of Americans. It initiated and expanded ill-conceived social projects that have led to disillusionment and disaffection in many quarters. Its unfulfilled promises sent many black citizens into the street in protest.

Liberalism contributed greatly to the increased bureaucratization and impersonalization that have alienated even many members of the so-called radical left. The radical left, however, has generally attributed the ills of the country to insufficient liberalism rather than too much of it. Their slogan "Power to the People," rather ironically, is the antithesis of liberalism, for what the liberal has done in the forty years that he has controlled our government is to take the power further and further away from the people. He has created agencies and bureaucracies that become caught up in their own paperwork and fail to fight the ills they were created to fight. Rather, they have become ills in themselves.

It has remained for President Nixon, in his 1971 State of the Union Message, to call for a genuine return of power to the people, in the form of sharing federally collected revenues with the States and communities. This is a first step in decentralizing the government. For conservatism, unlike liberalism, recognizes the fact that men are at best fallible beings, and that too much power in federal hands poses a threat to the liberty of all.

Liberty, in fact, is a quality quite neglected by the liberal who in his arrogance seeks to undermine individual freedom and the individual's right to his property in the name of an enforced economic and social equality. But, again ironically, the very programs that are meant to bring about this equality often do little more than expand the reach of the Washington octopus. The welfare system is a notorious scandal. Urban renewal is costly, slow, and wasteful—ghetto leaders even have coined the slogans "urban renewal is Negro removal." Minimum wage laws designed to help the least affluent members of our society

have forced employers with limited means to fire many of the people the minimum standards were designed to help. And liberal Congresses refuse to modify these standards—instead, they say, higher minimum wages are the answer.

One of the great faults of liberals is their reluctance to admit their own errors. When their laws fail to solve the problems of poverty and racism they say not that their approach may have been wrong, but that their laws (in the face of "stodgy" conservative opposition) failed to go far enough. That is why the liberal calls for higher minimum wages, more money for urban renewal, and balks at reforming the welfare system.

The events of the past decade have thus in a negative fashion verified the substance of conservative thought by showing the moral (and financial) bankruptcy of liberal thought. But this negative verification is not, and should not be, enough. The overwhelming vote against the Democratic Presidential candidate in 1968 showed that the people of this country want a change. And after forty years of a modified New Deal they certainly deserve a change.

The challenge of conservatism is that of restoring to the forefront man as an individual, rather than man as a part of the collective mass of men; it is overcoming the trend against freedom that we Americans are today confronted with; it is defending this country from would-be destroyers of our liberties from both within and without.

It is true conservatism, I suggest, guided by the (conservative) Declaration of Independence and Constitution, that offers the best hope for the freedom of the individual and the survival of the nation.

**URGENT NEED FOR EMERGENCY  
ASSISTANCE TO AVERT DECLINE  
IN QUALITY DUE TO COST OF  
DESEGREGATION**

**HON. ALPHONZO BELL**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 4, 1971

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2266, the Emergency School Aid Act of 1971 is still languishing in the Education and Labor Committee while school districts are forced to search on their own to find the funds necessary to ease the transition process during school desegregation.

In case after case school districts find they must take funds from ordinary educational expenditures such as books and teaching equipment and divert resources into areas associated solely with the logistics of desegregation.

Mr. Speaker, if these school districts are going to be required by the Federal Government under the Constitution to incur the expenses of school desegregation, the Federal Government must also provide the resources to insure that desegregation will not result in diminished educational quality.

The Federal Government must insure that the quality of the education children receive after schools desegregate is sufficient to prevent the resegregation of those same schools.

Mr. Speaker, I recently received a letter from a school district which has attempted to comply with legal desegregation requirements as smoothly and effectively as possible. This letter from the Pasadena Unified School District in-

dicates the urgent hope of the people of Pasadena for quick congressional action on H.R. 2266.

The letter follows:

PASADENA UNIFIED SCHOOL  
DISTRICT EDUCATION CENTER,  
Pasadena, Calif., August, 31, 1971.

Hon. Alphonzo Bell,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BELL: As one of the school districts required by court order to integrate its schools and as a district dedicated to carrying out the spirit as well as the letter of the law, we wish to commend you for the foresight and initiative you have expressed in preparing, submitting, and working in behalf of H.R. 2266.

It is with some dismay and concern that we witness the long delay in the final passage of this bill by Congress.

We wish you to know of our strong interest in your bill. Our hopes for successfully meeting the unusual conditions related to integration rest greatly on the prospects that substantial financial assistance would be forthcoming. Without this help, our task will indeed be burdensome.

Please let us know if there is any way we can assist you in conveying to pertinent committees and the Congress how vital and urgent the passage of this bill is to the general welfare of our students and our community.

Sincerely,

RAMON C. CORTINES,  
Assistant Superintendent for  
Secondary Education.

**THE UNITED STATES IS WEALTHY,  
BUT NOT HEALTHY**

**HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS**

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 4, 1971

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, the American Medical Association has for decades played the role of the antagonist in the quest of Americans for improved health care. The same argument is constantly employed: What the United States can do in the field of health care is far superior to that of any other nation. True, but what the United States is capable of doing and what it is indeed accomplishing with respect to providing adequate health care for its citizens are worlds apart.

For the benefit of my colleagues who yet accept the AMA's incorrect statement of "facts" regarding health care delivery, I provide for the RECORD today an article by Mr. Anthony Lewis, published in the Detroit Free Press on October 4, 1971, which compares the success and economy of the British National Health Service to the health care provided in the United States.

The article follows:

UNITED STATES IS WEALTHY, BUT NOT HEALTHY  
(By Anthony Lewis)

LONDON.—Wesley Hall, M.D., the president of the American Medical Association, visited Britain last summer and went away distressed. He observed the National Health Service in a small mining town in Scotland and found it so bad that Americans would never tolerate it.

"The people over there don't know any better," Dr. Hall told the National Press Club in Washington on his return. "It is tragic."

Before Americans shed too many tears for the health of their British friends, it seemed wise to look at a statistic or two.

The result of this check shows that Hall is faithfully maintaining the AMA's well-known reputation for accuracy and fair-mindedness.

Infant mortality is one widely accepted test of a society's standard of health. In 1969, the rate in Britain per 1,000 live births was 18 infant deaths; in the United States 20.7.

Then there is the maternal death rate. In Britain the 1969 figure per 100,000 births was 19, the American 27.4.

Not only are those British figures significantly better today. They were achieved, over one generation, from a starting-point much worse than America's. In 1945 the infant mortality rate was 46 in Britain, 38 in the United States. The maternal death rate was an appalling 1,260 in Britain, 207 in the United States.

That generation is the one during which the British National Health Service, the system of tax-supported medicine for all, was created and grew up.

Of course that is not the only reason for the spectacular changes in the figures. But it is certainly not irrelevant that the British standard of infant and maternal survival caught up with America's and passed it precisely during the years of the Health Service's development.

Outside the maternal-infant area, Britain publishes death rates for men and women from a number of diseases. A table published in Social Trends, a statistical annual, uses the 1950-52 average as a base of 100. If the rate is up by 10 percent in a later year, for example, the table would show 110.

Seven leading causes of death were chosen completely at random for comparison with American trends: Respiratory tuberculosis, diabetes, arteriosclerotic heart disease including coronary, hypersensitive heart disease, influenza, pneumonia and bronchitis. With the same 1950-52 base as 100, these were the U.S. and British death rates for men in 1967, the last year available:

	U.S.	Britain
Tuberculosis	25	15
Diabetes	150	112
Arterio.	160	158
Hyperten.	55	40
Influenza	20	9
Pneumonia	135	118
Bronchitis	253	91

In every one of those randomly selected categories, then, the British figure is lower. The death rate has risen less since 1950-52 than the American, or fallen farther. A similar table for women shows exactly the same phenomenon, except that the British figures are comparatively even better.

Now there naturally may be many causes for the comparative death rate trends. American pollution could be growing worse faster, or family tensions increasing. But not even the sophists of the AMA could read those figures to prove that Britons get inferior medical care.

Hall should stop shedding tears for the British and start worrying about the real problem. That is the inadequate medical care provided in the richest nation on earth.

At its best, American medicine is superb, as British doctors often admiringly remark. But too few Americans get the best. That is why the United States is down farther than might be expected in world health tables, not only in comparison with Britain. In infant mortality, for example, a 1969 United Nations report showed 22 countries with a lower rate than ours.

The characteristic, generous answer to such evident national failings is to spend more money. But we know by now that in the medical field that alone is no solution. The United States spends about 6.9 percent of its Gross National Product on health and medical care, Britain only 4.9.

What needs to be changed is the system of delivering medical care to the individual American. It is, as a British medical writer put it, "a desperately inefficient as well as a heartless way of bringing the benefits of modern medicine to the population. Despite its wealth, the health of America is poor."

**WESTVACO PLANT CARRIES FORWARD EXTENSIVE POLLUTION ABATEMENT PROGRAM—PEOPLE OF TWO STATES SHARE BENEFITS**

**HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH**  
OF WEST VIRGINIA  
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES  
Monday, October 4, 1971

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, it is my practice to call attention to examples

of significant progress by Government, citizens, and industry in our efforts to reduce pollution.

It is important to do this, I believe, to avoid giving a wrong impression through constant reference to unsatisfactory environmental situations. All segments of our society are making headway in reducing all types of pollution. This progress needs to be recognized for it contributes to the improvement of the quality of life available to the American people.

An important source of employment for people of two States is the paper mill operated by Westvaco at Luke, Md., just across the Potomac River from Piedmont, W. Va. This long-established plant provides employment for 2,200 persons, approximately 800 of them are West Virginians.

As a responsible industry and member of the community, the Westvaco plant has for 14 years been engaged in a continuous program to eliminate air and water pollution resulting from its operations. In the past 10 years, \$24 million has been spent on the installation of facilities for environmental improvement. This has resulted in a 90-percent reduction in airborne fallout and other benefits.

At the present time the company is constructing a \$8.5 million recovery furnace that will make even greater improvements in the air quality of the region. The huge facility is now about 45 percent finished and is scheduled for completion in mid-1972. When in operation it will reduce odor from the mill by 50 percent.

While Westvaco has already effected significant reductions in pollution, it has commitments to the State of Maryland to install even more abatement facilities.

The Westvaco plant at Luke demonstrates that an industry sincerely concerned with the environment can stop pollution and still remain economically viable. The experience of this plant should be an inspiration to business throughout the country.