

H.J. Res. 919. Joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to certain boundary agreements between the States of Maryland and Virginia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOWARD:

H.J. Res. 920. Joint resolution to amend the Disaster Relief Act of 1970 to authorize disaster loans with respect to certain losses arising as the result of recent natural disasters, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. RARICK:

H.J. Res. 921. Joint resolution asking the President of the United States to declare the fourth Saturday of each September "National Hunting and Fishing Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. Con. Res. 417. Concurrent resolution to commend the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration for successfully performing valuable humanitarian work on the occasion of its 20th anniversary; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DELANEY:
H. Con. Res. 418. Concurrent resolution calling for the American people to boycott all French products until the cost of the boycott to the French people exceeds the benefits to them of the drug traffic out of Marseilles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RANGEL:

H. Con. Res. 419. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that there should be a boycott in the United States of French-made products until the President determines France has taken successful steps to halt the processing of heroin and its exportation to the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WOLFF (for himself, Mrs. ABZUG, Mr. BRADEMANS, Mr. DRINAN, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mrs. MINK, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. MOSS, Mr. RYAN, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. STOKES, Mr. TIERNAN, and Mr. KOCH):

H. Res. 638. Resolution directing the Secretary of State to furnish to the House of Representatives certain information concern-

ing the role of our Government in the events leading to an uncontested presidential election in South Vietnam on October 3, 1971; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARRETT:

H.R. 11142. A bill for the relief of Carlo and Elvira Viola; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 11143. A bill for the relief of Stanley Bialowas, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRAY:

H.R. 11144. A bill for the relief of Lawrence C. Henk; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MATSUNAGA:

H.R. 11145. A bill for the relief of Mitchell L. Balutski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

JUDICIAL RESTRAINT?

HON. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 6, 1971

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, the September 23 edition of the Bristol, Va., Herald Courier included an interesting editorial on my proposed constitutional amendment which would require periodic reconfirmation by the Senate of those named to the Federal judiciary.

The editorial states, and I agree, that regardless of the outcome of my proposal, the debate over the status of the Federal judiciary is worthy of the attention of all Americans.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial, "Judicial Restraint?" be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

JUDICIAL RESTRAINT?

Sen. Harry F. Byrd, Jr. has made a reasonable proposal with reference to service on the U.S. Supreme Court, though it is not a proposal which is likely to win approval—not anytime soon, at least.

The senator, through a constitutional amendment, would subject members of the Supreme Court to congressional review every eight years by the Senate Judiciary Committee.

Those who passed scrutiny would be reconfirmed for another eight years; those who did not would be replaced. Gone would be the lifetime appointments which have always been tendered members of the nation's highest court.

In what might be termed an understatement, Sen. Byrd points out that "everyone should be subject to some review."

He adds: "The federal judiciary is the only group in the world—except for some kings or dictators or sultans or something—that does not have to answer to someone."

Sen. Byrd decided to introduce the constitutional amendment after concluding that the "era of judicial self-restraint appears to be over."

He has "enormous respect for the men who drafted our Constitution 184 years ago," and believes that "had the Supreme Court followed the role designed for it by those framers of the Constitution, an amendment such as this would be unnecessary."

However, he said, "not even the strongest of the Federalists ever suggested that the federal courts should, or could, extend federal law into the domain reserved for the states and the legislative branch of government."

But, he continued, the federal judiciary has, in large measure, rejected the doctrine of self-restraint and, "accountable to no one, has run rampant in asserting its authority over the daily lives of all Americans."

Sen. Byrd points out that every state sets fixed terms for the members of its judiciary, and only the federal government appoints judges for life.

Of course, such appointments also apply to federal judges at levels below the Supreme Court, and it is not clear whether Sen. Byrd's proposed amendment would subject them also to congressional review.

The danger, of course, is that Supreme Court justices might be subjected to pressures and, thus, not render decisions in an objective manner. But it must also be recognized that a great many of the high court's decisions in recent years have been as much subjective as they have been objective.

As we noted in the beginning, Sen. Byrd's proposal probably will not be approved by Congress and then submitted to the states for ratification—at least, not for many years to come, if then. But he has pointed clearly to a failing in the present system and he has suggested a remedy.

When and if Congress gets around to considering that suggestion, the debate, itself, should be worth the careful attention of all Americans.

NATION'S DETERIORATING DEFENSES: MOST PRESSING PROBLEM OF OUR TIME

HON. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 6, 1971

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, the Cincinnati Enquirer recently pub-

lished an interesting account of the recent colloquy on the floor of the Senate concerning the military posture of the United States.

This article, reprinted on September 25 in the Lynchburg News, contains cogent quotations from the several Senators who took the floor to stress the continuing need for maintaining a strong national defense.

I ask unanimous consent that the article, "Most Pressing Problem of Our Time," be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

NATION'S DETERIORATING DEFENSES: MOST PRESSING PROBLEM OF OUR TIME

Shortly before Congress recessed last Friday, seven lawmakers took the Senate floor and sought, at some length and in some detail, to alert Congress—and the nation—to the growing disparity between U.S. military power and that of the Soviet Union.

The colloquy was, in the words of Sen. Hugh Scott (R-Pa.), the Senate minority leader (who was not among the colloquy's participants), "a noteworthy attempt to call the attention of the Senate to the need to strengthen the President's hand."

It was that, to be sure. But it was also a reminder of all Americans that neither in national defense nor any other field of endeavor is a margin of superiority permanent.

Let the senators speak for themselves:

"The security of the United States," said Sen. James L. Buckley (Con.-R.N.Y.), "is endangered to a degree unparalleled in its modern history. If present trends continue much longer, the ability of the President of the United States to support U.S. foreign-policy objectives in Europe, the Middle East, in Asia and even in the Caribbean will be in jeopardy because of the precipitate erosion of U.S. strategic power in the late 1960s and early 1970s."

"The United States virtually halted any increase in strategic strength during the entire decade of the 1960s," said Sen. Peter H. Dominick (R-Colo.), "while the Soviets devoted enormous sums and energy to the mushroom growth of their economic power. In relative terms, the United States is far weaker in relation to the Soviet Union than at any time during the past 25 years and

... at present growth rates the Soviets will have superior strategic strength in the very near future."

"It is especially noteworthy," declared Sen. William E. Brock (R-Tenn.), "that the acceleration in the Soviet naval buildup was accomplished precisely at a time when the United States started to reduce the scope and offensive nature of our armed forces . . . Our unilateral reduction in forces did not stop the Soviet drive for more and newer sophisticated long-range weapons; rather, it seems to have spurred the Soviets on to a greater effort coupled with the all-out psychological and political offensive in every part of the globe."

"We shall be heading for serious trouble," said Sen. Harry F. Byrd, Jr. (D-Va.), "If we let our hopes (for the success of the strategic-arms-limitation talks (SALT) and of President Nixon's impending trip to Peking), rather than our realistic assessment of the world situation, dictate our defense policies. None of us knows just what are Communist Russia's intentions. We do have evidence, however, as to her capabilities. It is on her capabilities that we must judge our defense needs."

"Today," said Sen. Strom Thurmond (R-S.C.), "the Soviets not only have a working antiballistic-missile (ABM) system around Moscow, they are working steadily toward achieving a crushing first-strike capability, a capability they could achieve within 36 to 48 months at their present rate."

"We must remember," said Sen. Edward J. Gurney (R-Fla.), "that the United States can never match its potential enemies in numbers of land armies or in ships or in numbers of tactical weapons. We can and must maintain an extensive leadtime in military technological superiority if we are to maintain a viable defense posture. And yet we appear to be engaging in a continued policy of eliminating projects involving scientific and technological progress."

"For some obscure reason," said Sen. Carl Curtis (R-Neb.), who spoke in support of the development, without further delay, of the B1 strategic bomber, "every heavy bomber ever built by the United States has fought its stiffest battle in Congress."

Senator Curtis reinforced his view by citing the conclusion of George P. Hunt, a former Marine Corps officer and a former Life magazine editor, who wrote in the June 18 issue of Life:

"In some eight years Russia has caught up and is now going ahead of us in many categories of missile strength. She could today concentrate off Cuba a powerful surface fleet, newer, faster than ours and equipped with weapons we do not have and an underwater fleet outnumbering ours by many times. It will surprise most Americans that today, as opposed to 1962, we are the ones who could find ourselves at a military disadvantage. It will take fast and skillful work to put (our) military back in shape."

Curiously enough, when the senators completed their discourse on the nation's defenses, the Senate shifted to a discussion of the railroad strike and never returned to the serious and far-reaching questions the senators raised.

Yet the dire warnings their colloquy imparted come on the heels of a growing number of similar alarm signals.

At roughly the time the senators spoke, in fact, the editor of "Jane's Fighting Ships," internationally recognized as the authoritative guide to naval power, warned in London that U.S. naval power is in a serious decline. "By any standards," added Raymond V. B. Blackman, "the Soviet fleet now represents the 'supernavy of a superpower.'"

Somewhat earlier, seven members of the Blue-Ribbon Defense Panel (appointed by President Nixon in 1969 to assess the nation's defense establishment) reported that

"U.S. strategic superiority had ended." They added: "The situation which our country faces is without precedent . . . It is not too much to say that in the '70s neither the vital interests of the United States nor the lives and freedom of its citizens will be secure."

What makes such findings doubly disturbing is that they unfold in an era in which the military establishment—along with the so-called military-industrial complex—has become the favorite target for growing numbers of Americans and in an era in which every defense expenditure is represented as robbing the hungry, the jobless and the destitute.

The fact of the matter is that the nation's investment in the urgent business of national defense has been declining almost as rapidly as its expenditures in behalf of health, education and welfare have been increasing.

As Senator Dominick told the Senate last month, the \$76 billion requested for defense for the fiscal year that began July 1 is the lowest figure, when viewed as a percentage of the U.S. gross national product (GNP), since fiscal 1951—before the upsurge in spending occasioned by the Korean War.

The same figure—6.8 per cent of the GNP—is notably lower than the 9.5 per cent figure of fiscal 1968.

Almost as disturbing has been the failure of the nation's defense planners to keep abreast in the crucial area of research and development. "While military research and development expenditures made by the Soviet Union have been growing at a rate of approximately 14 per cent per year," Senator Gurney told the Senate, "this country's funding in that category has remained nearly constant."

The further fact is that the Soviet Union has nearly one and a half times as many scientists and engineers employed in research and development as the United States.

Indeed, as Senator Gurney declared, existing pools of skilled technical and scientific personnel are being rapidly dissolved.

"A vast national resource of some of the most highly skilled workers in our history," Senator Gurney went on, "are now selling hamburgers or hot dogs, doing a host of things that any high-school dropout could do. Thousands are on welfare. Most are bitter and disillusioned. I do not doubt that, in years ahead, we will look back in wonderment and inquire: How could a nation be so criminally wasteful of its greatest resource, skilled scientists and engineers and technical people?"

No less baffling has been the growing disposition to treat technology itself as a national enemy rather than as the principal advantage that stands between U.S. national security and the threat of any external enemy.

A final factor—and perhaps the most disquieting of all—is the resolve, particularly among the current crop of Democratic presidential candidates, to slash defense spending to make more money available for a variety of domestic priorities, ranging from welfare to health insurance and from urban renewal to environmental improvement.

The fact of the matter is any government's first obligation must be the preservation of its people from external assault.

Senator Henry M. Jackson (D-Wash.) sought some weeks ago to put the issue into realistic perspective:

"My father and mother came from Norway back in the 1880s," he said. "That little country had one of the highest standards of living, relatively speaking, in the world. A thousand years of freedom, clean air and clean water. But what good did that do when the hobbled boot moved in and took over in 1940 and destroyed the Norwegians' liberties, their freedom, their standard of living."

"The issue," he added, "is survival."

NATIONAL 4-H—BRIDGING THE "GENERATION GAP"

HON. LAMAR BAKER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 6, 1971

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, this week, October 3-9, is National 4-H Week. I want to take this opportunity to call attention to the outstanding achievements of this organization nationwide and to commend especially 4-H members and leaders in my home State of Tennessee.

National 4-H, which counts over 4 million members in rural areas as well as urban communities, has designated the theme of this year's observance, "4-H Bridges the Gap."

This title is appropriate, because the 4-H program indeed bridges the gap between the idealistic aspirations of youth and the practical wisdom of parents and adult leaders.

We have always experienced a so-called generation gap between youth and the older generation, and today presents no exception. National 4-H, however, is actively working toward constructive achievements utilizing the special talents and experiences of many age groups. Combining skills of members from elementary school through college age, teen and adult leaders, 4-H puts abilities of all to good use in reaching common goals.

Other adult-youth community programs would do well to study what cooperation has enabled 4-H to accomplish.

It was an honor to meet with leaders of the Tennessee 4-H, in Washington to attend a citizenship conference at the National 4-H Center in Bethesda, in June of this year. The high caliber of the youth and adults representing our State organization left a tremendous impression upon me.

They combine high goals and ambition with practical knowledge. The 4-H program has equipped them with pragmatic experience which will enable them to be better citizens and leaders of tomorrow. While a few of their contemporaries are criticizing the flaws of our society, 4-H'ers are digging in and working to achieve solutions.

Figures tell the story of the program's success in Tennessee. Since its inception in the State in 1911, 4-H now reaches into every county of Tennessee, boasting 3,360 clubs and nearly 129,000 members. In addition, over 9,000 teenage and adult leaders volunteer their time and know-how to contribute to the program's smooth operation.

The dedication and initiative of Tennessee 4-H'ers is demonstrated by the fact 374,419 individual projects were completed in 1971 in such areas as food and nutrition, clothing, field crops, animal science, and electrical skills. Through their endeavors, these young people are learning first hand the values of perseverance, ambition, and hard work.

Each year, the National 4-H Foundation selects several topics as the focal points of its commemoration, designed to

better acquaint the people of the community with 4-H and its contributions. This year, the emphasis is upon the environment, nutrition, development, health, and careers, all areas of concern to today's young people.

I commend the USDA extension personnel, nearly 7,000 adult volunteer leaders, parents, local civic leaders, and Tennessee 4-H members for their demonstrated ability to select and attain high goals. All of us, young people and adults, would do well to adopt the 4-H pledge as our inspiration for better living:

I pledge my head to clearer thinking, my heart to greater loyalty, my hands to larger service, my health for better living for my club, my community and my country.

FORWARD IS BACKWARD

HON. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 6, 1971

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, the September 27 edition of the Roanoke Times included an excellent editorial on the subject of compulsory busing of school children as it applies to the Chinese-American population in San Francisco.

The editorial makes the point that money for education should be spent on teachers, books, and buildings, and not on unnecessary and unwanted buses.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the editorial "Forward Is Backward," be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

FORWARD IS BACKWARD

The protest from Chinatown in San Francisco illustrates precisely what has gone wrong since the Supreme Court's desegregation decision of 1954. The court ruled—rightfully and unanimously—that it was unconstitutional to assign students to school because of their race. What are the schools doing now? Under court orders they are assigning—and busing—students to school because of their race. That is the ironic result of all the vain resistance measures.

Whether Chinatown's neighborhood schools have been as inferior as Negro neighborhood schools is not known here. Black schools in many cases have been inferior, in cases vastly inferior. There is one similarity among the racial neighborhoods: The black man is beginning to show racial pride and a desire to keep his one identity just as the Chinese-American does. There is another similarity: Chinatown's protest has been rejected. It, too, must pay the penalty for mistakes made elsewhere and embodied in court rules adopted to counter the mistakes.

A solution to these problems will contain many elements, but one of them is to spend money on teachers, books and buildings, not on unnecessary buses. Today's solution seems to have come from Alice in Wonderland, where up can mean down and forward can mean backward. Greater wisdom must be applied in the true spirit and meaning of the 1954 decision.

EMPLOYMENT TAX CREDIT—A WORTHY CONCEPT

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 6, 1971

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, the House is acting on legislation today that will map this country's economic future. The Revenue Act of 1971 includes a number of proposals designed to untrack our lethargic economic system and induce greater spending through increased confidence in the entire system.

Yet, the legislation reaches the floor unamendable, on a take-it or leave-it basis. Unfortunately, the Revenue Act of 1971 contains one proposal that will confound the average citizen over and over again in the months to come. The investment tax credit was submitted by the administration to provide a direct inducement to order new capital equipment—thus increasing aggregate demands and subsequent production of goods and increased employment. It is a sound concept, but not designed specifically for a period of high unemployment and strong inflationary pressures.

Through conventional means the investment tax credit operates on a demand-and-supply principle, yet does not guarantee a drop in unemployment or an increase in goods produced or profits. There are loopholes, especially for the major corporation that already planned to purchase new equipment this year. Most important of all, there is no guarantee for the labor force under this system. Certainly we will find some situations in the future where the Federal Government gave a tax break to a corporation that purchased new equipment, only to see that corporation lay off part of its labor force because of the increased capability of production in the new equipment.

Essentially, Mr. Speaker, the investment tax credit is a gift for business that offers little or no help to the workingman in America and, much worse, offers little evidence that unemployment can be brought down to an acceptable level, while stimulating the economy. The investment tax credit is no more than a faltering step toward solution of our economic troubles from an administration that promised a giant stride forward.

Mr. Speaker, a study submitted to me by the University of California at Berkeley has prompted my remarks today. In preparation for phase two of Mr. Nixon's economic program, Prof. B. F. Roberts and Richard Thunen have come forward with a novel idea I think is worthy of our consideration. It is called an "Employment Tax Credit," and would give employers a tax credit for net additions to employment. I am including in the RECORD the text of a public policy workingpaper on the subject, prepared by Professor Roberts and Mr. Thunen, which goes into great detail on the idea.

Mr. Speaker, the employment tax credit is truly a novel idea. It is designed

to accompany the conventional economic instruments which operate through a supply-demand channel. It is designed to increase the primary factor of production—labor—and provides a direct inducement to increase employment of labor, production of goods, and subsequently, raises total wage incomes and increases demand. The tax credits under this plan would be structured on the unemployment rate—as the unemployment rate falls the credit rate would fall accordingly.

Just last week the Washington Post editorialized—

... if post-freeze rules are to work they must treat labor and business in what both regard as an even handed manner and must not leave substantial numbers of people feeling victimized by accidental circumstances like the timing of their wage contracts or price announcements. The challenge is to design a system that seems likely to be fair and effective without erecting a lot of administration machinery . . .

Mr. Speaker, it is my opinion that this proposal provides the simple and effective means to get this economy untracked—with a minimum of bureaucracy. This concept could be easily administered by existing Government agencies. Yet, it also provides an even break to both business and labor. The Nation cannot afford another 90-day period in which labor organizations and individual workers lose confidence in the Government. Granted, there is a loophole for those businesses which intended to hire more workers. But in comparison I would much rather see such a loophole go to General Motors for hiring an addition 200 assembly-line workers than see this Government give them a tax break for purchase of machinery that would eventually mean a layoff of 200 men.

Simulation experiments with economic models indicate this plan will prove quite effective in lowering the unemployment rate, while increasing our GNP, profits, and wages. In addition, it is also expected that implementation of this plan will improve the unemployment-inflation trade-off and permit the phasing out of wage-price controls as early as 1972.

Mr. Speaker, because of these economic factors and my belief the investment tax credit will do little to stimulate this depressed economy, I submit this proposal for stabilization policy for inclusion in the RECORD.

The material follows:

EMPLOYMENT TAX CREDIT: PROPOSAL FOR STABILIZATION POLICY¹

(By B. F. Roberts, Richard N. Thunen, University of California, Berkeley, September 22, 1971)

This paper suggests a fiscal policy instrument—employment tax credit—which in the current economic situation could significantly stimulate employment and production, increase both labor income and profits, reduce the federal deficit, and diminish inflationary pressures.

It is estimated that a modest application of this instrument as a supplement to the President's new economic program could, by fourth quarter 1972, increase employment by

¹Footnotes at end of article.

1.9 million workers, GNP by \$23.7 billion, real GNP by \$17.0 billion, wages by \$24.3 billion, and profits by \$3.7 billion; and reduce the unemployment rate by .7 percent, and the federal deficit by \$5.9 billion, more than can be obtained by the President's program alone. Also, it is expected that implementation of the employment tax credit will improve the unemployment-inflation trade-off and permit the phasing out of wage-price controls as early as 1972. In addition, this fiscal instrument can easily be structured as an automatic stabilizer which once implemented will not need adjustment, and can be administered by the Internal Revenue Service in cooperation with the Bureau of Labor Statistics without additional bureaucracy.

The proposed policy instrument is a tax credit granted to employers for net additions to employment. The tax credit associated with each net new employee would be calculated as a fraction of the wages paid to the employee during a specified period of time.² The magnitude of the credit fraction, or credit rate, granted the employer can be structured to depend progressively upon the unemployment rate, such that when the unemployment rate is high, the credit would be relatively large, but when the unemployment rate is low (at a level reflecting only transitional or frictional unemployment and generally regarded for practical purposes as full employment³), the credit rate would go to zero. The employment tax credit would thus provide a progressive inducement, through labor cost reduction, to hire additional employees when labor markets are slack but would eliminate the inducement when labor markets are tight to avoid upward pressure on wage rates.⁴ Structured this way, the employment tax credit has the character of an automatic stabilizer.

The presumption that the employment tax credit will induce additional employment rests on the plausible notion that entrepreneurs will find the utilization of additional factor inputs more profitable if the cost of additional input units is reduced. This notion has been the basis for numerous incen-

tive schemes to promote local industry.⁴ It is also the basis for belief in the effectiveness of the investment tax credit toward promoting expenditures for capital goods.⁵

While the employment tax credit shares the same conceptual foundation as the investment tax credit, and is in some ways symmetric with it, there are important distinctions relevant to the design of economic policy. The employment tax credit is tied to a primary factor of production (labor), provides a direct inducement to increase the productive employment of labor and thus increase the aggregate supply of goods and services and, subsequently, by increasing total wage income, stimulates demand. The investment tax credit is tied to a produced factor of production (capital), provides a direct inducement to order new capital stock and thus increase aggregate demand, and subsequently stimulates increased production of capital goods and the employment of labor.

The alternative channels of supply-demand versus demand-supply, through which the two instruments are routed, are of crucial importance for designing stabilization policies under the current circumstances of high unemployment and strong inflationary pressures (price rises are being confined by the freeze but inflationary pressures persist). The conventional monetary and fiscal instruments, including the investment tax credit, operate through the demand-supply channel and are currently thought to face an unfavorable trade-off between attainable unemployment and inflation.⁶ By supplementing the conventional instruments by others, such as the employment tax credit, which operate through the supply-demand channel, the terms of the apparent unemployment-inflation trade-off might be substantially improved.⁷ A crucial effect expected from the employment tax credit is an expansion of the aggregate supply of goods and services relatively faster than aggregate demand, thus shifting the unemployment-inflation trade-off.

Whether the employment tax credit will actually work is, of course, an empirical matter that can be verified only if implemented. Reasoned estimates of the effects can, how-

ever, be derived from simulation experiments with econometric models. The numerical results of two such experiments, using the California Economic Forecasting Project national econometric model, are reported here.⁸ The two cases reported are:

CASE I—PRESIDENT'S NEW ECONOMIC PROGRAM

The principal assumptions of this simulation are: the President's program of August 14 is enacted, wage-price control will be implemented after the freeze to restrict inflation to three percent annual rate, the import surcharge is converted to a five percent revaluation of the dollar, and monetary expansion is gradually slowed to seven percent annual rate.

CASE II—PRESIDENT'S NEW ECONOMIC PROGRAM PLUS EMPLOYMENT TAX CREDIT

The principal assumptions of this simulation are identical with those of Case I plus a modest application of the employment tax credit. The credit rates and dollar amounts of the credits for this simulation are:

Quarters	1971		1972				1973	
	IV	I	II	III	IV	I	II	
Credit rate (percent).....	26.0	23.8	20.0	16.6	12.2	8.2	5.0	
Credit (billion dollars).....	2.1	4.0	5.5	6.6	5.2	3.7	2.5	

The credit rates shown here have been calculated as an increasing function of the unemployment rate of the preceding quarter. This formulation permits the credit rate which will apply for any specific period to be calculated and announced at the beginning of that period. These credit rates represent the percent of wages paid to net new employees (at wage rate prevailing when hired) for a period of one year. Employers must maintain or increase the level of their employment for a one year period in order to receive the full credit. Numerous other formulas, giving various degrees of employment incentive, are possible.

The simulation results of Cases I and II for selected variable are summarized in the following tables:

Footnotes at end of article.

TOTAL CIVILIAN EMPLOYMENT

[In millions of dollars, seasonally adjusted]

	1971		1972				1973	
	III	IV	I	II	III	IV	I	II
Case I.....	78.9	79.3	79.8	80.5	81.2	82.0	82.8	83.7
Case II.....	78.9	79.9	80.9	81.9	82.9	83.9	84.9	85.9

UNEMPLOYMENT RATE

[In percent, seasonally adjusted]

	1971		1972				1973	
	III	IV	I	II	III	IV	I	II
Case I.....	6.1	6.0	5.8	5.7	5.5	5.3	5.1	5.0
Case II.....	6.1	5.9	5.6	5.3	4.9	4.6	4.4	4.2

GROSS NATIONAL PRODUCT

[In billions of dollars, seasonally adjusted annual rate]

	1971		1972				1973	
	III	IV	I	II	III	IV	I	II
Case I.....	1,056.3	1,079.7	1,106.1	1,131.0	1,155.8	1,180.6	1,205.5	1,230.5
Case II.....	1,056.3	1,085.5	1,117.7	1,147.7	1,176.7	1,204.3	1,230.9	1,256.4

REAL GROSS NATIONAL PRODUCT

	1971		1972				1973	
	III	IV	I	II	III	IV	I	II
Case I.....	742.3	754.7	768.1	780.2	792.3	804.1	815.9	827.6
Case II.....	742.3	759.1	776.7	792.6	807.5	821.1	833.8	845.7

The simulation results for Case I, the President's program, represent a moderately optimistic view. Some forecasters are suggesting greater optimism based largely on greater consumer and investor enthusiasm than is suggested here. Regardless which view of the President's program is used, the employment tax credit supplements that program and the

relative improvement represented by Case II is of the greatest importance for estimating the impact of the employment tax credit.

The Case II results show an immediate response to the fourth quarter 1971 introduction of the employment tax credit. Employment, output, inventories, wages, and profits all show substantial gains. With the pace of

WAGES AND SALARIES

	1971		1972				1973	
	III	IV	I	II	III	IV	I	II
Case I.....	580.7	587.0	597.6	608.3	622.0	635.2	648.6	662.1
Case II.....	580.7	592.3	609.5	625.4	643.5	659.5	673.9	687.5

CORPORATE PROFITS AND INVENTORY VALUATION ADJUSTMENT

	1971		1972				1973	
	III	IV	I	II	III	IV	I	II
Case I.....	77.0	82.7	87.5	91.6	94.4	97.4	100.4	103.4
Case II.....	77.0	84.3	90.0	95.1	98.6	101.1	103.8	106.3

CHANGE IN BUSINESS INVENTORIES

	1971		1972				1973	
	III	IV	I	II	III	IV	I	II
Case I.....	1.1	5.2	8.5	10.2	11.4	11.7	11.7	11.4
Case II.....	1.1	7.5	11.8	13.6	14.4	13.9	13.1	12.1

FEDERAL DEFICIT

	1971		1972				1973	
	III	IV	I	II	III	IV	I	II
Case I.....	22.3	24.2	29.5	27.6	26.1	21.2	18.5	14.6
Case II.....	22.3	24.9	29.2	25.8	23.0	15.3	10.3	5.1

activity increased, the federal deficit is gradually decreased suggesting that the employment tax credit more than pays its way.

The employment tax credit rates used for the Case II simulation may actually be higher than required to induce these levels of hiring. The model's response to the credit was intentionally dampened to minimize the pos-

sibilities of overstatement in favor of the tax instrument. Even if the initial rate is higher than necessary, the automatic stabilization feature of the proposal would make the system self-correcting during subsequent periods and there would be little if any federal revenue loss due to the initial high rate.

The assumption of wage-price control has been maintained for both simulations. All indications to date are that phase II of the President's program will include some form of wage-price controls so this assumption is probably realistic. However, it is interesting to question whether controls are actually necessary to contain inflation. The reasoning developed above suggests that the employment tax credit could be an inflation dampening force. To investigate this, simulations of Cases I and II with price controls removed mid-year 1972 have been run. For Case I (the President's program) the simulation suggested that the economy tends toward a stable situation characterized by a 5 percent unemployment rate and a 3.3 percent annual inflation rate, in terms of the consumer price index. For Case II (Case I plus employment tax credit) the economy tends toward a stable situation characterized by a 4.2 percent unemployment rate and a 3.7 percent annual inflation rate. Case II has a substantially lower unemployment rate but a higher inflation rate, but this combination seems to represent a favorable shift in the unemployment-inflation trade-off.⁶

The tentative nature of the estimates given in this paper should be recognized and their use in contemplating policy implications should be tempered with caution. They are estimates obtained through experiments with a specific econometric model and our judgments. Our work is continuing and we hope that the issuing of these estimates, while the nation is searching for effective new economic programs, will prompt other investigators to conduct independent experiments with the employment tax credit to evaluate its probable impact.

FOOTNOTES

¹ This revises and extends an earlier draft given limited circulation dated April 26, 1971.

² The employment tax credit is similar to the negative wage bill tax discussed by Ragnar Frisch, *Price-Wage-Tax-Subsidy Policies as Instruments in Maintaining Optimal Employment*, Economic and Employment Commission, Economic and Social Council, United Nations, April 14, 1949.

³ Locational variations in the credit rate to preferentially promote employment in high unemployment areas could be obtained by calculating the credit rate as a function of the local unemployment rate.

⁴ See John E. Moes, *Local Subsidies for Industry*, University of North Carolina Press, 1962, and Harry Richardson, *Regional Economics*, Praeger, 1969, for discussions of local incentives to industry.

⁵ See Robert E. Hall and Dale W. Jorgenson, "Tax Policy and Investment Behavior," *American Economic Review*, June 1967, and subsequent related communications by Robert M. Coen; Robert Eisner; and Robert E. Hall and Dale W. Jorgenson, *American Economic Review*, June 1969, for detailed examination of the investment tax credit.

⁶ It is widely believed that low unemployment and stable prices are competing objectives and that the unemployment-inflation trade-off is such that high inflation must be accepted to maintain relatively full employment or, high unemployment must be accepted to maintain stable prices. This topic has received considerable recent discussion. See for example: *Economic Report of the President 1971*, Government Printing Office; Milton Friedman, "The Role of Monetary Policy," *American Economic Review*, March 1968; Arthur M. Okun, *The Political Economy of Prosperity*, Norton, 1969; George L. Perry, "Changing Labor Markets and In-

flation," *Brookings Papers on Economic Activity* 3, 1970; Robert J. Gordon, "Inflation in Recession and Recovery," *Brookings Papers on Economic Activity* 1, 1971.

⁷ A reminder of this possibility was given by Professor Stefan Robock in the *Wall Street Journal*, May 18, 1970:

... strategy should shift to one of increasing supply rather than reducing demand. Inflation is most frequently described as an excess of demand over the supply of goods and services. But it is equally valid to consider inflation as a shortage of supply in relation to demand. In other words, inflationary pressures can be reduced by expanding supply faster than demand.

⁸ A technical description of the CEFP national econometric model is in preparation.

⁹ Estimated unemployment-inflation trade-off curves for the U.S. economy have been constructed by Robert J. Gordon, "Inflation in Recession and Recovery," *Brookings Papers on Economic Activity* 1, 1971. The unemployment-inflation combination of 5 percent, 3.3 percent, respectively, of the President's program is compatible with these trade-off curves. The combination 4.2 percent, 3.7 percent of the President's program supplemented by the employment tax credit falls below Gordon's trade-off curves.

CBS EXPANDS THOUGHT CONTROL FROM THE LIVING ROOM TO THE HISTORY CLASSROOM

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 6, 1971

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, CBS News and Grolier Educational Corp. have announced a new series of audio cassettes to provide schools and libraries with a continuing history of major contemporary news events.

Now not only TV news but also educational aids will be distorted to adhere to the CBS slant. Apparently CBS feels they can prove their lies are true by writing history for the coming generations.

If these cassettes are as biased and incorrect as CBS television "documentaries" have been, there will be little improvement in our children's minds. In fact, their highly impressionable minds can be expected to regress to the stage of confusion and chaos—the only future for an issue-oriented world.

One wonders if this CBS venture is financed by taxpayers' funds or out of the tax-free foundation; there is little difference. The proposal for truth in broadcasting (H.R. 6536) now needs to be extended to truth in education.

I insert a related news clipping in the RECORD at this point:

[From the Evening Star, Oct. 6, 1971]

CBS, GROLIER PLAN VENTURE TO AID SCHOOLS
NEW YORK (D.J.).—CBS News and Grolier Educational Corp. announced a new series of audio cassettes to provide schools and libraries with a continuing history of major contemporary news events.

CBS News is a division of Columbia Broadcasting System and Grolier Educational is a unit of Grolier Inc.

The joint venture is designed to give libraries and schools a resource center of all history analogous to the archives of CBS News.

Included in the series will be news con-

ferences, major talks and speeches of President Nixon and interviews and talks with a wide range of prominent national and international figures.

SOVIET SEA POWER

HON. THOMAS N. DOWNING

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 6, 1971

Mr. DOWNING. Mr. Speaker, very timely remarks on Soviet seapower were delivered by Mr. W. Tilford Smith of the Newport News Shipbuilding & Dry Dock Co. at a seminar of the Navy League of the United States in San Francisco, Calif., on September 25. I am pleased to include them in the RECORD so that everyone who is concerned about the threat which the Soviets pose on the high seas may have an opportunity to read them.

The remarks follow:

SOVIET SEA POWER

Mr. Chairman, distinguished members of the panel, ladies and gentlemen. It is a pleasure to be with members and friends of the Navy League today in this magnificent City by the sea and to participate in this timely discussion of sea power.

It is more than 3,000 miles across our great land to my home in Newport News, Virginia—a city, too, that sits by the sea. But, our country is virtually surrounded by navigable waters: the Pacific Ocean here on the West Coast; the Atlantic Ocean washing our Eastern shores; the Gulf of Mexico bordering much of our Southland, and the Great Lakes with outlets to the Atlantic. One half of our States border these great water areas, and 80 percent of our States have access to the seas either directly or via major waterways such as the St. Lawrence and the Mississippi River with its tributaries.

To put all of this water in clear perspective, let me cite a few unassailable facts:

Our nation has land boundaries with only two of the 150 or so countries of the world with which we conduct trade and commerce.

More than 90 percent of our import and export tonnage is carried by sea transportation.

Five out of every six of the world's nations border on the seas which make up 70 percent of the earth's surface.

Ninety-five percent of the world's population live within 600 miles of the ocean's shores.

Our nation, occupying only 2 percent of the surface of the globe, is sensitively dependent on sea commerce for vast quantities of goods and materials for industrial uses and consumer needs.

Just a few days ago, on Wednesday of this week, the Secretary of Navy John Chafee, speaking at the Launching of the new frigate USS California, at Newport News Shipbuilding, said "Of the 71 so called strategic materials critical to our national defense, we must import all or part of sixty-eight."

Our life style would be quite different without those liquid refreshments—coffee, tea, cocoa and Scotch, for example—which come to us from across the seas in ships.

The products of our farms and factories are shipped to consumer markets abroad, and those exports have an important bearing on the vitality of our national economy.

I believe it can be accurately claimed that we are a maritime nation, a trading nation whose history and development have, in great measure, been shaped by a commercial

interchange with other nations and thus on the mobility of the seas.

The Soviet Union, on the other hand, has long been a land-oriented nation. There were occasions in the past when Russian ships were seen on the oceans, but until Nicolai Krushchev, the Soviet Union was a nation preoccupied with expanding and defending her land frontiers. That man, who died almost in obscurity a few weeks ago, believed that political tactics alone could not effectively spread international communism—to him economic penetration beyond Russian borders was necessary, and this could not be accomplished without exploitation of the seas—without merchant shipping resources.

Josef Stalin may be given credit for the long range program to build a Soviet naval fleet, but it was a coal miner from the Ukraine who set the stage for the phenomenal growth of the Soviet Merchant Marine.

In 1950 the USSR had 432 merchant ships aggregating 1.9 million deadweight tons. Fifty-one of these were loaned to Russia by the United States under the Lend Lease program of a quarter of a century ago, and I am not sure that we were ever paid for them.

As of the first of this year, the Soviet Merchant Marine consisted of 1,942 ships of 14.3 million deadweight tons—a 700 percent increase in tonnage in two decades. A truly remarkable growth!

By comparison, the United States privately-owned active fleet, which in 1950 numbered 1,100 ships of 13.5 million tons today consists of 754 ships of 14.1 million tons. This latter tonnage figure reflects the greatly increased sizes of today's tankers and cargo ships having three to five times the capacity of vessels ten years ago.

There is now little doubt that deliveries of merchant ships this year will place the Soviet merchant fleet ahead of our own in both numbers of active ships and tonnage within the next two years. It might also be noted that Liberia, Japan, Britain, Norway and Greece continue to rank ahead of the USSR and the USA in shipping tonnage.

Advances in Soviet maritime affairs are more remarkable when one considers that the Soviets were practically without a Navy, and had few merchant vessels for domestic use at the close of World War II. Many of her major shipyards had been destroyed. In this predicament, communist leaders came up with a plan—or plans if you think of the glowing pronouncements that came from the Kremlin every five years.

The first goal was to construct a modern Navy for defensive power and international stature. Second, ports and inland waterways were to be improved for domestic trade needs. The third objective was to build a modern merchant fleet as a major instrument for the extension of Soviet power and influence throughout the world. Attainment of the first objective is frightening to free people for the Soviet Navy is today second only to that of the United States and closing fast. Her accomplishments in connecting her far flung land areas with navigable waterways are feats of brilliant engineering and hard work that cannot be ignored.

In the decade of the fifties, Russia relied on Finland, Poland and East Germany for merchant ship construction, mainly for fishing vessels, coastal freighters and barges. But, when the Soviet naval program was in full swing in the late fifties, the Kremlin was ready to devote attention to building her own merchant ships for world commerce, and today Russia's shipbuilding complex possesses a capability equal to that of the United States. But, unlike the United States, design and construction as well as employment of all Soviet ships—navy, merchant marine, fishing and oceanographic—are carefully coordinated in the upper echelons of the Soviet bureaucracy, and matters of shipbuilding, shipping and international trade are given high priority.

Unlike the new, large ships of the Western World and Japan, ranging from 40,000 to 400,000 tons, the Soviets have concentrated much of their building on smaller ships in the 5,000 to 8,000 ton class—to meet her particular needs and to make use of the inland waterways and shallow coastal ports many of which require icebreaking operations during parts of the year. Additionally, the Soviets build smaller vessels for service to underdeveloped foreign countries where port facilities for large sophisticated ships are either not available or limited as to draft. Presently, about 20 percent of the Soviet Fleet is involved in domestic shipping accounting for about 55 percent of the total tonnage of cargoes carried.

There are thus those who suggest that the Soviets are not in the big league of maritime nations, that she is not a serious merchant marine competitor. In certain respects, her ships do not have the same payload coefficients, but then profits, in the usual sense, are not their motivation. Presence has much to do with sea power, and the ships flying the "hammer and sickle" are now seen on the seas throughout the world whether they be fishing vessels, trawlers with intelligence gathering equipment, cargo, or passenger vessels. These ships provide a formidable strategic political and propaganda function as well as providing sufficiency for their own shipping needs.

Last year, Soviet merchant ships visited more than 900 ports in 98 different countries. The equivalent of millions of dollars in military and economic aid were distributed from these ships. On almost every port of call, there is a Soviet consular representative or a Russian trade group and as these calls multiply, her fleet enlarges, her trade increases, Soviet communist influence becomes greater.

Soviet officials proudly predict that by 1980, cargoes for developing countries will be worth more than the equivalent of 11 billion dollars. By using the seas, communist Russia expands her political and economical presence around the world, and this is a strategy of sea power of most alarming dimensions and definite purposes.

Mr. Guzhenko, Minister of the USSR Merchant Marine, boasts that Soviet merchant vessels now service 33 regular freight lines abroad and maintain 15 international passenger lines connecting the ports of 24 countries. Soviet shipping agreements have been completed with several western countries including France, Great Britain, the Netherlands, Japan and Canada, and one permitting ports of call here on the West Coast of the United States has already been approved.

Even with relatively small ships, she has been able to successfully supply Cuba with oil estimated at some 12,000 tons per day from tankers of about 50,000 deadweight tons. Of course, the missiles brought to that island just 90 miles from our shores, during the historic confrontation of several years ago, were carried in Russian bottoms. The communists do not intend to suffer again the embarrassment of an American sea blockade to thwart their ambitions.

The Soviets are in no way satisfied with the composition of their present shipping fleet. Mr. Bakayev, Guzhenko's predecessor as Soviet Maritime Minister, frequently states that Russia, by adding a million tons of shipping per year, will be the number one maritime power by 1980. Whether or not that goal will be accomplished by the end of the present decade remains to be seen. But, it must be remembered they started from scratch just a few years ago, and the intensity of their ambitions should not, and must not, be underestimated.

Within the past several months, the Soviets have departed from the norm. They have announced construction of a series of tankers in the 150,000 deadweight category. Mr. Guzhenko openly states that the size of the ships is geared to passage of the Bosphorus

and Baltic Straits. In another departure from the cast of the past, the keel for her first all container carrier was laid last year. This ship, it is said, is the first in a series having the capacity to accommodate approximately 300 international standard 20 foot containers. A second series of containerships capable of carrying 700 standard containers is believed to be in the offing. How many of these new tankers and containerships are planned is still not known.

From available data, however, it is estimated that the Russians are spending the equivalent of \$1.7 billion for new merchant and fishing vessels each year whereas in 1970 the United States expended \$253 million for merchant ships and virtually nothing for the fishing fleet. Again, from available data, as of January 1970, the USSR had 131 merchant ships under construction compared to our 49, and for the past several years, new ship deliveries to the Russian merchant fleet have outpaced deliveries in our country by nearly 4 to 1.

Our merchant fleet carries less than six percent, by volume, of our imports and exports while the Soviet merchant fleet moves close to 75 percent of all her cargoes in her "red flag" ships. In addition, the Soviets maintain "effective control" over some 700 ships of about 6,500,000 deadweight tons total of satellite countries. United States corporations own about 50 percent of the so-called "flags of convenience" fleet under the registry of Liberia, Panama and Honduras, but more than half of these ships are tankers and far less valuable from a total ocean strategy point of view than the cargo vessels which constitute 90 percent of the Soviet "effective control fleet."

In their intense effort to move their commercial shipping throughout the world, the Soviets have no problems with training or wages of seamen; carrying as much of their own trade as they wish; or devoting vigorous efforts to marine engineering and naval architecture. By manipulating cargo rates, and even perhaps by commodity dumping, the Russians could seriously threaten free world shipping—virtually at will.

The Center for Strategic and International Studies has stated: "By winning the dominant role in world shipping, the Soviet Union might hope to be in a position to deny strategic materials to the United States or to dictate the terms under which they could be provided. Such leverage would endanger our national security and is possible because foreign flags now carry more than 95 percent of the many strategic materials that the United States imports."

To meet the Soviet threat on the seas, several truisms should be self-evident. We must revitalize our merchant marine. Seventy-five percent of our merchant ships are 20 years of age or older while 80 percent of the Soviet fleet has been built in the last ten years. We must carry more of our own cargo in our own bottoms and seek out opportunities for increased shipping with foreign nations. By such measures, we can decrease the flow of gold from our nation, bring aid to our balance of payments problem, strengthen our national employment, develop a healthier base for marine technology and, importantly, have the sealift to support our military forces whenever called.

As Edwin M. Hood, President of the Shipbuilders Council of America, has said: "Soviet Russia is mounting at sea a new challenge that the United States will have to deal with long after the fighting in Southeast Asia is ended. This challenge extends across the full spectrum of sea power. If the United States is to continue as a preeminent world power, this challenge must be faced squarely."

I can think of no more appropriate thought with which to end these remarks.

Thank you.

CHINA, HERE AND THERE

HON. HERMAN T. SCHNEEBELI

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 6, 1971

Mr. SCHNEEBELI. Mr. Speaker, with his usual sensitivity and perspicuity, Mr. Erwin Canham in an October 4 editorial in the Christian Science Monitor has given us a fine, expressive presentation of a great group of people—the Chinese in this country. Native Americans would do well in emulating the excellent spirit of citizenship and dependable character which these people have displayed.

The editorial follows:

CHINA, HERE AND THERE

(By Erwin D. Canham)

Probably the most interesting and distinctive minority in the United States is the Chinese.

Now that President Nixon has opened a doorway to Peking, now that other minorities—notably the African—have vigorously demanded a whole series of "rights," it is interesting to contemplate how the Chinese live and what they signify.

In the first place, the Chinese create and prefer segregation. They dwell in the most intense and clearly separated ghettos in the nation. They run most of their own affairs: governance, some education, social controls. They have recently burst into the news as they resisted efforts to integrate their children in public schools by bussing. San Francisco's Chinatown produced a spectacular protest as the sturdy Irish or Italian policemen of that city's finest found themselves totally unable to cope with the tiny but far from inscrutable Asian mothers.

CRIME RATE LOW

The Chinese-American rate of juvenile crime is very low indeed, presumably the best of any ethnic group in the nation.

Historically, the Chinese have been discriminated against as much or more than any other people who came to the United States. They were branded as inferior by the Chinese Exclusion Act of 1882, and the stigma was not removed until 1943. Only in Hawaii have they taken anything like an equal and prominent role in civic affairs.

Chinatowns are growing and producing serious urban pressures. This is because migration from Hong Kong and Taiwan proceeds apace. More than half the Chinese in New York City's Chinatown, and presumably in others, have come to the United States since 1961. A large proportion of them do not speak English. Most of them, it appears, have no intention of becoming Americans. They are in the United States—now as ever—for strictly economic reasons, they contribute substantially to their relatives back home, and they intend to return to China as soon as they may.

PARABLE OF SORTS

What the Chinese in the United States have done, and have not done, is something of a parable of China in the world. Discreet, hard-working, rigorously self-disciplined, organized by clans and tongs, they show all the evidences of their ancient civilization and social order. They are a formidable people, wherever they exist in the world.

But their threat is not military. It is not activist. They do not demand "rights," except latterly in the "right" to segregated education. They should be studied by the political scientists and by the sociologists, for their sense of community is so deep-seated

and effective. They have an inner confidence, a sense of racial pride and security, which brings them through severe trials and contributes to their survival.

Lin Yutang, I believe it was, compared his people to sand. He used rock as a symbol for the Japanese. He pointed out that a severe blow, even an explosion, could not destroy the essence of sand as sand but would shatter rock as rock. The Chinese sand has taken many blows down through history and has always retained its being as sand. It is the oldest and the most numerous of all human civilizations.

VICTIMS OF WEST

For the last century or two, until recent decades, China was victimized at the hands of the West. Its sovereignty was grossly violated. Its pride was insulted at home. China survived, and from the chaotic sand emerged a powerful national structure. Now, in the latter stages of its 20th-century history, a gulf seems to yawn between the nationalist refugees on Taiwan and the mainland government. The breach is complicated by the Taiwanese, themselves Chinese of earlier migration, who want at least autonomy.

Most Americans have come to respect the Chinese in their midst. They respect their discipline, order, and social values. They should respect what Chinese society over the long run stands for in the world, regardless of the police-state Marxist regime which exists in Peking. Americans have long felt, though rarely understood, some sort of affinity with China.

And so, as we hear about and puzzle at the events in Peking, we can remember, wonder at, admire, and learn from their brothers who live among us.

ETHICAL AND MORAL TRAINING
NEEDED IN PUBLIC SCHOOLS**HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT**

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 6, 1971

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, I am again introducing a bill to provide for Federal grants to assist local school systems in providing instruction in ethics and standards. This bill has wide support from both sides of the aisle and throughout the Nation.

The time has come in the United States when this type of instruction is greatly needed. The texts and content of this instruction would be determined by the school boards. For example, instances of courage, heroism, and other distinctive American and democratic ideas might be taught through individual classes, lectures, and auditorium programs, or the origins of criminal statutes and their necessity and community responsibilities might be stressed.

The Roper organization polls recently reported that nearly two-thirds of the American people believe that their country has lost its proper sense of direction; additionally, almost half the people polled in a Gallup survey in June, reported they are pessimistic about the Nation's future and believe there could be a real breakdown in this country.

There is a great need in America for broad instruction in the development of man's moral and ethical values, and the

legislation we propose today is an answer to the need to fill the vacuum evident today in this important segment of our life. Many State education leaders and civic leaders have expressed strong support for the bill.

Cosponsors of H.R. 8782, introduced June 1, 1971, are Congressmen SIKES, GARMATZ, CLARK, HALPERN, PEPPER, BEVILL, KUYKENDALL, NICHOLS, RARICK, MANN, WHITEHURST, and METCALF.

Cosponsors of the bill introduced Tuesday are Congressmen FISHER, FULTON of Pennsylvania, BARING, PERKINS, HALEY, FASCELL, QUIE, DENT, NIX, DANIELS of New Jersey, NELSEN, UDALL, GIBBONS, MATSUNAGA, CARTER, DUNCAN, VIGORITO, BLACKBURN, BRINKLEY, GALIFIANAKIS, BIAGGI, CHAPPELL, MCCORMACK, and BAKER.

HOUSE RESOLUTION 630

HON. ANDREW JACOBS, JR.

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 6, 1971

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, I was wondering, in view of the events of the past few weeks in Saigon, if any Member of Congress or any member of the executive branch would care to say he or she is willing, from this day forward, to give his or her life, limb, sanity or freedom—POW even for another day—further to prop up the Saigon dictatorship.

Other Americans are being ordered to do so today.

Following is the language of House Resolution 630, which I introduced on September 30, 1971:

Whereas the President of the United States on March 4, 1971, stated that his policy is that: "as long as there are American POW's in North Vietnam we will have to maintain a residual force in South Vietnam. That is the least we can negotiate for."

Whereas Madame Nguyen Thi Binh, chief delegate of the Provisional Revolutionary Government of the Republic of South Vietnam stated on July 1, 1971, that the policy of her government is: "If the United States Government sets a terminal date for the withdrawal from South Vietnam in 1971 of the totality of United States forces and those of the other foreign countries in the United States camp, the parties will at the same time agree on the modalities:

"A. Of the withdrawal in safety from South Vietnam of the totality of United States forces and those of the other foreign countries in the United States camp;

"B. Of the release of the totality of military men of all parties and the civilians captured in the war (including American pilots captured in North Vietnam), so that they all rapidly return to their homes.

"These two operations will begin on the same date and will end on the same date.

"A cease-fire will be observed between the South Vietnam People's Liberation Armed Forces and the Armed Forces of the other foreign countries in the United States camp, as soon as the parties reach agreement on the withdrawal from South Vietnam of the totality of United States forces and those of the other foreign countries in the United States camp."

Resolved, That the United States shall forthwith propose at the Paris peace talks

that in return for the return of all American prisoners held in Indochina, the United States shall withdraw all its Armed Forces from South Vietnam within sixty days following the signing of the agreement: *Provided*, That the agreement shall contain guarantee by the Democratic Republic of Vietnam and the Provisional Revolutionary Government of the Republic of South Vietnam of safe conduct out of Vietnam for all American prisoners and all American Armed Forces simultaneously.

OIL AND GAS PRODUCTION INCENTIVES

HON. ROBERT PRICE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 6, 1971

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, this afternoon I am introducing the third in a series of bills designed to stimulate the domestic exploration for and production of oil and gas.

My bill, which I previously introduced in the latter stages of the last Congress, revokes the Federal Power Commission's jurisdiction to regulate the price of natural gas at the wellhead. This bill is quite compatible with the efforts the Federal Power Commission has been making to alleviate the substantial and serious shortage in domestic supplies of natural gas.

Inasmuch as I have outlined the extent of the natural gas shortage in other statements I have made before this body, I will not rake over old ground again today. I would, however, like to emphasize that the present natural gas shortage has not been caused by inflated prices—on the contrary, it has been caused largely because the FPC controlled prices have been set at such artificially low levels that the incentives for oil and gas producers to engage in the exploration for and the development of new sources of supplies have become critically weakened.

The bill I am introducing today is addressed precisely at the cause of the present situation, the FPC pricing structure. In general terms, I propose that certain provisions of the Natural Gas Act relating to rates and charges shall not apply to new sales of natural gas so long as the sales in question are treated as being in interstate commerce and so long as the sales are made by persons engaged solely in the production, gathering, and sale of natural gas. In more specific terms, the prices of new gas contracted for between the independent producer and the pipeline company would no longer be determined or approved by the Federal Power Commission. All prices and price increases would be stated in unit terms. And natural gas contract provisions unrelated to price would still be subject to FPC regulation.

Mr. Speaker, while my proposal has the blessings of former FPC Chairman Carl Bagge, and is consistent with present FPC policies, it represents but one step—the major step—but one step toward my goal of removing FPC regulation in its entirety from the natural gas

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

business. As I have said on an earlier occasion:

FPC regulation of natural gas prices has created more problems than it has solved. As I see it, the regulatory system should be scrapped, not face lifted.

AIR TRAFFIC DEMANDS

HON. JOHN J. McFALL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 6, 1971

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to present for the RECORD an editorial of September 22, 1971, in the San Francisco Chronicle entitled "Air Traffic Demands."

In future plans for airport construction the subject of this editorial is of great importance to the Members of the Congress because a substantial share of the funds for future development will come from the user taxes under the Airport Development Act of 1970.

The steps being taken for a regional San Francisco Airport system are in the right direction and that concept should be expanded.

The next outer ring of airports in the system, which eventually should form a web of air transportation corridors, should include those airports in Stockton, Modesto, Fresno, and Sacramento.

Those of us responsible for appropriating Federal funds know that airports are complex transfer points between air and ground transportation and are part of a total transportation system that must consider a door-to-door destination of travelers. The development of a sound transportation system and future plans will require that planners keep this concept in mind.

James K. Carr, mentioned in the editorial, is a former Under Secretary of the Interior who has been assisted in this commendable regional air transportation effort by Ben E. Nutter, executive director of the Port of Oakland, and James M. Nissen, director of aviation at San Jose. The editorial follows:

AIR TRAFFIC DEMANDS

New York's prolific air traffic, which even now produces time-consuming and somewhat perilous stack-ups over the three metropolitan airports, demands creation of a gigantic offshore facility, at an estimated cost of \$8 billion, according to a \$400,000 study financed by the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA). Located three miles out in the Atlantic and connected by fast train with ten satellite terminals, it would be able to handle 600 takeoffs and landings an hour, as compared with the 173 now handled by Kennedy, LaGuardia and Newark combined.

San Francisco International airport, one of the world's busiest, is facing congestion problems, too, but through foresight and geography, is under no compulsion to go out to sea. Together with Oakland and San Jose airports and with help from the FAA, it has studied the situation in depth, and its findings are now under review by the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG).

According to James K. Carr, general manager of San Francisco airport and a prime mover in the study, it looks toward creation of an integrated, regional airport system. Such a system would include the existing (and possibly enlarged) airports at San

October 6, 1971

Francisco, Oakland and San Jose, with the addition, as required, of new airports in Sonoma, at Livermore, and, for private planes, San Carlos. Such a system would not only be capable of handling all predictable air traffic in and out of the region, but would be exceptionally supplemented through its networks of surface transportation to carry travelers between airports and destinations.

CLEAR THOUGHTS FROM CLEARMONT

HON. TENO RONCALIO

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 6, 1971

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, living daily in the bustle of business in our Nation's Capital sometimes makes it hard to realize that people removed from our immediate surroundings may also have a very real understanding of the problems the United States is facing. Such insight is witnessed in a poem by Mrs. Edith McDonough, a lady living in a town of about 140 people—Clearmont, Wyo. This poem contains an excellent message and I am sure my colleagues will enjoy reading it.

The poem follows:

AN ODYSSEY OF MAN AND HIS FUTURE
The moaning wind blows the stinking black sand,
O're the ugly and lifeless stinking black land.
The grit and the grime of a million years,
Compared to a day of Big Industry's smears,
Was clean and shiny and sunny and bright,
Like telling the time of day from night.
God gave man a planet, the best of all,
That came from His Hand in stately fall,
He clothed this planet with grass and trees,
With flowers and streams and beautiful seas.
He filled this planet with living things,
From the tiny gnat and the bird that sings,
To the eagle who soars on majestic wings.
From the mouse so small it is nothing at all,
To the mighty elephant and giraffe so tall.
Fish in the streams and creatures that creep,
And all sorts of things in the ocean deep.
Then He said to man, "This planet you see,
Rule it well and keep it for Me".
But man in his power and man in his might,
Set out for to plunder all in his sight.
He thought he could improve on God's
Mighty Hand,
And that there was no end to the give of the land.

He put all the water to work his will,
He used all the trees to make paper and fill,
He killed all the non-subservient life,
And fashioned their skins to fit his wife.
He sang as he sprayed the birds and the bees,
A far better place the land will be,
A far better place to live for me.
But is it far better all seared and black,
Covered with muck in Big Industry's track?
Is it far better with the mountains all bare,
With the murky streams that once were so fair?

Is it far better all lifeless and dead?
Why, even the rats and the mice have fled!
Is it far better now man doesn't care,
And he sits in a bubble because of the air?
Can a plastic bubble be serene or fair?
Can turf made of rubber, paint, plastic and glass,
Ever replace the living grass?
How long before man himself will die,
For the want of the things he killed nearby?
Yet he thought he could improve on God's
Mighty Hand,
And that there was no end to the give of the land.

EDITH R. McDONOUGH.

MISSION FOR THE WEST IN SOUTH-
ERN AFRICA II

HON. JOHN G. SCHMITZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 6, 1971

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, Ian G. Anderson, editor, Rhodesia and World Report in "The Ultimate Weapon," said:

It may be that we, here in Rhodesia, with the aid of our neighbors to the East, west and south, and the good will of a host of friends overseas, can emulate the gallant little island that, 400 years ago, defied the might of tyranny. Maybe we shall be the rock on which Communism broke itself, and from which the Christian world took heart and started to fight back. If so, in the words of the greatest Grand Master of the Order of the Knights Militant of St. John of Jerusalem: "If heaven requires the sacrifice of our lives, there can be no better occasion than this."

This Rhodesian writer is referring to one of the most magnificently heroic episodes in all of history, the glorious and successful defense of the island of Malta against the great Turkish assault on the Christian West in the 16th century. The role he sees for his country and its neighbors—the Portuguese overseas provinces of Angola and Mozambique, along with the Union of South Africa, all of which I recently visited—may or may not come to pass; but what is most significant is to find men of the West still speaking and thinking in these terms, which my visit showed to be quite typical of this part of the world.

It has been a long time since people talked that way about our own country. In fact, many of our leaders and spokesmen rather pride themselves that America's days of crusading have passed.

But no civilization or way of life can endure unless enough of its members are, in a crisis, willing to crusade for it. That willingness is being demonstrated by the representatives of the West in southern Africa—but at the moment, almost nowhere else.

Everyone has heard a great deal about the racial situation in southern Africa, nearly all of it slanted against the Western peoples, when not downright false. As I pointed out in this newsletter 2 weeks ago, describing my visit to the Portuguese African province of Angola, there is no color bar there; blacks are full citizens with equal rights, expected eventually to run the country. The same is true in the other Portuguese southern African province of Mozambique.

In cooperation with the Union of South Africa, the Portuguese in Mozambique—who are making no financial profit in this area, but rather are suffering a loss—have undertaken the fourth largest electric power project in the world, a 500-foot dam across the mighty Zambezi River at Cabora-Bassa. To fly across hundreds of miles of African wilderness and then to see this huge undertaking below was one of the most impressive sights of my trip. Significantly, halting this great project has become a prime target of Communist-

backed revolutionaries in Mozambique. The Mozambique Revolutionary Committee, headquartered in Communist East Germany, has reportedly stated:

We shall either destroy the dam or make it completely uneconomical.

Flying over the dam, it seemed to me that the bulldozers busy there were like peaceful tanks driving the terrorists back.

Rhodesia and South Africa are prospering, so much so that the allegedly persecuted blacks are flocking into these countries from the rest of Africa, and very few are leaving. It is officially estimated that well over 1 million new blacks have come into the Union of South Africa in recent years, and remain there. In the Rhodesian Senate, 10 black chiefs sit and vote with their white colleagues.

The U.S. Senate vote September 23 to eliminate our absurd, self-defeating ban on the importation of Rhodesian chrome—which ban has forced us to depend on the Soviet Union for this strategic metal—may be the harbinger of a more realistic policy toward Rhodesia.

PRAYER AMENDMENT

HON. CHALMERS P. WYLIE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 6, 1971

Mr. WYLIE. Mr. Speaker, I respectfully take issue with the statement issued by a group of church leaders and Congressmen that my amendment "would alter the Bill of Rights for the first time in the Nation's history and would threaten religious freedom."

Sixteen amendments have been added to the Constitution since the adoption of the first 10 amendments. Each has been in the nature of a clarifying amendment as to basic fundamental rights.

For 171 years constitutional lawyers and people across this great Nation alike thought the first amendment clause "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion" meant exactly that. It was understood that the establishment of a religion meant the setting up or recognition of a state church or the conferring upon one church special favors denied to others. The word religion presupposed, for constitutional purposes, that a belief in God was the common denominator of all religions. The first amendment was designed to compel neutrality among religious sects. It was never contemplated that this clause would be tortured into compelling neutrality between religions which profess a faith in God and non-theistic religions or theism.

How can the language of my amendment "legalize a kind of religion?" It specifically says nondenominational which means without reference to a particular religious faith or sect.

In the Engel case, decided by the Supreme Court in 1962, the Court held:

State officials may not compose an official state prayer and require that it be recited

in the public schools of the state at the beginning of each day—even if the prayer is denominationally neutral and pupils who wish to do so may remain silent or be excused from the room while the prayer is being recited. The prayer in question was: "Almighty God, we acknowledge our dependence upon Thee, and we beg Thy blessings upon us, our parents, our teachers and our Country."

I think the decision was constitutionally wrong as an erroneous application of the doctrine of neutrality. The Court found the prayer to be denominationally neutral. In my judgment that meets the test of the establishment clause.

In the Stein against Oshinsky decision in 1965, the Supreme Court had a beautiful opportunity to clarify this whole situation. But, the court denied certiorari leaving the court of appeals' decision to stand. There students had asked to be allowed to initiate a prayer period on their own for those who wished to participate. The principal refused. A group of parents brought action to enjoin school officials from preventing recitation of prayers on the children's initiation. The court held:

The constitutional rights to free exercise of religion and to freedom of speech do not require a state to permit "student-initiated" prayers in public schools; the Court of Appeals would direct judgment dismissing the complaint. The prayer they recited: "Thank you for the world so sweet, thank you for the food we eat, thank you for the birds that sing—thank you, God, for everything."

My amendment is clarifying in nature only and could not alter the meaning of the Bill of Rights one whit.

Of course, prayers are being recited in schools across the Nation. They are being recited in schools in my district. But, the persons involved believe they are acting unconstitutionally in view of the Court decisions. My amendment would say that recognition of a Supreme Deity is perfectly proper and is a basic constitutional right as the framers of the first amendment intended. If, as Bishop John Wesley Lord said, "voluntary prayers may be said and are being said," my amendment would say only that it is right and proper and his argument falls of its own weight. My amendment would only write into the Constitution a practice which he feels is proper according to the first amendment. How does that alter the Bill of Rights?

THE LATE HONORABLE NOBLE J.
GREGORY

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 30, 1971

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I was saddened recently to learn of the passing of my good friend from Kentucky, the late Honorable Noble Gregory who for 22 years so ably served in this body. Noble Gregory was already a member of the distinguished House Committee on Ways and Means when I

came to Congress. Over the years I watched with great admiration as he used legislative skill and know-how to see important tax legislation through to a successful conclusion. A quiet determined man, he avoided the center stage, yet he was extremely effective in representing his district. He had many friends here and we shall all miss him. To his family I extend my deepest sympathy.

THE MANPOWER FIELD—A PASTURE FERTILE WITH IDEAS

HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 6, 1971

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, October 4, Secretary of Labor James Hodgson, spoke at the 35th annual meeting of the Interstate Conference of Employment Security Agencies. I had the privilege of attending that meeting and listening to Secretary Hodgson's remarks.

The issues in manpower policy are many and varied. But Secretary Hodgson in his remarks did an exceptionally fine job of outlining some of the problems and guidelines needed for a comprehensive manpower policy in the United States.

I commend his thoughtful and perceptive address to all of my colleagues:

THE MANPOWER FIELD—A PASTURE FERTILE WITH IDEAS

When a Federal government official appears before an assemblage of consummate manpower specialists such as this one, he usually is tempted to follow one of two courses.

First he may boast. He may point to the great deeds, superb programs, and manifest accomplishments of his Agency or Administration.

Or he may exhort. He may plead for support for a point of view, make a pitch for harder work or for a change of policy he believes is needed to lead us all out of some fancied wilderness.

Much as I am tempted by both approaches today I shall forego the temptation. I should like, for instance, to boast of the incredible speed with which Mac Lovell and Bill Mirengoff have launched our new Public Employment Program. I'm equally tempted to try to win new converts to greater local control over manpower programs—A very big thing with this Administration. But I'll let these matters wait for another time.

Today I want to talk about ideas—about the scope, nature, role, and impact of ideas in the manpower domain. The theme goes something like this. We live in changing times and changing values. Depending on the intensity of the rhetoric, our times are described either as transitional or revolutionary. But what is often not clearly recognized is that a major focus of much of our change is centered directly on this fascinating subject of manpower. So we would do well to examine both the ideas that prompt this phenomenon and the ideas that are produced by it.

Let's start with a bit of historical perspective. Back in the 1940's that brilliant and prophetic Harvard economist Sumner Slichter sat down and wrote out four ideas he suggested would mark the future course of American history. Slichter listed these four. First, the idea that government must become

an instrument of economic policy and intervene in economic matters. Second, the idea that there is no single panacea that will solve all our problems. Third, the idea that there must be an opportunity for all to find employment. And, finally, the idea that everyone should have a chance to enjoy the good life here and now.

When he wrote, all four could have been sharply questioned. Today they all have practically consensus acceptance. And the fascinating thing is where manpower fits into this prophecy—two of these four ideas directly affect the manpower domain, and the other two have marked indirect interrelationships. In short, this means that the manpower millennium is right at the center of our rapid recently evolving social and economic history. In the argot of the day, manpower is where the action is.

We need to examine the ideas that have propelled manpower to this center stage and at the same time to look at the ideas its new position is spawning.

Take Slichter's first idea—"that government must be an instrument of economic policy and intervene in economic matters." That shot, made in the forties, is certainly right on target today.

For during the interim government has discovered manpower activity to be a useful tool for its new-found active role in economic policy. Like a rocket going into orbit our investment in manpower programs shot up from \$50 million nine years ago to \$1.5 billion today. I personally see no leveling off.

The main reason for the sudden flowering of manpower activity as an economic instrument can be found in another of Slichter's prophetic ideas, that "there must be an opportunity for all to find employment." History bears out the validity of this prediction.

Full employment or "A job for everyone" has through the years become an increasing demand of the American people. The nation's tolerance of unemployment is now at a lower level than ever before. This is one of the reasons that the contention that current levels of unemployment are really no higher than in other peace-time periods falls on deaf ears today. Today government is expected to be better. Old standards no longer apply. This means that in setting our economic policy goals we have upgraded the objective of full employment to a higher level of priority than ever before. And it means we must upgrade it still further.

It may be that we as a nation are now evolving through a phase similar to that experienced by major American corporations 20 to 30 years ago. Then, for a number of reasons, American industrial corporations had to upgrade personnel policy to a higher level of priority. They had to assume greater responsibility for their employees on the job and for cushioning employees from the adverse effects of management actions. In consequence corporations began to engage in long-range manpower planning, to build up sizeable personnel organizations, and to establish policies to cushion effects of management policy decisions on the work force.

My thesis is that we may have now reached a point in time when we must inject this same kind of thinking and action into Federal economic policy. For instance, when government takes steps that will have a major dislocating effect on the nation's work force, could we not couple these steps with counter-measures designed to ameliorate any resulting adverse effects on the work force?

Let me illustrate. As the nation has turned its economy away from war to peacetime production, we have drastically cut back defense spending, turning loose hundreds of thousands of people into the labor market. The normal operation of the labor market did not result in a reasonably rapid and appropriate re-employment of many of these people elsewhere. Such reemployment did not occur for

two reasons. First, the level of economic activity was not adequate to provide jobs for some. Second, adverse structural conditions existed, including lack of job openings appropriate for the skills available.

This experience suggests what I might call the number one manpower idea for the future—that the nation's future economic policy might be formulated in such a way that we not only maintain overall employment opportunity at a high level, but that we either develop specific areas of job opportunity to match the talents that become available through government policy shifts or that we provide timely retraining of those talents.

We are, in my judgment, well on our way toward endorsement and support of this basic idea. We are spending one and a half billion for manpower programs and proposing to increase that to two billion. We have just instituted a \$1 billion experiment in public employment—the first such venture in 30 years. We are proposing to spend around another billion annually to move people off welfare roles into jobs.

Programmatically we are providing what is called "trade adjustment assistance" to tens of thousands of workers displaced by foreign competition. Through training we are converting engineers and scientists to new disciplines. We have instituted special programs to speed employment of returning veterans and have required government contractors to list job openings with the Employment Service. It all adds up to a tremendous new emphasis on manpower activity as an economic tool.

The manpower sphere has also produced a number of narrower ideas that have caught a fragment of attention but which are as yet far from realized. The idea of training and education for a career, not a single job, is one. Another centers on the need for a major infusion of new priorities and methods for vocational training. As a nation I believe we are still searching for a more satisfactory approach to government supported on-the-job training. And the comprehensive and updated apprenticeship concepts so many have been talking about for years still are largely on the drawing board. There are a dozen other worthwhile similar ideas that are either dormant or are still struggling for a foothold in the manpower field.

It is well to ask why this field so pregnant with good ideas is experiencing such difficulty in their realization. I suggest there are three reasons, one focused on "what we do" and two on "how we do it." The "what" reason has to do with policy. The more I examine our activity in the manpower field the more I am convinced it suffers from an absence of policy focus.

The structure of American government and the pragmatic tradition of American politics have too much defined public policy in forms of program, and in consequence have inhibited the development of true policy. In effect, a collection of programs is put together, and it is hoped these will somehow add up to a policy. There is little regard for system. Programs relate to a single part of a system, policy seeks to respond to the system in its entirety.

Certainly in earlier and simpler times a programmatic approach was an effective way to go about public business. The problem, it seems, comes with complexity. If gears are to mesh in a complex society, government programs must fit in rather than stand out. It is a wise program that knows its place and does not aspire beyond its station.

Certainly our manpower programs have grown topsy-like in the last ten years. The result is that today we have an impressive accumulation of programs but little in the way of cohesive policy focus.

In discussing manpower policy recently with Kenzaburo Hara, the Japanese Labor Minister, he gave me a one-sentence statement of that nation's manpower policy. He

said it focused on "grasping of talented people and rediscovery of human capacities, cultivation of rewarding job opportunity, and the recovery and enhancement of humanity through it." Quite simply this means that Japan endeavors to cultivate and *capitalize on the strengths* of its manpower resource. If anything, our policy is the opposite, we seek to *remedy weaknesses*. But we do not do it with cohesive breadth or adequate impact.

Now let's examine the two reasons limiting our manpower progress that fall in the "how we do it" category. First, I believe we have too much program control and concentration at the national level. And second, we have not devised a suitable system to bring the citizen and his government together for effective manpower service at the community level.

The first deficiency we hope to remedy in substantial measure with a revenue-sharing approach to manpower programs—to let local communities use uncategorized funds to respond to local needs. The remedy for the second deficiency is more elusive. We need to bring together, both physically and administratively, such diverse services as unemployment compensation, labor exchange activity, training and related services, and certainly the contemplated new effort to get welfare recipients into jobs.

From a bureaucratic view we may be doing these things reasonably well now. From the view of the citizen, our activity is fractionated and unresponsive. A winning wager would be that the next 10 years will produce widespread system changes.

Perhaps we might draw this to a conclusion with a reflection on Professor Slichter's two ideas that have a less direct but still important relation to manpower. You'll recall he suggested we would come to accept the fact that no single panacea will solve all our problems. Certainly the complexity and interrelatedness of things today prove his point. Few would contend that even in the manpower sphere is there a single idea or action available to bring about the millennium.

But it is Slichter's final idea that fascinates me most—his prediction that Americans would one day subscribe to the idea that "everyone should have a chance to enjoy the good life here and now." Slichter certainly anticipated present national values with that observation. With his emphasis on "everyone" he anticipated the effort our nation would expend on Civil Rights, on Equal Employment Opportunity, and on helping the disadvantaged, with his emphasis on "here and now" he anticipated the so-called "now generation" with its penchant for immediate gratification of needs. But most of all he anticipated what has become perhaps our dominant national theme, an emphasis on improved quality of life. This, of course, was the theme of President Nixon's 1969 inaugural message. It is the motive force behind the current passion for environmental improvement. And it reflects the underlying sentiment that prompts support of our wide ranging manpower efforts. To those of us in manpower work it has special meaning. To help improve the quality of American lives, we must provide useful ideas, policies, and programs and services. We are engaged in a mission, not just an activity. And it is a mission central to the foremost hopes and aspirations of American people today. For all our many frustrations and troubles, we are fortunate to be in manpower work—to be where the action is.

Now perhaps a brief summary. Today the manpower domain abounds with ideas. Some are of long standing and not yet fully realized. Some are emerging and need examination and testing. And nowhere are additional new ideas more welcome. This means that those of us in the manpower business have unusual opportunities to be creative, to be selective, and to be effective and importantly, to be buoyed by the realization that our work

is peculiarly relevant to the felt needs of our times. We must all work to capitalize on those opportunities. I'm sure we will.

SAN FRANCISCO BUSING SURVEY

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 6, 1971

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, I insert in the RECORD the results of a survey taken by Multi-Media Research to determine the attitude of the people of San Francisco to the busing of school children.

[From the San Francisco Sunday Examiner & Chronicle, Aug. 29, 1971]

WHAT SAN FRANCISCO THINKS ABOUT BUSING

(NOTE.—Multi-Media Research and Development Company is an independent research company experienced in public opinion and consumer research. A member of the national Market Research Association, the company has conducted studies for government commissions, school districts and political candidates as well as market analysis and advertising awareness.)

A poll to determine the attitudes of San Francisco parents toward busing shows a majority of whites, Negroes, Chinese and Latin-Americans oppose busing their children.

The poll, carried out for the Examiner by Multi-Media Research Co., found that most parents seem to be saying, "We think integration is OK, but don't take my child out of my neighborhood to accomplish it."

The sample, according to Multi-Media Research, was composed of white 35.3 percent, Negro 30.7 percent, Chinese 17.0 percent and Latin-American 17.0 percent.

Here are the questions and answers as reported by the poll:

Q—Do you feel the education your child is getting is excellent, good, fair or poor?

A—The opinion of parents regarding the quality of education their children are now receiving was as follows: 46 percent felt it was excellent or good, 42 percent felt it to be fair or poor; the remainder have not yet had children in City schools.

The highest degree of satisfaction was in the Latin-American group, the lowest in the Negro community. Here is the rating breakdown:

Excellent: white 15 percent, Negro 8, Latin-American 25 and Chinese 15.

Good: white 38, Negro 24, Latin-American 35, Chinese 31.

Fair: white 22, Negro 39, Latin American 27, Chinese 46.

Poor: white 8, Negro 18, Latin-American 4, Chinese 2.

Q—A plan for busing children to school in order to achieve racial balance has been ordered in San Francisco. Do you approve or disapprove?

Approve: White, 14 percent; Negro, 39 percent; Lat. Amer., 38 percent; Chinese, 6 percent.

Disapprove: White, 83 percent; Negro 56 percent; Lat. Amer., 59 percent; Chinese, 92 percent.

"Not Sure" Omitted.

A—Overall the parents disapprove of busing by a ratio of 4 to 1. This again varies among ethnic groups with the Chinese population being the most emphatic with 92 percent opposed. The Negro population showed the least opposition with 56 percent disapproving.

Q—Our children will benefit from the experiences of racially balanced schools.

A—A slight majority of parents indicated agreement with this statement—48 percent agreed, 40 percent disagreed and 12 percent indicated they were not sure.

The Latin-American respondents were high in this area with many write-in comments that the schools in the Mission were already racially balanced. This same group of respondents showed a very high objection to having their children taken out of the Mission on the basis of losing contact with the schools and fear of racial tension.

The Negro respondents were strongest in this area with 64 percent feeling their children would benefit from racially balanced schools.

White, agree 38 percent, disagree 51 percent; Negro, agree 64, disagree 24; Latin-American, agree 59, disagree 21; Chinese, agree 28, disagree 54.

Q—Busing would deprive my child of participating in after-school activities.

Agree: white, 74 percent; Negro, 51 percent; Q—Busing would deprive my child of parent.

Disagree: white, 17 percent; Negro, 39 percent; Latin-American, 44 percent; Chinese, 17 percent.

A—An overall 62 percent agree with this statement, with 29 percent disagreeing and 8 percent no opinion.

The Chinese population showed 79 percent agreeing due to their children attending regular classes in Chinese language after school. White parents also were high in agreeing that busing would limit after-school activities for their children.

Q—I am sure my child would be well treated and understood by teachers in another neighborhood.

A—Overall most parents felt sure their children would be well treated and understood by teachers in another neighborhood. However, the ethnic pattern here is very revealing.

The white, Negro and Latin-American parents follow the same thinking, while the Chinese parents show great fear for how teachers in another neighborhood would treat and understand their children.

Twenty-three percent of the Chinese parents agreed their children would be well treated and understood, while 38 percent felt they would not and 40 percent were undecided on this question.

Agree, white 59 percent, Negro 67 percent, Latin-American 60 percent and Chinese 23 percent. Disagree, white 28 percent, Negro 18 percent, Latin-American 23 percent and Chinese 38 percent.

Q—Busing my child to another area would make me feel out of contact with the school.

Agree: White 88 percent; Negro, 53 percent; Latin-American, 71 percent; Chinese, 82 percent.

Disagree: White, 11 percent; Negro, 44 percent; Latin-American, 23 percent; Chinese, 6 percent.

"Not Sure" Omitted.

A—This is a major point with parents—75 percent agreed that busing would make them feel out of contact with the school. This same feeling was strong in the write-in comments. Parents want their children in close physical proximity to them and indicate a desire for the neighborhood concept of schooling at the elementary level.

Q—I do not feel I could talk as satisfactorily with the teacher in another neighborhood as I could if my child were going to school in this neighborhood.

A—Half the parents interviewed felt they could not talk as satisfactorily with teachers in another neighborhood. Spanish speaking and Chinese parents were high in this category, possibly on the basis of language barrier.

Q—I feel the school my child attends

should reflect the racial characteristics of our neighborhood.

Agree: White, 60 percent; Negro, 39 percent; Lat. Amer., 50 percent; Chinese, 58 percent.

Disagree: White, 33 percent; Negro, 50 percent; Lat. Amer., 30 percent; Chinese, 27 percent.

A—Fifty-one percent agreed, 38 percent disagreed, with the remaining 11 percent not sure. The white population felt more strongly on this question than any other group. Chinese parents agreed by about the same margin; Latin-Americans agreed close to the same degree, but Negroes disagreed by a large margin.

Q—I feel the school my child attends should reflect the economic characteristics of our neighborhood.

A—The response to this question was interesting in relation to the response to the previous one. There was slightly less agreement with this statement—again, the whites being highest in agreement, but the Chinese parents disagreed most strongly that the school should reflect economic characteristics of their neighborhood.

This is one question that showed a correlation between home ownership and renting. Parents who felt this need for the economic status quo being reflected in the school by a 55 percent yes and 37 percent no. Renters were reversed with 38 percent yes and 54 percent no.

Q—I really am in favor of integrated schools but do not favor busing.

Agree: White, 88 percent; Negro, 60 percent; Latin American, 73 percent; Chinese, 96 percent.

Disagree: White, 10 percent; Negro, 37 percent; Latin American, 23 percent; Chinese, 4 percent.

A—Parents in all ethnic groups indicated a strong agreement with this statement—78 percent agreed, 19 percent disagreed, the remainder not sure.

The ethnic breakdown lacks validity because many in the Negro community expressed the fact that they wanted busing so could not agree with the statement. The Chinese community, on the other hand, expressed their almost unanimous agreement (96 percent) but this does not correlate with their response to question 18 which indicated 27 percent not wanting integrated schools.

It would appear that the overall percentage is fairly accurate with the reasons stated making up the balance pro and con.

Q—I would worry about the physical safety of my child attending school in another neighborhood.

Agree: White, 75 percent; Negro, 53 percent; Latin American, 88 percent; Chinese, 92 percent.

Disagree: White, 23 percent; Negro, 45 percent; Latin American, 10 percent; Chinese, 6 percent.

'Not sure' omitted.

A—Three-fourths of our respondents agreed with this statement; however, the reasons given to the question "why" reflect a real difference in attitudes.

The Latin Americans show a real fear on racial grounds. They were the only group in our sample indicating the racial tensions to be the primary fear in regard to the busing of children. Most of the other groups expressed greatest concern for their children being away from the parent in case of illness or accident. There was mention of some of the school buildings and facilities being unsafe, a fear of the neighborhood being strange in case their youngsters miss the bus.

However, the greatest concern was simply being too far from home, with the exception of the Latin American parents who are fearful of their children going out of the Mission in the Negro schools.

Q—I would worry about my child's safety if he had to ride a bus each day:

Agree: White, 68 percent; Negro, 53 percent; Latin American, 73 percent; Chinese, 100 percent.

Disagree: White, 30 percent; Negro, 48 percent; Latin American, 23 percent.

'Not sure' omitted.

A—Parents are worried about their kids riding a bus every day. In answer to the "why," such things as heavy traffic, inadequate supervision on the bus, incompetent drivers, no seat belts on buses and not enough money to provide safe buses were cited. Also repeatedly mentioned was the belief that elementary children were too young to have to assume the responsibility of riding on a bus.

Although the Negro community showed the least amount of worry, two parents from Hunters Point said they were afraid to have their children waiting on the corner for a bus in their own neighborhood.

Q—I feel my child might get a better education at a school not in our neighborhood.

Agree: White, 13 percent; Negro, 46 percent; Latin American, 29 percent; Chinese, 2 percent.

Disagree: White, 73 percent; Negro, 43 percent; Latin American, 54 percent; Chinese, 67 percent.

A—Overall, parents disagree with this statement. With the exception of the Negro community, parents do not feel their children might get a better education elsewhere. Even the Negro community is fairly evenly divided on this question. The question brought a high percentage of "not sure" responses in all ethnic groups. Overall, 16 percent were "not sure."

Q—I really prefer non-integrated schools.

A—Seventy-eight percent of the parents disagreed with this statement. On this question, the white and Negro communities were aligned in favoring integrated schools—82 percent of the white sample; 90 percent of the Negro. Although both other groups favor integration, they show a great deal less enthusiasm—54 percent of the Latin community and 72 percent of the Chinese community indicated favoring integrated schools. The home ownership correlation was exactly the same as the overall percentage, that is, 78 percent of both owners and renters favor integrated schools.

Q—Do you believe integrated schools will cause too much contact between the races?

A—Sixty-nine percent of our respondents answered "no" to this question. However, we found an imbalance on a racial basis. The Chinese and Latin-American parents were evenly aligned on this question—52 percent answered "no," 33 percent answered "yes" and the rest refused to give an opinion. Contrast this with the white response—76 percent "no," 15 percent "yes" and 8 percent no opinion, and the Negro with 80 percent "no," 7 percent "yes" and 12 percent no opinion.

Q—Do you believe racial balance achieved by busing will raise the standard of education very much; raise the standard of education somewhat; lower the standard of education somewhat; lower the standard of education very much; not make any difference in the standard of education?

Raise the standard of education: White, 7 percent; black, 38 percent; Latin American, 30 percent; Chinese, 2 percent.

Lower the standard of education: White, 43 percent; black, 12 percent; Latin American, 31 percent; Chinese, 44 percent.

Not make any difference in standard: White, 44 percent; black, 40 percent; Latin American, 35 percent; Chinese, 35 percent.

A—The largest percent believe that busing would make no difference in the standard of education—20 percent felt it would raise the standard. As would be expected from the previous questions, the Negro parents (38 percent) felt this would be the case. Only 2 percent of the Chinese respondents felt it would raise the standard. There were write-

in comments to the effect it would raise some, lower some, lower all for a while and then raise all in time.

Q—If you had to describe busing in one or two words, how would you describe it?

A—Half our respondents answered with such negative words as lousy, unfair, unnecessary and a few unprintable words. It was also described in positive ways, such as equal opportunity, and bettering education. Money was mentioned frequently, waste of time, confusing, morally wrong, unconstitutional, Communistic, and unfortunate but necessary were all ways of describing busing by parents.

TRIBUTE TO HARRY ANSLINGER

HON. JACK EDWARDS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 6, 1971

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, until Harry Anslinger retired in 1969 after serving 32 years as U.S. Commissioner of Narcotics and 23 years—some of them overlapping—on the United Nations Narcotics Commission, he proved himself almost more than a match against the sleazy legions of drug pushers and underworld henchmen who constantly found themselves being forced back into the woodwork as a result of his aggressive efforts. His service to his country has been an inspiration to those who carry on the battle against drugs.

In tribute to this great American, Washington Post writer Michael Kernan has authored an inspiring commentary, extolling Harry Anslinger as he was during his earlier life and as he is now, during his twilight years. The article, which was carried in the Post of Tuesday, October 5, 1971, is hereby submitted for insertion in the RECORD:

TURNING THE WORLD OFF

(By Michael Kernan)

Last year the East Village Other ran a full-page photo of Harry Jacob Anslinger with marijuana leaves superimposed on his bald forehead. The caption read: "The Man Who Turned the Whole World Off."

The same man drew this comment from a congressman in 1943: "He deserves a Medal of Honor . . .", and this from a leading psychiatrist in 1951: ". . . one of the greatest men that ever lived."

The Mafia calls him "that bastard Anslinger."

Rounding one of those majestic, tire-tugging highway curves that sweep through the Pennsylvania coal hills, a visitor comes upon Hollidaysburg all at once, sprawling across a broad valley, yet clearly centered upon the time-blackened spires of the Blair County Courthouse and the First Presbyterian Church.

It is close to the heart of this town, barely five miles from his native Altoona, that Harry Anslinger lives by himself in a house crowded with Oriental vases, joss tables, ivory carvings, bronze trays, Kurdistan rugs, a knotty-pine bar and mementoes of his 32 years as the first U.S. commissioner of narcotics and 23 years (some of them overlapping) on the United Nations Narcotics Commission.

At 79, he is still a commanding presence, a big man with clear, measuring eyes, though he walks with difficulty. A cane dangled from the mantel, and in the bedroom stood an oxygen tank.

This is the man who, perhaps more than any other individual, erased opium addiction in America, made cocaine a rarity for decades, outlawed marijuana and made possible today's international network for the control of narcotics. He is also the man whose relentless drive for strict prosecution has drawn the wrath of a wide spectrum of Americans.

He was talking about the Mafia, which he was battling as far back as the early 1930s.

"There were only three of us in law enforcement who believed in the Mafia in those days," he said. "The first indication we had was that we were deporting so many Sicilians—300 one year. We also had some very fine Sicilian agents we sent to Italy, and they found the thing was all tied together, here and Sicily. The syndicate moved in on every big city in America (in drugs) except San Francisco, where the Chinese used to keep a pretty tight hold. There was one big Mafia man we heard was trying to take over San Francisco. We located him in his car, over the bridge in Oakland, with his brains all over the windshield."

An entire generation had to pass before the confessions of Joseph Valachi in 1963 forced many other top enforcement officials, not to mention congressmen and assorted opinion molders, to admit that the Mafia does in fact exist.

At that, Valachi was handed over to the Justice Department only after "we'd had him for two years," Anslinger said. Valachi named Vito Genovese as the kingpin of organized crime in this country; today, Anslinger added, the real leader is Meyer Lansky: "We didn't see much of him, though, because he was in gambling and not much in drugs."

The Valachi case opened many American eyes. So did Appalachian, the top-level Mafia conference in upstate New York that was broken up by a remarkably alert state trooper who had spotted the limousines streaming through town. Appalachia was no surprise to Anslinger. He had happened upon a similar parley years earlier in Hollywood, Fla., where he was investigating racehorse doping.

"I walked through one of the fancy restaurants," he said, "and there was Lucky Luciano big as life, and a lot of others. One of them came around to me later and said, 'Lissen Comish, we're clean, no narcotics. This is just business.' Well, we got them out of town pretty quick anyway. What they were doing was having a trial. A while later we got word that Bugs Moran had been executed."

At Appalachian, according to Anslinger, the older mafiosi tried to get the syndicate out of the drug business—largely because of the pressures applied by Anslinger's bureau—but the young turks insisted on sticking with it despite the harsh penalties of such Anslinger-inspired laws as the 1956 mandatory five-year sentence aimed at pushers.

It was typical of the Mafia's attitude to the man who has hounded them for nearly half a century. Though he was probably the most important single factor in the downfall of Louis (Lepke) Buchalter and the other leaders of Murder, Inc., and though he brought down Luciano, among many others here and in Europe, the syndicate has always seemed to tolerate Anslinger as an antagonist (in contrast to undercover men, who are murdered on discovery).

"I thought one guy was coming after me once," said Anslinger. "But he never showed up. If you get scared at these bums you shouldn't be in the business."

The Mafia deals in many forms of crime, but for Anslinger it has been merely one part of a global war on drug traffic.

Establishing a reputation for bravery behind German lines in World War I (in 1917 he liberated the Kaiser's personal field kit) and for law enforcement in his years as consul in the Bahamas and Venezuela, Anslinger cut his eye teeth on international relations in

London, Paris, Antwerp and Ottawa during the 1920s at conventions on everything from smuggling to alcoholism. After brief service with the Prohibition Commission, he moved into the narcotics post.

Penalties have been a theme of the Anslinger years. He was responsible for the 1937 Marijuana Tax Act, which first placed controls over the drug, and for the 1956 mandatory sentence. He also was a leader at the 1931 Geneva conference of 67 nations where international drug traffic first was effectively curbed.

Opium, which once was virtually sold over the counter in every village, today has almost disappeared from America. The great-power imperial monopolies throughout Asia are long gone. The once-ubiquitous bamboo opium pipes, of which an addict needed a dozen a day, are all but impossible to find even for exhibition. Anslinger has some fancy ones in a display cabinet along with krises and other trophies. Morphine was a legal drug, and laudanum (a 10 per cent opium tincture) was used like aspirin, especially by women. Cocaine dropped from sight after Anslinger closed the factories in Bolivia and Peru. For 20 years, he said, not a single cocaine user was reported in U.S. drug hospitals.

Today it is back in a big way. And heroin addicts are showing up in our junior high schools.

"I remember when you could get heroin in certain New York hotels for \$12 an ounce. Pure. The same thing would be worth \$35,000 today."

"We used to get a lot from China, but no more. Today the sources are Turkey and Iran. There are some hill tribes in Thailand that still make it from opium and ship it down through Hong Kong, but the Chinese are working hard to eradicate it. But you know, it's all over the place."

Harry Anslinger shook his head. He was among the first to see narcotics as a world problem; he was among the last to believe it could be solved by law enforcement alone. His final years in office (he retired in 1969) were increasingly noisy with attacks on his clobber-the-pusher policies and his strict attitudes even toward victim-users.

"I don't know what the answer is now," he said. "You can't blame the enforcement people. It's the courts and state legislatures and Congress, reducing the penalties. Maybe the laws on marijuana were too stiff, but they were a deterrent for years. It's this permissiveness. It's gone through the moral fabric of the people of the United States."

Methodone he views as monstrous: "It's more stimulating than heroin, and just as addictive. Addicts use it to keep going when they're low on money. I hear they find ways to put it aside and sell it on the street."

Note: When heroin was first manufactured in Germany, it was hailed as a cure for morphine addiction. And then there is marijuana. The 1937 act was a result of Anslinger's brisk campaign highlighted by his magazine article, "Marijuana, Assassin of Youth," and his subsequent work through international conventions has tied up the weed so thoroughly that its legalization in this country may never be feasible.

In a recent magazine forum with writer William Burroughs, philosopher Alan Watts, Richard Alpert and other proselytizers for marijuana, Anslinger did not seem to be speaking the same language.

"I never tried it," he said. "You never know if one cigarette will trigger violence. Something beneath the surface, I've watched research with prisoners. I've seen its effects."

He cited an article by a Bureau of Narcotics adviser, listing instances of violent behavior by users, and recalled warnings by African UN delegates who linked mass murders in the Congo and Cameroons to hashish (which word has long been believed the origin of the

word "assassin" because of its use by a murderous sect of smokers). African hashish, American hash and marihuana are related forms of the same plant but are not identical.

"I smoke a cigar," Anslinger smiled. "That's about it. And Jack Daniels cheers you up on a bad day."

His wife Martha is dead, but his son Joseph lives next door. Hollidaysburg is full of old friends and the country-side is still, for him, the world's greatest place to fish and hunt. There are changes even in Hollidaysburg though. Marijuana is commonplace there among the young, and hard drugs have begun to appear.

"It wasn't on the campuses when I left the job," he said. "I would have adopted the hot-pursuit policy and got it out of there. I don't know. I don't know what the answer is."

ENERGY POWER CRISIS

HON. JOHN H. TERRY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 6, 1971

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Speaker, there is in this country an approaching crisis—which, if nothing is done to avert it, will worsen with each passing year. The Congress will shortly have to come to grips with the problem, and this year may not be soon enough.

I call the attention of my fellow colleagues to the following editorial which very adeptly points up the seriousness of this situation:

[From the Syracuse (N.Y.) Herald-Journal, Sept. 27, 1971]

ENERGY POWER CRISIS

Are the seemingly endless supplies of power really endless?

Congress is beginning to believe those who say a power crisis is close at hand.

Two major studies are already under way. Other committees are investigating the location of new power plants, economic concentration in the fuel production industry, energy research and development and the cost of home heating fuel.

All this might mean that Americans used to consuming power to heat homes, cool offices, run factories, light their streets and carry on the major and minor tasks of living may soon have to change their ways.

Right now fears of power blackouts and brownouts in the summer are growing more numerous as are concerns over shortage of heating fuels in the winter.

Annual consumption rates of some fuels exceed the discovery of new reserves in this country, increasing U.S. dependence on foreign supplies, and the prospect of the use of nuclear energy to supplement coal, gas and oil systems appears further in the future than originally estimated.

Some congressmen believe that a national policy on energy is needed immediately because there has been too much planning on a piecemeal basis. Too often one governmental agency sets a policy and a second takes action independently of the other, even at odds at times.

Michael D. Hathaway, director of the Republican Task Force on Energy and Resources, said this fragmentation has resulted in equal confusion of congressional actions. What we have today, Hathaway said, is a "mishmash of energy policy."

There are efforts now to clear away the mishmash, besides the congressional committees and studies.

President Nixon has called for a new De-

partment of Natural Resources to consolidate most, but not all, of the agencies dealing with energy matters. He also has outlined a "broad range of actions to ensure an adequate supply of clean energy."

We had better consolidate soon for U.S. reserves of petroleum and gas are declining every year. Coal reserves appear to be sufficient for the near future but certain kinds of coal pollute the atmosphere. This leaves nuclear energy, on which many are pinning their hopes for the future.

But increasing use of nuclear energy can increase thermal pollution (excess heat into lakes and streams), discharge of radioactive gases into the air and the disposal of radioactive wastes.

Maybe the power crisis is already here.

HUMANITIES OF THE SEA

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 6, 1971

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the University of Virginia this semester is offering a new course in "The Humanities of the Sea," the first such course to be offered in the United States.

This course should serve as the foundation for a new discipline, widening man's horizons to the challenges and opportunities in the sea and offering new professions and careers.

The distinguished gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. ANDERSON) and I have been invited to be among the guest lecturers for this course.

Following is a Copley News Service story on the program and its meaning to its cosponsors, the University of Virginia and the Oceanic Educational Foundation.

HUMANITIES OF THE SEA

CHARLOTTESVILLE, VA.—The first college course in "The Humanities of the Sea" has been added to the University of Virginia's Adult Education Program, President Edgar F. Shannon has announced.

The course will be co-sponsored by the university and the Oceanic Educational Foundation, and will be taught as part of a pilot research program to introduce the new discipline of oceanic education into the American school system.

Shannon also serves as senior vice president of OEF.

"Man's future is dependent on his knowledge of the seas and his understanding of their dynamic relationship to his society," the course outline says. "In no facet of education do the seas receive sufficient curriculum and program emphasis to impart comprehensive knowledge of the dependence of mankind on the world ocean."

The first course has been fully subscribed. Horace M. Kallen, distinguished philosopher of the New School of Social Research who will lecture on "Peace and Prosperity—The Philosophy of the Sea," says the new discipline of oceanic education should reach students from childhood through all levels.

"Oceanic education . . . should make possible new professions, new vocations, and new careers, parallel to the innovations on land and in the air," he said.

The university hopes to utilize the lectures, dialogues and discussions of the humanities of the sea to construct a textbook in oceanic education. Guest lecturers will include Robert E. Abel, director, Na-

tional Sea Grant program; Rep. William R. Anderson, D-Tenn.; George E. Love, U.S. Office of Education; Dr. Klaus P. Heiss, mathematician, Princeton, N.J.; Dennis Brezina, environmentalist at the National Academy of Engineering; Mrs. Helen Delich Bentley, chairman of the Federal Maritime Commission and Rep. Craig Hosmer, R-Calif.

GUAR: NEW CROP FOR SOUTHWESTERN OKLAHOMA

HON. TOM STEED

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 6, 1971

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, the article that follows was written by one of Oklahoma's top agriculture authorities, Herb Karner, farm editor of the Tulsa Daily World. It tells the story of the development of a crop new to southwestern Oklahoma, guar. Through the enterprise of growers in the Mangum area, it is becoming a significant cash crop and is claiming a growing role in the economy of our State.

The article follows:

[From the Tulsa (Okla.) Daily World, Aug. 9, 1971]

GUAR PROMISES TO BE "WONDER-CROP" FOR SOUTHWEST OKLAHOMA

MANGUM.—Guar spells m-o-n-e-y, cold cash upon which the Empire of Greer is hoping to bring stability to the drought-ridden area.

"There's just nothing wrong with it . . . it's almost too good to be true, is the candid appraisal of Adrian Richardson, agent for Stein-Hall, major buyer of Guar.

This year some 25,000 acres of the exotic wonder crop will be harvested and marketed at Mangum with most of the production contracted to Stein-Hall at \$5 a hundred.

Guar is not a new crop to Greer County. It has been grown off and on for the past 10 years, but has not gained favor until about three years ago.

"The old variety we started with was called Groehler and it grew tall—much like a sunflower. Seed was all concentrated in an area about the size of your fist. It was hard to harvest, yield was low and price nothing to brag about," Richardson said.

Results at Oklahoma State University Sandy Land Experiment Station show Groehler average yield was 554 pounds an acre.

But because the crop held promise, plant breeder Lester Brooks, Iowa Park, Texas, worked on improving Guar. Today the Brooks strain is most popular variety in the Mangum area. It grows much as does soybeans; will get waist high and is bushy with bean pods distributed fairly evenly over the plant. Yield has been boosted to 1,207 pounds average an acre at the experiment station.

"We have yields as high as 2,000 pounds an acre," said Ray Babb, manager of the Mangum Chamber of Commerce who believes in the future of Guar and has vigorously pushed it as a cash crop.

"Additional uses have been found for Guar products which has pushed demand beyond production," Babb said. "Predictions are that prices may surpass the contract price of \$5 a hundred this year and go as high as \$6 a hundred. Years ago Guar sold for around \$2.50 a hundred.

"Last year was not a good year for Guar because of dry weather, but we averaged better than 800 pounds an acre with price at \$4.60 a hundred. At top yields of 2,000, income from a crop that costs practically

nothing to grow, amounts to an income of \$100 an acre," Richardson said.

Guar grows extremely well on the thin, sandy lands of Greer County. "Grows where nothing else will . . . even sunflowers, and because it's a legume, don't need fertilizer," Babb said.

He recalled that many farmers in early days grew Guar as a green manure crop to improve the tilth and nitrogen content of the sandy soil.

"It only takes six pounds of seed an acre to plant and seed only costs 11 cents a pound which puts you in at 66 cents an acre. You plant with a corn planter and harvest with a combine. It'll stand all winter and not shatter," Richardson said.

Of the 25,000 acres expected to be harvested Clinton Nesmith has possibly the largest amount, some 500 acres, followed by Bob Davis with 480 acres. Many growers have small plots they are banking on for ready cash.

"You can plant Guar as late as July 15 and still make a crop," Richardson said. Guar, a plant native to India and Pakistan, has ability to withstand unusual dry weather. "When it gets hot and dry, it just stands there, and when you get rain, it really takes off," he said.

Insects are no worry and there does not appear to be any natural enemies in this dry part of the country where most successful crops of Guar are grown. "We had one field pretty heavily infested with careless weeds. Webworms stripped the weeds, but didn't touch the Guar," Richardson said.

Babb touts the wonder crop not only because it means cash to area farmers, but the possibility exists a plant will be built at Mangum "if we get the acreage up to 40,000" Babb said.

While Greer County has the majority of acres in Guar, some is also grown in Beckham, Jackson, Harmon and Kiowa counties. Currently the crop is hauled to a mill for processing at Vernon, Texas.

"We have a potential of 50,000 acres in Greer County alone," Babb said.

Babb believes Guar may replace much of the wheat grown in the area. "With dry weather and government programs affecting wheat, and with prices as low as they are, it looks like Guar is going to push wheat into the background," he said. There are no planting or government restrictions on Guar production.

What's Guar used for? According to a brochure printed by Stein-Hall, the oil industry uses Guar products to reduce friction loss, give viscosity and fluid loss control.

"New York City is saving millions annually by using Guar in their water supply. It makes water slicker. They've found they can pump as much water through a 3-inch pipe when it is treated with Guar, than they can through a 4-inch pipe before," Babb said.

The dairy industry uses Guar as a stabilizer in ice cream and the food industry uses it as a stabilizing agent.

Paper makers use Guar to improve strength of paper and textile industry uses it as printing compounds for many fabrics. The pharmaceutical industry uses Guar to help in the disintegration of tablets.

In addition to Guar gum, processing of Guar seed produces a high protein meal as a secondary product. When mixed with other feed components, it makes an ideal stock feed.

How about competition? "Practically none. There are not many places in this country suited for Guar production. It requires from 17 to 24 inches of moisture a year. In this area we normally get 24-26 inches," Richardson said.

Leonard Graumann, who has a 40-acre field of registered seed south of Granite, said at his place so far this year he has received 7 inches of rain . . . three of that came in

June. "But my Guar looks good because the rains came at the right time," he said.

Graumann said one drawback to growing Guar—if it can be called that—is "the seed runs out pretty fast. You've got to keep planting good seed."

"I AM NOW A KEYNESIAN IN ECONOMICS"—PRESIDENT NIXON

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 6, 1971

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, President Nixon has publicly stated, "I am now a Keynesian in economics."

Just as many Americans have found it incredible to believe the President of the United States would accept the advocacy of J. M. Keynes in economics, they certainly hope that he does not extend his affection to the full repulsive philosophy. Is it possible to support a man's economic theories without understanding the vile nature of the author's total objectives or to be sympathetic to the total Keynesian philosophy?

I submit a newsstory explaining the full disgusting philosophy of J. M. Keynes:

[From the Manchester (N.H.) Union Leader, Sept. 23, 1971]

SUGAR KEYNES: THE IMMORAL MAN BEHIND IMMORAL ECONOMIC THEORIES

President Nixon has said that he is a Keynesian in economics. Well, we are happy that the President of the United States limited his affection for Keynesianism to Mr. Keynes' economic theories, bad as they are. While it is very evident that neither President Nixon nor Walter Lippmann nor Felix Frankfurter have done nothing but abhor the immoral excesses attributed to Keynes and his companions, this newspaper believes they should have the common sense to evaluate the total philosophy of one whose economic theories they now endorse.

The goal of Keynes' philosophy is obviously atheism, communism, degradation of the human personality and the abolition of individual liberty. We are quite sure that neither the President nor Mr. Lippmann nor Justice Frankfurter ever endorsed such objectives, yet this is the nature of the man whose economic theory they embrace.

If you want to realize just how horrible Keynes' character was, be sure to read the article at the top of our back page today. This is written by Mr. Zygmund Dobbs and is reprinted from American Opinion magazine of June 23, 1971.

Mr. Dobbs, in association with the last surviving son of Theodore Roosevelt, Archibald Roosevelt, has written a great deal exposing the influence of Keynes at Harvard, from which Mr. Roosevelt graduated. After you have read this article at the top of our back page today you will see the cause for concern over students or groups of other individuals who are so foolish as to associate themselves with Keynes' economic philosophy which, in the opinion of this newspaper, is as irresponsible and immoral as were his own personal habits.

Unfortunately, the activity of Keynes is one of many matters being swept under the rug by a permissive society which seems to recognize fewer and fewer moral standards.

WILLIAM LOEB,
Publisher.

[From the Manchester (N.H.) Union Leader, Sept. 23, 1971]

STATEMENT MAKES RESEARCHER WONDER IF NIXON KNEW WHAT HE WAS SAYING: "I AM NOW A KEYNESIAN IN ECONOMICS"

(By Zygmund Dobbs)

Singing the Red Flag, the highborn sons of the British upper-class lay on the carpeted floor spinning out socialist schemes in homosexual intermission. Sometimes, one of the participants would shout out an obscenity—then, as if on signal, the entire group would join in a frenzied babble of profanity. Here and there individuals would smoke or chew hashish. Most had unkempt long hair, and some sported beards.

The attitude in such gatherings was anti-establishmentarian. To them the older generation was horribly out of date; even superfluous. The capitalist system was declared obsolete, and revolution was proclaimed as the only solution. Christianity was pronounced an enemy force, and the worst sort of depravities were eulogized as "that love which passes all Christian understanding."

The year was 1904, and the participants were destined to become the intellectual and political leaders of the British Empire.

Chief of this ring of homosexual revolutionaries was John Maynard Keynes, who eventually became the economic architect of English socialism and gravedigger for the British Empire. The chief American Fabians, acting as carriers of the Keynesian sickness, were Felix Frankfurter and Walter Lippmann. Covertly, they mobilized their Leftist comrades to spread this pollution in America also.

So successful were they that on January 4, 1971, President Richard Nixon announced: "I am now a Keynesian in economics." What does that mean?

Keynes was characterized by his male sweetheart, Lytton Strachey, as "A liberal and a sodomite, an atheist and a statistician." His particular depravity was the sexual abuse of little boys. As a sodomistic pedophile, he ranged throughout the Mediterranean area in search of boys for himself and his fellow socialists.

These Leftists degenerates began to scheme over 60 years ago to secure public acceptance of their depravity. Havelock Ellis, a founder of the Fabian Society, compiled a massive erotic work entitled, *Studies In The Psychology Of Sex*. Ellis was a sexual pervert and drug user. He and a group of fellow Leftists even pioneered in the experimental use of hallucinogens in private orgies.

MOVE ON SCHOOLS

The Fabian socialists used the writings of Ellis as a wedge for sex education in the schools. They started in the colleges and gradually eased into the high school level. Today, his perversions are standard reference material for the sex educators, and Havelock Ellis is popularly called "the father of social psychology."

Keynes and his cohorts seized upon the works of Ellis as justification for their depravities. They were also greatly bolstered in their campaign by the theories of an Austrian Leftist named Sigmund Freud. Dr. Freud acknowledged in private correspondence that he copied the thesis of sex as the central determinant in human action from Havelock Ellis. Echoing Ellis, he laid down the premise that homosexuality and carnal depravities are not a matter of abnormality, but merely a case of personal preference.

During the same period (1925) Keynes struck out against drug control. He laid down the line which has been pursued by Leftists to the present day in demanding that distribution of narcotics be unrestricted.

Keynes and his conspirators projected homosexuality and drug addiction as an intrinsic part of their collectivist society of

the future. His male sweetheart, Lytton Strachey, wrote privately that they would corrupt the whole population, "subtly, through literature, into the bloodstream of the people, and in such a way that they accepted it all naturally, if need be without at first realizing what it was to which they were agreeing." He pointed out that the object was "to write in a way that would contribute to an eventual change in our ethical and sexual mores—a change that couldn't be done in a minute, but would unobtrusively permeate the more flexible minds of young people."

PUBLISHED IN UNITED STATES

Keynes and Strachey used their malignant writings to help contaminate the entire English-speaking world. In the United States they both found expression in the *New Republic*, the *New York Times*, and the *Saturday Review of Literature*.

In 1939, a comrade of Keynes and Strachey named Bertrand Russell came to America to push their obscurantist socialism and was (he says in his *Autobiography*) legally charged as "lecherous, libidinous, lustful, venerous, erotomaniac, aphrodisiac, irreverent, narrow-minded, untruthful, and bereft of moral fiber." His abhorred object had been to permeate the College of the City of New York with the corruption of the British Fabians. Immediately, John Dewey and other American Fabians organized to cry that "Academic Freedom" was under attack. The National Education Association and the whole Leftist educational complex began to percolate pervasive degeneracies as being "Liberal" and "progressive."

The works of Keynes, Lytton Strachey, and Bertrand Russell have been, and are today, required reading in almost every college and university in the United States and Canada.

In the spring of 1905 Keynes and his lavender cohorts had been thrilled by a conference of Russian revolutionaries in London. British Fabians and Joseph Fels, an American soap manufacturer who was also a Fabian, had financed the Russian gathering and furnished them a hall in a Christian church. Key revolutionaries at this London conference included Nikolai Lenin, Leon Trotsky, and Joseph Stalin.

BECAME PACIFISTS

Keynes and his fellow debauchees became active pacifists and conscientious objectors during World War I. The socialist position against military service dovetailed perfectly with the homosexual aversion to any kind of physical danger and the manly requirements of military training. Yet, in spite of Keynes' sheltering of "queer conchies," and his own refusal to serve his country, he was made the head of an important division of the British Treasury. During March of 1917 he confided privately that he supported the bolshevik group among the Russian socialists after the overthrow of Czar Nicholas.

The seizure of power by the bolsheviks in November of 1917 elated Keynes and the rest of the Fabian coterie. At leftist parties in London, Keynes and his fellow perverts celebrated by dressing in women's clothes and performing lewd dances. He has as his consort an eighteen-year-old boy who was ensconced as his assistant in the Treasury Department.

Just before the Bolshevik Revolution, Keynes had made a hurried trip to the United States for the British Government. Here he had a chance to make contact with the American Fabians who were similarly entrenched, via the Frankfurter-Lippmann group, in key positions of the Wilson Administration.

On February 22, 1918, Keynes proudly boasted of "being a bolshevik." Yet the British Government blindly sent Keynes to the Versailles peace talks. There he joined forces with his Fabian American comrade, Walter

Lippmann, who was among those representing the equally blind U.S. Government.

In 1919 Keynes authored *The Economic Consequences Of The Peace*, which was promptly acclaimed from Moscow by Nikolai Lenin, himself. The Red dictator declared: "Nowhere has the Versailles treaty been described so well as in the book by Keynes." A special edition of *The Economic Consequences* was printed under the label of the Fabian Society; and, Frankfurter and Lippmann brought the manuscript to the United States and arranged with Harcourt and Brace to publish it here. The volume became required reading among American socialists and Communists.

LENIN PROTECTS

However Keynes' value as a hidden Red was in danger. The Fabians had developed the posture of "respectability" to a fine art and the value of Keynes' book as an "impartial work" was in jeopardy. With Keynes' future usefulness in upper-class circles at stake, Lenin had personally come to the rescue. He pulled the classic Leftist double-twist, praising Keynes' book as a model for Communist revolutionaries and at the same time covering for Keynes by labelling him as "anti-bolshevik."

Thus was launched the career of Fabian leader Keynes as a "non-Leftist" and "non-Communist."

In 1925, John Maynard Keynes was married. It was a bizarre performance. His best "man" was Duncan Grant, his male lover for many years, and intimates swear that Keynes held Duncan's hand as the marriage vows were spoken. But the background of the bride was equally odd. She was Lydia Lopokova, the premiere ballerina of the Diaghilev Ballet. She was an habitue of Leftist circles, and had at one time been engaged to Heywood Broun, the well known socialist and confidant of Leon Trotsky, but had broken the engagement to marry a dwarf named Marocchi.

Following the wedding to Comrade Lydia, Mr. and Mrs. Keynes were the special guests of the Soviet Government.

Meanwhile, the perversion continued apace. It was quite a pace. As I have noted in the new edition of *Keynes At Harvard*:

Keynes had relations with Strachey;

Strachey had affairs with Duncan Grant; Keynes stole Grant from Strachey; Lytton's brother James Strachey adored Rupert Brooks, but so did Keynes; Strachey reports to G. E. Moore on seduction of new boys; Keynes steals Edgar Duckworth from Lytton... Strachey and Keynes promote obscurantist talk in colleges; Lytton lives with Dora Carrington, a Lesbian; Carrington solicits homosexual partners for Lytton; Keynes, Lytton and Carrington have orgies...

INCREDIBLE SUCCESS

The Fabian homosexual circle was incredibly successful in gaining influence and control in a wide area of activity. They staked out the entire British Empire and the United States as well.

J. M. Keynes became the mastermind behind the economic structure of British and American socialism. Strachey was responsible for writing books that undermined the Christian ethic of the Nineteenth Century and set the tone for the pornographic and depraved literature of today. Leonard Woolf worked out the details of the socialist drive for World Government. He was not only the architect of the League of Nations but outlined the structure of the United Nations.

Others of this perverted group of Keynesians have set the tone in art, music, education, and religion. Today, alas, even the President of the United States says: "I am now a Keynesian in economics." It is disgusting!

WHO ARE THE IMPERIALISTS?

HON. JOHN G. SCHMITZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 6, 1971

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, James Burnham, "Suicide of the West," said: What is ending in our age is not empire, but merely the empires of the West.

NEW INDEPENDENT NATIONS SINCE WORLD WAR II

Country	Area	Population	Year of independence	Former control	Country	Area	Population	Year of independence	Former control
Algeria	919,352	12,943,000	1962	French.	Malagasy	228,000	6,643,000	1960	French.
Barbados	166	251,000	1966	British.	Malawi	48,443	4,285,000	1964	British.
Botswana	238,605	629,000	1966	Do.	Malaysia	128,430	11,835,000	1957	Do.
Burma	261,721	26,389,000	1948	Do.	Maldives Island	115	104,000	1965	Do.
Burundi	10,744	3,406,000	1962	Belgian.	Mali	478,640	4,900,000	1960	French.
Cambodia	69,898	6,557,000	1949	French.	Malta	95	319,000	1964	British.
Cameroon	183,381	5,562,000	1960	Do.	Mauritania	397,850	1,120,000	1960	French.
Central African Republic	241,000	1,518,000	1960	Do.	Mauritius	720,000	810,000	1968	British.
Ceylon	25,332	11,964,000	1948	British.	Morocco	171,843	14,816,000	1956	French/Spanish.
Chad	495,624	3,361,000	1960	French.	Nauru	8	6,053	1968	Australian.
Congo (Brazzaville)	132,000	826,000	1960	Do.	Niger	489,062	3,909,000	1960	French.
Congo (Kinshasa)	905,328	16,730,000	1960	Belgian.	Nigeria	356,574	62,650,000	1960	British.
Cyprus	3,572	621,000	1960	British.	Pakistan	365,532	109,520,000	1947	Do.
Dahomey	44,685	2,571,000	1960	French.	Philippines	115,800	35,993,000	1946	American.
Equatorial Guinea	10,830	286,000	1968	Spanish.	Rwanda	10,170	3,306,000	1962	Belgian.
Fiji	7,055	519,000	1970	British.	Senegal	76,104	3,685,000	1960	French.
Gabon	103,000	480,000	1960	French.	Sierra Leone	27,625	2,475,000	1961	British.
The Gambia	4,003	357,000	1965	British.	Singapore	225	2,004,000	1965	Do.
Ghana	92,100	8,376,000	1957	Do.	Somalia	246,000	2,500,000	1960	Italian/British.
Guinea	97,000	3,702,000	1958	French.	Southern Yemen	111,080	1,146,000	1967	British.
Guyana	83,000	710,000	1966	British.	Sudan	967,275	14,979,000	1956	British/Egyptian.
Iceland	39,758	200,000	1944	Danish.	Swaziland	6,705	375,000	1968	British.
India	1,261,483	523,893,000	1947	British.	Syria	71,228	5,738,000	1944	French.
Indonesia	735,268	112,800,000	1949	Dutch.	Tanzania	362,820	12,926,000	1961	British.
Israel	7,992	2,813,000	1948	British.	Togo	22,600	1,818,000	1960	French.
Ivory Coast	127,520	4,200,000	1960	French.	Tonga	270	81,000	1970	British.
Jamaica	4,411	1,900,000	1962	British.	Trinidad and Tobago	1,980	1,010,000	1962	Do.
Jordan	37,738	2,071,000	1946	Do.	Tunisia	63,379	4,533,000	1956	French.
Kenya	225,000	10,209,000	1963	Do.	Uganda	93,981	8,133,000	1962	British.
South Korea	38,012	30,400,000	1948	Japanese.	Upper Volta	105,946	5,278,000	1962	French.
Kuwait	6,178	555,000	1961	British.	South Vietnam	66,263	17,414,000	1954	Do.
Laos	91,429	2,825,000	1949	French.	Western Samoa	1,097	137,000	1962	New Zealand.
Lebanon	4,015	2,367,000	1943	Do.	Zambia	290,586	4,144,000	1964	British.
Lesotho (Basutoland)	11,716	1,000,000	1966	British.					
Libya	679,182	1,869,000	1951	Italian.					
					Total	13,223,124	1,153,452,053		

HERE IS THE SOVIET AND COMMUNIST CHINESE RECORD AS OF 1970

	Area (square miles)	Population (before annexation)
Territories annexed:		
Romanian provinces.....	19,446	3,700,000
Estonia.....	18,353	1,122,000
Latvia.....	25,400	1,951,000
Lithuania.....	22,059	2,957,000
Northern East Prussia.....	5,418	1,187,000
Eastern Czechoslovakia.....	4,900	731,000
Eastern Poland.....	70,000	11,800,000
Finnish provinces.....	18,000	450,000
Tannu Tuva.....	64,165	65,000
Japanese possessions.....	17,850	433,000
Tibet.....	560,000	1,200,000
Total.....	825,591	25,596,000
"Socialist camp" dependencies:		
Albania.....	11,100	2,019,000
Bulgaria.....	42,845	8,370,000
Cuba.....	44,218	8,074,000
Czechoslovakia.....	49,370	14,362,000
Eastern Germany.....	41,500	16,100,000
East Berlin.....	155	1,100,000
Hungary.....	35,919	10,284,000
Poland.....	120,632	32,207,000
Romania.....	91,660	19,721,000
Outer Mongolia.....	604,090	1,174,000
North Korea.....	46,814	13,100,000
North Vietnam.....	63,360	20,000,000
Total.....	1,151,663	146,511,000
Total annexations and dependencies.....	1,977,154	172,107,000
Under attack:		
Cambodia.....	69,898	6,557,000
Laos.....	91,429	2,825,000
South Vietnam.....	66,263	17,404,000
Total.....	227,580	26,786,000
Grand total.....	2,204,834	198,893,000

VICE PRESIDENT A DIVISIVE INFLUENCE

HON. ANDREW JACOBS, JR.

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 6, 1971

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, comes now Vice President AGNEW and says:

So that there can be no misunderstanding about my feelings on this subject, I not only plead guilty to this charge (being a divisive influence in American politics) but I am somewhat flattered by it.

The Vice President goes on to explain that he is a "positive" divisive influence.

So I took down my copy of the American Political Dictionary and found under the term, "positive divisiveness," the following definition:

One who calls those with whom he disagrees "Christine Jorgensen," "pusillanamous pussyfooters," "nattering nabobs," and a whole bunch of other stuff.

In conceding his own divisive influence on our country, the Vice President has insisted that the far left is divisive too.

No argument there from those of us who all along have deplored the hateful and divisive ways of both the far right and the far left.

In essence the Vice President's remarks

are me-tooism in reverse—"them too, but they can do it worse."

In any case, the divisiveness of the Vice President about which you can be most positive is the clear division between what he has been saying on behalf of the administration and the inaugural words of the administration, "bring us together."

MARINE LANCE CPL. JAMES D. HOWE

HON. WM. JENNINGS BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 6, 1971

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, the following concurrent resolution was introduced by the Pickens County delegation and adopted by the South Carolina General Assembly honoring the memory of Marine Lance Cpl. James D. Howe, posthumous recipient of the Congressional Medal of Honor.

The resolution follows:

TO HONOR THE MEMORY OF LANCE CORPORAL JAMES DONNIE HOWE OF LIBERTY, SOUTH CAROLINA, POSTHUMOUS RECIPIENT OF THE CONGRESSIONAL MEDAL OF HONOR

Whereas, Lance Corporal James Donnie Howe of Liberty, South Carolina, was recently awarded our Nation's highest tribute, the Medal of Honor, for gallantry far above the call of duty in service as a Marine in Viet Nam; and

Whereas, Corporal Howe, the twenty-one year old son of Mr. and Mrs. Odis S. Howe, gave his life to save the lives of fellow Marines by covering an enemy grenade with his body in a combat situation; and

Whereas, by his devotion to duty at the cost of his life this young gentleman from Pickens County has earned forever a place of honor and respect in the hearts of all South Carolinians, and indeed the entire Nation; and

Whereas, despite the tragedy of his death, the sorrow of his family and the loss to the community, the memory of this young man will provide an example and inspiration to those who must follow in his footsteps, for "Greater love has no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends."; and

Whereas, the people of South Carolina would most certainly wish to honor the deed and memory of Lance Corporal Howe.

Now, therefore, be it resolved by the House of Representatives, the Senate concurring: That the General Assembly by this Resolution recognizes and salutes Lance Corporal James Donnie Howe, posthumous recipient of the Congressional Medal of Honor for gallantry and intrepidity above and beyond the call of duty while serving as a rifleman with the First Marine Division in Viet Nam on May 6, 1970.

Be it further resolved that the members of the General Assembly would at this time recall that James Donnie Howe joins perhaps the most select group of men from Pickens County, Pfc. Furman L. Smith, Pfc. William A. McWhorter and Pfc. Charles H. Barker, other Medal of Honor winners whose valiant deeds are not forgotten.

Be it further resolved that copies of this Resolution be forwarded to Mr. and Mrs. Odis S. Howe, Wanda Howe, Brenda Howe and Sandra Howe, all of Liberty and Mrs. Shirley Ann Edens of Pickens with the assurance that their sorrow and loss is tempered with a pride which few persons are allowed to share.

AMBASSADOR PORTER ADDS REFRESHING DIMENSION TO PARIS PEACE TALKS

HON. JOHN E. HUNT

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 6, 1971

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Speaker, a little-noticed news article appeared in the inner pages of the Washington Post on October 1 which caught my attention because its heading highlighted a reference to the Paris peace talks in which there seems to have been a sustained lack of interest of late. Upon reading the article, however, I was surprised that it had not been given a higher priority than page A22 inasmuch as it was reporting on the activities of the President's newly appointed negotiator at the talks, Ambassador William J. Porter. Even more significant was what the Ambassador had to say to his North Vietnamese and Vietcong counterparts. His remarks were in reference to the persistent demands by the Communists for a total and unconditional withdrawal of American troops from South Vietnam. Quoting the excerpts verbatim from the news story:

You apparently overlook the fact that your military position is unimpressive. One needs only to keep in mind that, of the 300 or so district and province capitals in South Vietnam, you do not hold a single one after these many years of war, and your best military efforts.

You are, in fact, further from military victory than ever. In such circumstances, your use of peremptory language seems rather pretentious. Perhaps the use of such language is intended to conceal your lack of authority and military success in South Vietnam, but I would suggest that . . . you keep in mind that your negotiating proposals . . . would be much more effective if they reflected a greater sense of realism on your part.

Mr. Speaker, as I read this forthright statement of fact, I could not help but get the impression that the former stance of our negotiating team was one of not doing anything to offend the Communist negotiators for fear they would pick up their marbles and go home. Regardless of the validity of that impression, no one can dispute the fact that we have taken the brunt of the propaganda beating at the Paris peace talks and I am quite certain that the primary reason for this is the predisposition of the news media.

It is my firm belief that if we had not crawled into the conference room at the peace talks on our hands and knees in the first place, the war would have ended long ago and we would not now be faced with the impossible negotiating stance of the Communists of trading our POW's for a commitment to set a deadline for the withdrawal of American troops.

Perhaps the new vigor and candidness of the Ambassador reflects the air of futility that has plagued the peace talks, but it is certain to add stature and credibility to the United States/Vietnamese position in contrast to the pompous rhetoric of the implacable and arrogant Communist negotiators.

JUSTICE HUGO L. BLACK

HON. HENRY B. GONZALEZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 5, 1971

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, only a few men have ever had the honor to be named a member of the U.S. Supreme Court. Hugo Black was one of these. Fewer men still come to be recognized as great Justices—men who leave their personal imprint on the highest body of law in the land. Hugo Black was one of these.

The Supreme Court is a unique body; it has no equal anywhere in the world. The Court represents the living Constitution, safeguards it and passes it on, ever changing and yet always intact, the foundation of our laws and our Republic. I suppose that not many citizens know who the members of the Court are, but virtually all citizens honor it without question. It is the Court that assures us all that this is a government of laws, not of men; and it is the Court that is our ultimate defense against assaults on liberty. Every act of our Government is subject to measurement against the single standard of the Constitution, and it is the Court that applies the measure. The burden and the glory of the Court are impossible to imagine; the weight of its work and the import of its decisions affect us all, and so we have all the more reason to be grateful for the outstanding men who have graced it. Hugo Black was one of these.

Controversy is not new to the Supreme Court; by its very nature the Court is called upon to settle the fundamental legal issues of the country. Nor was the Supreme Court free of controversy when Hugo Black was named to be a member in 1937. Indeed the Court had just emerged from a storm of political controversy, in which there had been bitter attacks.

Mr. Justice Black was no patrician; his background hardly seemed suited to the great tribunal. He had been a senator, once had even been a member of the notorious Ku Klux Klan; and his legal credentials were not impressive. His judicial experience was limited to the role of a former police judge.

But Hugo Black earned the highest respect of the Court. He served on it almost longer than any other man, and he became its intellectual leader. He was not the legal craftsman that his colleague Justice Harlan was, but he was unquestionably the guiding spirit of the Court.

It was Justice Black who said that the 14th amendment bound all the States to the Bill of Rights, and that therefore every citizen of every State was covered by those amendments. And though his was at first a minority voice, his idea became the doctrine of the Court later, and from it flowed a whole body of law, perhaps the greatest single bulwark to assure every citizen in the land of equal rights. Thanks to this doctrine, the States must apply to every citizen those same standards prescribed for the Fed-

eral Government, measured against the same Constitution—the right to counsel, the universal freedom of speech and press, protection against self-incrimination—all those political rights and protections that are the essence of freedom.

Black was a strict constructionist, in the highest sense of the term. He applied the law as he saw it, and though he was considered among the "liberals" of the Court he was no prisoner of doctrine; his decisions sometimes confounded and dismayed his staunchest admirers. Yet none faulted him, for Black very simply applied the law as he saw it.

Black was not particularly concerned that he would leave the court some day; he was aware of his mortal state; he did not regret that his career would some day end. For he had faith in the judicial system, which he had served so long, faithfully, and well. He had an abiding faith in the law and in the Constitution; he had seen the law grow, and with it his faith, and in him they became one, living testament to the strength of the Court that he served so honorably and well.

Few men can serve on the Supreme Court, and fewer are great members of that honorable body. Mr. Justice Black has earned his rest; we are in his debt, and we shall miss him.

THE LATE HONORABLE WILLIAM COWGER**HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER**

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 4, 1971

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the news of the sudden and unexpected death of one of our former colleagues, Bill Cowger, of Kentucky came as a very real shock and sorrow to Mrs. Steiger and me.

Bill Cowger and I both came to Congress in 1967; he was a close and valued friend during his 4 years of service. Bill Cowger took the lead in urban affairs and had an exceedingly fine record in the House of Representatives. He was chairman of the House Republican Task Force on Urban Affairs and carried on an excellent program of education and legislation.

During his service as mayor of his home city, Bill Cowger successfully undertook to reconcile differences that divided groups and individuals. He made that city a better place to live in. His years as mayor of Louisville made him one of the most knowledgeable House Members regarding urban needs.

His family can be assured that the memory and leadership of Bill Cowger will be with us for a long time to come. In his short lifetime he made an extraordinary contribution to his Nation and to all those who came in contact with him.

Mrs. Steiger joins with me in extending our deepest sympathy to his family.

**DRUG ABUSE PREVENTION WEEK
IDEAL TIME TO RENEW EFFORT
TO SECURE ACTION ON COMPREHENSIVE
DRUG TREATMENT BILL
FOR SERVICEMEN****HON. LAMAR BAKER**

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 6, 1971

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, many of my colleagues, as I have introduced legislation to control drug abuse, particularly heroin addiction, among our U.S. troops abroad. During Drug Abuse Prevention Week, it is important to re-emphasize the importance of prompt action on this legislation. We must keep in mind that we risk losing an entire generation of young Americans to the scourge of heroin addiction unless we wage an all-out war on drug abuse.

The bill my colleagues and I are co-sponsoring presents a two-pronged approach to the rehabilitation of addicted U.S. servicemen. It provides funds for an accelerated attack upon drug abuse among our men in uniform.

Our measure would allocate funds for the Department of Defense to develop an efficient and thoroughly reliable means of detecting heroin addicts. Accurate and prompt identification of military addicts is essential if these men are to be rehabilitated before being discharged from our Armed Forces.

Our bill would also make additional funds available to our Armed Forces for increased detoxification and rehabilitation services.

The second stage of the measure provides for extended rehabilitation programs where military efforts prove unsuccessful. Under the bill, the unrehabilitated addict could be assigned by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs for a maximum period of 3 years to any existing civilian rehabilitation program, including that operated by the VA itself, and those of the Public Health Service, National Institute of Mental Health, and State and community rehabilitation centers. Funds would be appropriated, under this bill, to expand military, VA, and other treatment facilities to accommodate addicted veterans.

In my opinion, one of the most significant points of our bill is its provision to crack down on in-service drug pushers. The measure provides for mandatory jail sentences without possibility of parole for those convicted of peddling narcotics to our servicemen.

In America today, we face a very serious, tragic, and baffling problem in drug abuse. Unless we immediately undertake a massive rehabilitation program, the number of young Americans becoming addicted in Southeast Asia will compound this severe national problem.

The latest study conducted by a special House Foreign Affairs Committee has revealed some 30,000 to 40,000, or 10 to 15 percent of our U.S. troops in Southeast Asia, are addicted to heroin. In some units, estimates of addiction rates

run even higher—up to 25 percent. Clearly, the problem is serious.

When we study figures revealing U.S. military deaths due to drug abuse, we can see the severity of the problem even more clearly. In a 5-month period, between August and December 1970, 59 U.S. servicemen in Southeast Asia died of drug overdoses. Since then, drug-related deaths among our men in uniform have averaged 18 per month. If this trend continues, it is estimated over 200 young Americans will die of heroin addiction this year.

Heroin addiction at home, too, is on the rise. Once confined to our inner-city ghettos, heroin addiction has spread to smaller towns and cities and suburbs of major metropolitan areas. The National Institute of Health has estimated there are at least 250,000 heroin addicts in the United States, excluding the number in uniform overseas.

When we review the cost of financing the average heroin habit, it is easy to see the tremendous cost of addiction to our society in terms of crime alone. Experts say the average heroin addict must spend a minimum of \$30 a day, or nearly \$11,000 per year, to finance his habit. Authorities further estimate the average addict must steal goods worth at least four times that figure—or \$44,000 worth of merchandise—to buy these illegal drugs. Any legislation to curb addiction, therefore, will pay for itself many times over in the long run.

Current efforts by the military to curb growing addiction rates have met with only limited success. Educational programs relating to drug abuse in some units may have had some success in discouraging servicemen not to become addicted to heroin, but rates of cure in existing rehabilitation programs are discouraging. Current efforts have been hampered by the fact there are now no adequate, reliable procedures for detecting heroin addiction. Improved programs of urinalysis are needed, and our measure would provide funding for necessary research in this area.

In addition, success of present rehabilitation programs has been limited by the fact participation by addicts has been on a voluntary, not mandatory, basis. Our bill would make participation required.

An extensive program combining education and rehabilitation is necessary if we are to curb addiction among our troops. At the same time, of course, we must continue to enforce sanctions upon governments in countries where U.S. troops are stationed to halt the illegal flow of opium into these areas. The fight to curb addiction would be greatly aided if we could cut off the heroin supply at its source.

Our bill is in line with recommendations of the House study committee and will implement President Nixon's announced massive program to curb drug abuse throughout our society. I believe this measure will take a giant step forward in helping to curb a potentially disastrous new source of drug addiction in our society.

I heartily concur with the President that the time for an extensive battle on

drug abuse is here. I join with my colleagues in supporting the committal of all available U.S. resources into this battle. Short-term costs will be heavily counterbalanced by the immense long-term gains to our Nation.

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT NEEDS

HON. BILL ALEXANDER

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 6, 1971

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, a fact sheet prepared by the Bureau of the Census to present some of the highlights of the 1970 census contains some facts which I find particularly worth reviewing during any consideration of community development needs in nonmetropolitan areas.

For instance, about one-half of the Nation's counties lost population between 1960 and 1970. In addition, another one-fourth of the counties had a low rate of growth. Of the counties which showed a decrease in the last decade, two-thirds of them had also lost population between 1940 and 1960. Since 1960, the farm population has declined by approximately one-third. This population group dropped from about 15 million to some 10 million persons.

The migration pattern is well established. Coastal areas continue to grow as outmigration goes on in the midcountry region. The shift continues from rural to urban. Residents leave the sparsely populated areas in search of jobs. The small towns' and counties' tax base continues to shrink. They cannot afford to carry out economic development programs on their own. Thus work opportunities in these areas expand little, if at all, and more often than not, they diminish.

As I have repeatedly reminded my colleagues, we need to widen our horizons in the effort to solve the Nation's economic, population, and social ills. At least as much attention must be paid to the salvation and development of small towns and communities which these migrants are forced to leave in search of jobs as is put into solving the urban crisis.

In line with this, I would like to share with my colleagues testimony presented at my August 30 hearing in Brinkley, Ark., on community development needs. This informative statement was made by the very able J. Dan Roebuck, executive director of the Arkansas Industrial Development Commission.

Mr. Roebuck's testimony follows:

TESTIMONY PRESENTED AT COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT PROPOSAL HEARING

Congressman Alexander, I am Dan Roebuck, Director of the Arkansas Industrial Development Commission. I am appearing at this public hearing in support of your proposed legislation for a community development bank which would lend money on favorable terms to local county and municipal governments to enhance economic development prospects.

So many people in high places are wring-

ing their hands over the problems of U.S. cities that the real picture of America is becoming more and more distorted.

If those who are stewing so much about the problems of the cities would take time to look around America, they would see a land with elbow room to spare. A flight across the country from the Atlantic to the Pacific reveals vast open areas that are beautiful and unspoiled. If more people would drop down off the superhighways that carry them from one city to another, they would find thousands of communities where the quality of life is in sharp contrast to the fears and frustration of big-city living. In these communities removed from the teeming urban areas, crimes of violence are the exception rather than the subject of daily headlines as in big-city newspapers.

Yet, much of the nation's money and brains are devoted to stop-gap solutions of problems in the metropolitan areas while the possibility of solving the problems in rural areas gets relatively little attention. So far, heavy spending on U.S. cities seems only to have brought a greater and greater concentration of unemployable people into their crowded confines. At the rate of 500,000 to 600,000 a year they come, many of them completely unprepared for a useful role in big-city life. New slums spring up as fast as the old ones can be rooted out, or faster.

Many people are wondering what will stop this greater and greater big city concentration. People are going to move where they want to and the mobility of the American people is well established. If the jobs are available in the metropolitan areas, the people are going to those jobs. By the same token, if jobs are available in the thousands of small towns and cities away from the metropolitan areas, I think most of the people in the rural areas will not move. They will prefer to live in the circumstances in which they were raised. People everywhere can read. They see television and they read the papers. They know about urban crowding and the urban crimes. They also know that smaller places are friendly. They know that in the small town or city it takes only five to fifteen minutes to travel between home and work.

There is a good deal of industrial decentralization going on right now. Industrial plants are springing up in many places throughout the country, but they are also still springing up in the metropolitan areas as well and in greater population. At the present time we have a continuation of the trend to greater and greater big-city crowding.

By the latest figures available, the number of people employed in manufacturing plants in the rural counties is about 1.1 million and has gone up only 450,000 in 20 years. The number of people in manufacturing plants in metropolitan areas is 8.5 million and has gone up 3.4 million in 20 years, over seven times as much as in the rural counties.

If manufacturing were to schedule a fair share of their new plants to the smaller places distant from the metropolitan areas, this could well bring down the wrath of the metropolitan chambers of commerce and real estate promoters, but it shouldn't. Even if there were no more manufacturing plants built in the already overcrowded urban areas, there is still more cleaning up to do, more building expansion, more growth in the urban centers than probably can be handled well.

The fact that there is considerable unemployment in the poor sections of big cities would seem to argue for concentrating new plants in such areas. This seems to me to be a superficial conclusion. There are plenty of job opportunities now in the big cities for trained people.

If most of the new manufacturing plants are loaded into the metropolitan areas, this won't solve the unemployment problem of

the uneducated, but it will cause millions more from the rural counties to drift to the big cities to look for jobs.

Steps must be taken to upgrade the image and facilities in the smaller communities in order to alleviate the unemployment problems in the larger cities and to reduce the migration of people to the larger cities. This, however, requires considerable planning and effort to reverse.

Recognizing that a business is only, in essence, a group of people assembled together in a physical facility, communities which are actively seeking new industry, recognize that making the family of the employee contented makes for happier employees and higher productivity. The personal amenities, then, are more and more considered vital by smaller communities.

There are, however, some obstacles to operating manufacturing plants in the small communities. The difficulties might be considered to be these: lack of management and executive personnel, reluctance of some company executives or their wives to take assignments in small communities, lack of trained mechanical workers, inadequate utilities, poor housing supply, including rental and lack of construction work forces.

Obviously, every business doesn't belong in the small community. It happens that there is an enormous segment of the business complex that can't be disassociated from the greater population of the metropolitan centers. Specifically the services industry which includes retailing, wholesaling, utilities, transportation, construction, entertainment, banking, insurance and all other types of services that are necessarily indigenous to the population. They must be located where they are needed. It also happens that the services part of our economy is our fastest growing portion and now exceeds in employment the manufacturing part. The metropolitan areas will have their hands full adjusting to the growth in the services industries without further massive manufacturing plant loads.¹

Mr. Chairman, I agree with your statement that the problems of metropolitan areas like New York are inextricably tied to those of places like Strawberry, Arkansas. I have tried to point out some of the challenges that face us in solving metropolitan problems and to touch on the tremendous potential of labor and resources in our country's rural areas and smaller communities. Since there is a just correlation between the problems of metropolitan and non-metropolitan areas, I would like to present some specific areas of concern to us at the Arkansas Industrial Development Commission.

Perhaps the biggest need for us in Arkansas is to develop leadership in our communities. We need also to develop youthful leadership which will provide a reservoir of talent to solve the problems of tomorrow. We need to encourage our elected officials, both city and county, to identify the community problems and plan approaches to solve these problems. These elected officials should, and are in many cases, taking the lead by analyzing their community needs and outlining ways to fulfill them. These community leaders should place service above their self and personal interests and make this contagious in their communities. After the community leaders have set the goals and objectives, alternatives can then be determined to achieve these goals. It is estimated that of 420 incorporated cities in Arkansas, only 10% of these cities have identified their needs and made plans to solve them.

Good jobs and adequate housing are high on the list of needs of Arkansas' communities. Industrialization can help fulfill these needs, but we quickly get into "the chicken and the egg theory," i.e., industry creates

housing demand and housing creates job demands. Without delving into this theory any further, we can conclude that industry and housing go hand in hand and would solve many problems if they are available. Adequate jobs in our communities are essential in order to prevent the outmigration of our people. Plans should be made to develop industrial parks in some of our communities in order to have an attractive site for industry.

Our community transportation systems need improving. Many of our residential and business areas need upgrading by providing better streets, water and sewer facilities.

Another need is continuation of the educational activities in public schools and adult vocational schools to upgrade the quality of education of our people. Arkansas has a relatively low per capita income, and I believe this is directly related to both the quality and attainment levels of education. The average educational attainment level in Arkansas is 9.7 years, which again is reflected in our per capita income level.

Better health care delivery systems are needed for all age groups in our communities. Our people must have proper medical attention, in order to accomplish their community objectives.

The natural gas and electrical energy demands on our communities is increasing daily, and there appears to be a shortage of these energy demands. Adequate community growth and development will require solutions of these problems.

Community centers and recreational facilities are needed to provide outlets for our people's needs, especially our young people.

These are a few of the critical needs of our communities which must be met in order to stimulate our smaller communities and help prevent problems in our metropolitan areas.

The total funding requirements to accomplish these needs will be astronomical. However, many of the communities in our state would be most cooperative in sharing this cost in order to make the total funding requirements more feasible. Some of our communities have such a low tax base that obtaining matching funds is very difficult. Communities such as these may require grants in order to give them the initial stimulus to develop themselves.

Part of the low tax base situation in Arkansas has been enhanced by the recent legislative session which expanded the tax base. Hopefully, this increased base will provide additional funds to our communities to use in their development.

Industry will play a key role in community development by providing jobs to the people who in turn will boost their local economic situation.

To illustrate what I am saying I would like to present some statistics from the United States Chamber of Commerce. A plant which will employ 100 people in a typical community will provide the following:

296 more people, 112 more households, 51 more school children, \$590,000 more personal income per year, \$270,000 more in bank deposits, 107 additional car registrations, 174 more workers employed, 4 additional retail establishments, \$360,000 more retail sales per year.

An industrial center occupying 1.2% of a town's total area costs the town \$25,000 in municipal services, yet pays \$292,000 in taxes, saving each property owner an average of \$45 per year.

I think these figures speak for themselves.

Arkansas had a population gain of 137,000 (7.7%) between 1960 and 1970, and an estimated net outmigration of 51,000 persons from the State. It is estimated that during the 1960's that there was a net in-movement of 43,000 whites into the State and that there was a net outmigration of 94,000 non-whites, increasing a migration rates for the

two groups of 2.9% and -25% respectively. Thirty-four of the State's 75 counties experienced net in-migration for a total of 88,000 between 1960 and 1970 and the remaining 41 counties a net outmigration of 139,000. These net outmigration rates ranged from -1% in Madison and Craighead Counties to a high of -31% in Mississippi County. Practically all of the 41 counties that experienced a net outmigration during the past 10 years are located in the State's Eastern and Southern Regions.²

A dollar amount has not been calculated for the loss of the outmigration, but it is obvious that this loss is substantial.

There are many existing federal programs which are aiding cities and counties in their community development projects. The Planning and Development Districts have improved the health, social and economic situations in their regions. The Farmer's Home Administration is actively assisting in housing loans in our rural areas. The Green Thumb Project (Program for the Aged) has provided jobs for our retired people by developing parks and recreational facilities for others to enjoy. HEW and HUD are also actively developing community resources in many ways.

The attitude of many municipal and county officials towards existing federal programs could be improved. Some of the comments we have heard are that there is a maze of "red-tape" to weave through and many stringent requirements in order to receive federal money. On many of the 50-50 matching programs, the moneys are funded equally, but the federal programs completely dictate how the money may be spent. Many officials believe that there is too much overlapping of programs and planning and not enough coordination of efforts. Specifically these officials would like to see a state-wide clearing house with the authority to set priorities on funding requirements in areas such as job training, recreational development, health care improvements and economic development. Many officials feel that there is too much federal money siphoned off the top for administrative functions and little left for doing what the funds were intended to do. Some officials would like to see more multi-agency funding for common community and regional interests.

I have briefly summarized the status and potential of our Nation's rural areas and smaller communities and firmly believe that the solution of many of our metropolitan problems can be solved at the smaller community level. We have a tremendous reservoir of people and resources that provide us an outstanding potential.

The needs that I mentioned are, in my opinion, extremely urgent and I strongly believe that your proposed community development bank legislation could greatly assist us in fulfilling these needs through federal government low interest, long term loans to our communities.

It is my hope that your proposed legislation will provide ways and means to solve some of the challenges I have mentioned. Thank you very much for inviting me to appear before you.

This is the third insertion into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of testimony and other material which I have gathered during my search for ways to assist community development in areas of low population. Other material on this subject appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of September 22 on pages 32740 and 32741, and of October 1, 34505 and 34506.

² Arkansas Population Migration Estimates, 1960-1970, Forrest H. Pollard and Kenneth D. Jones.

¹ Excerpts from Maurice Fulton.

HELPING THE HOMEBOUND
HANDICAPPED

HON. ROBERT PRICE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 6, 1971

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to add my support and sponsorship to legislation on behalf of the homebound handicapped children of this country. These children have an impossibly difficult time in securing an adequate education. This is a problem we have been neglecting in this country for far too long, and I believe this bill when enacted will serve as an important first step in meeting an essential need.

There are over 7 million handicapped children under the age of 19 in the United States, a figure that represents almost 10 percent of the total number of children in that age group in this country. For many years the educational needs of the handicapped were largely unmet, but during the past decade or so, the Congress has enacted a number of far-reaching legislative programs designed to bring special education services to children with handicaps. These programs have been largely successful for those children that have been reached, but even so, there are still millions of handicapped children whose needs are as yet unmet. In 1968-69, for instance, only 2 1/4 million of the slightly more than 7 million handicapped children in the United States were served by special education programs.

Mr. Speaker, the facts are clear. There are still many handicapped children for whom adequate educational programs are not yet available. This is why I am sponsoring legislation designed to meet the very special needs of the million or so young people in this country described as homebound handicapped. These children, because of one handicap or another, are not able to attend classes in a school for varying lengths of time. They suffer immeasurably from this inability to attend classes. The majority of existing special education programs for the handicapped are designed to utilize special techniques and material in the context of special classes within a school facility. Because of their lack of mobility, the homebound handicapped cannot benefit from such programs.

To benefit from an educational experience, the homebound handicapped require individual attention within their own homes. This is what this bill will provide. The bill will authorize Federal funds to State educational agencies for the development of programs using college students as tutors for individual homebound handicapped children. It also provides a special preference for the use of disabled veterans and other handicapped college students as tutors under the program. Besides providing valuable educational assistance to homebound handicapped children, the program will provide an opportunity for handicapped students to supplement their incomes as tutors while they are furthering their education.

The legislation I am sponsoring today

will create a modest program in comparison with other Federal aid programs, but it can also be of invaluable assistance to the million homebound handicapped children of this country. Their needs have been forgotten and neglected for too long.

There is one final aspect of this matter which must be considered, Mr. Speaker; namely, that this legislation gives young people participating in this effort a chance to involve themselves in community affairs in a direct and rewarding way.

I have often stated that today's youth face three basic choices when they consider their future; drop out of society; join the youth rebellion and become a rock thrower; or, join with other concerned individuals of differing ages and attempt to make our world a better place to live.

This legislation is a small but important way to give concerned youth a chance to help others in need while at the same time enriching themselves. It represents an opportunity that Congress should examine very carefully, for it is only through bridges such as this that the gaps in our society will be bridged and our national spirit will be made whole.

JOHN CLARENCE WATTS

HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 6, 1971

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, one of the many rewards that accompany service in this great body is the opportunity to associate with men of varied backgrounds and experience. One learns much from such associations and the resulting exchanges of views. An especially rewarding friendship was the one that I enjoyed with John Clarence Watts, who served in the House of Representatives for over 20 years.

We must ever be mindful that "in the midst of life we are in death," as the Book of Common Prayer so eloquently puts it, but it is nonetheless a shock when a friend of many years suddenly leaves us. One of those whose passing will leave a void was the gentleman from Kentucky, with whom I was privileged to serve on the Committee on Ways and Means.

His years of experience as a lawyer and banker in his native State qualified him to become a valued member not only of that committee but of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation as well. On both these important bodies he had attained sufficient seniority to entitle him to a seat next to those of the leaders. His combined legal and financial counsel left its imprint on the revenue measures that emanated from the former committee and eventually became law.

John C. Watts represented his district, his State, and his country with great distinction. While he was devoted to his party and its interests, the good of his country received a higher priority.

May he rest in peace and may God comfort those he left behind.

CROSS FLORIDA CANAL VALUES
UPHELD BY FEDERAL COURT

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 6, 1971

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, the following interesting press release from the Cross Florida Canal Counties Association came to my desk today and I am happy to include it in the RECORD:

JACKSONVILLE, FLA., September 30.—The U.S. District Court here issued a ruling today which refused permission to dismantle a part of the Cross Florida Barge Canal project by the lowering of the Rodman Reservoir.

The ruling by Judge Harvey M. Johnsen of Omaha, Nebraska, made mention of the new "environmental conditions and the enjoyment of them now existing" and was viewed as a major victory by the supporters of the canal project.

The decision was hailed by canal supporters from many of the areas in the state almost immediately after the release of the ruling.

Jack Bush, chairman of the Putnam County Board of County Commissioners, said he viewed the ruling as "evidence that benefits to man will be considered in our courts and that the current status of the trees in question is very highly debatable at this point."

Bush continued, "The decision is obviously a major defeat for the opponents of the canal. I think that in their emotional zeal to destroy the project the opponents may themselves be guilty of the charges that they level against us—that of bringing damage to the environment."

"The self-appointed environmentalists completely ignored the benefits of Lake Oklawaha to our citizens and taxpayers and as Chairman of the County Commissioners in Putnam County, I would like to point out this is a very large benefit indeed. In fact we have already had hundreds of thousands of visitors to this wonderful new recreational lake which they seek to destroy."

The decision was termed to be "just what we expected all along" by Jack Lucas, president of the Florida Waterways Association and chairman of the port and waterway development committee of the Jacksonville Chamber of Commerce.

"We have been convinced and stated publicly on frequent occasions that when the unfounded excuses for lowering the Rodman Reservoir gave way to facts gathered under oath, the proposed lowering would be rejected."

"Today we rejoice in the fact that this expectation has been realized. This is a signal victory and we look forward with great optimism to the forthcoming full court hearings on the legality of the halting of the project and other issues pending."

L. C. Ringhaver, chairman of the Canal Authority of Florida, said, "Judge Johnsen's decision today shows that those persons calling themselves ecologists are not necessarily always acting in the best interests of our environment. The judge weighed courtroom testimony rather than publicity and emotionalism, and he determined that, in fact, the proposed reservoir lowering, heralded as a great benefit to the environment, might actually have created some losses."

"We were naturally very pleased with the outcome of these preliminary hearings and, as we have said before, we are glad that the facts are now being heard in an impartial courtroom setting. Two leading scientists in opposition to the Canal admitted under oath that they had not even visited the project at all before signing letters of opposition. Therefore, it seems to us to be a case of their

emotionalism weighing heavily in the mass media but being less convincing under the scrutiny of sworn testimony and cross-examination."

One of the plaintiffs in the case, Gene Loftin, who is also secretary of the St. Johns Bass Anglers Club, said simply, "I'm delighted. It appears that the judge concluded that the stated intent of saving a few trees was a mere pretext for the actual goal of some anti-canal forces to destroy a very valuable recreational area."

He added, "The periodic lowering of the Rodman Reservoir to deter the development of waterweeds was a planned part of the reservoir management. It was lowered to 18 feet for this purpose and would have been restored to the 20 foot level early last spring. Periodic lowering of the reservoir should be done as part of a sensible fish management program and certainly that was not the intent of the canal opponents."

In an earlier decision, Judge Johnsen ruled against a complaint from a private citizen, Thomas Chapin of Tampa to stop the Corps of Engineers from dismantling railroad relocation work near Dannelon. Judge Johnsen ruled that the citizen would not suffer irreparable damage. The work can be re-built and thus dismantling is not viewed as irreparable.

However, on the Rodman case Judge Johnsen ruled that lowering the reservoir would constitute irreparable environmental damage.

EDUCATION FOR HANDICAPPED CHILDREN

HON. WILMER MIZELL

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 6, 1971

Mr. MIZELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today seeking support and swift action on legislation I am cosponsoring to provide special education services for homebound handicapped children.

With the distinguished gentleman from New York, Mr. BADILLO, and more than 70 others, I am introducing today a bill for which there is a compelling and urgent need.

Educational opportunities for homebound handicapped children have in the past been severely limited, a fact acknowledged by every educational system in the Nation, no matter how large or advanced it may be.

Today there are 1 million handicapped children in America who are homebound and who have suffered from inadequate educational training. The program we are proposing would help these youngsters to overcome the social, academic, and emotional adjustments required to successfully compete and grow in society.

The legislation we are introducing would also provide jobs for handicapped veterans and other handicapped college students who would serve as instructors in the program.

The new service, with a proposed funding of \$55 million in the first year, would be administered by State and local educational agencies, and the student instructors would be supervised by qualified professional teachers.

I believe this is good legislation, Mr. Speaker, and I urge the swiftest possible consideration in committee and on the floor.

HOPE FOR THE CITIES

HON. PETER N. KYROS

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 6, 1971

Mr. KYROS. Mr. Speaker, the great majority of the Members of this chamber are concerned on a day-to-day basis with the numerous and severe problems plaguing our metropolitan areas. Air and water pollution, law enforcement and crime prevention, housing, and urban planning are just some of those problems. These areas of vital concern were the subject of a series of seminars held on Capitol Hill. Sponsored by the Washington Operations Research Council, a professional group comprised of scientists and technologists from government, industry, and universities, each evening session brought together a Member with a special legislative commitment to a particular problem and a private sector specialist who had been focusing on the same problem.

The result of this unique group of meetings was a book, appropriately entitled *Hope for the Cities*—New York: Spartan Books, 1971. Not only does this volume contain the formal remarks of the featured speakers, augmented by useful commentary from hand-picked panelists, but the dialog between them and knowledgeable and concerned persons in the audience is recorded. Congressional contributors to this work include my distinguished colleagues BROCK ADAMS of Washington and WILLIAM A. STEIGER of Wisconsin, as well as a former Member of this body, the Honorable Emilio Q. Daddario of Connecticut. Also authoring a major section of the book is Senator CHARLES H. PERCY of Illinois.

The "Introduction" to the volume, which places in a helpful context the factual and interpretive material on the four problem areas, was prepared by its editor, Robert L. Chartrand, who initially conceived of the seminar series and served as the moderator for the sessions. Mr. Chartrand, for 5 years the specialist in information sciences for the Congressional Research Service at the Library of Congress, has extensive experience in the application of innovative technology to societal problems. At this time I should like to commend this introduction to "Hope for the Cities" to my colleagues:

HOPE FOR THE CITIES

INTRODUCTION

(By Robert Lee Chartrand)

The cry of the cities reverberates across the land, and echoes in the chambers of those who govern. The contemporary compression of people, buildings, institutions, and time factors has brought society perilously close to disaster. Increasingly the question is asked: Can our present governmental forms cope with the domestic challenges of our times?

Any consideration of this problem must reflect the positions and opinions of diverse public and private sectors. Those who conceive strategies and goals, program managers and monitors, project planners and implementers, should be represented. In the belief that better communication must be established between legislators and technologists, the two groups with critical assignments in the formulation of the nation's future, a series of seminars was established under the

auspices of the Washington Operations Research Council. Four top-priority problem areas were selected for treatment: environmental pollution, law enforcement and crime prevention, housing, and urban planning. Each session—and all were held in the buildings of Congress between February and May, 1969—featured a member with responsibilities and a personal interest in one of the problem areas. Following the presentation of the problem from the congressional vantage point, a senior member of the operations research-systems analysis community set forth the possible role of systems technology in meeting the subject problem. Comments of experienced discussants and audience dialogue with the panel followed.

Inasmuch as this type of forum is necessarily limited in attendance, it was determined that the publication of the formal papers and the edited discussion would benefit large numbers of involved persons and organizations throughout the country. The willingness of the congressional participants—Senator Charles H. Percy and Representatives Emilio Q. Daddario, Brock Adams, and William A. Steiger—to communicate candidly and face the penetrating questions of the attending melange of disciplines is evidence of the importance which they attach to these national problems.

It was realized by the sponsors of this series that other problems of equal magnitude exist and require remedies of high potency. Furthermore, it was believed that the initiation of an idea-action exchange between congressmen and technologists would further both groups' involvement in determining how, when, and where powerful new tools and techniques could be applied to the "human problems" of the age.

ENUNCIATION OF THE PROBLEMS

As the specter of disaster has loomed larger and larger, those responsible for the well-being of the citizenry have hastened to re-examine the problems facing the United States. In some instances the problem may be relatively straightforward, but in others its elements may be so subtle and interrelated that a belief in its simplicity is deceiving.

In looking at the environmental quality situation, Representative Emilio Q. Daddario of Connecticut notes that science often may be applied in a direct way, and reminds his listeners that:

The environment is used simultaneously for raw materials, recreation, agriculture, esthetic enjoyment, and waste disposal. Economic indicators are insufficient to evaluate quantitatively all of the uses of the landscape. Management of the environment depends on legal, institutional, and political aspects as well as technologic and economic feasibility.

Defining the problem, communicating it to all involved, helping to lay out jurisdictional boundaries—both for government and the private sector—and marshaling the resources necessary to come to grips with the problem are the direct responsibility of the federal government, State, county, city, and sometimes regional managers will be affected, and may have to carry the burden of organizing the actual thrust against the problem. How well the efforts of the various governmental echelons mesh and are effective depends on such facets as the persuasiveness of key individuals, the language of the law, the inducements (e.g., tax benefits) to encourage change, the measure of trauma prompting citizen groups to exert pressure, and the willingness of these grass-roots elements to bear an increased tax load.

Establishing a perspective on a problem as complex as crime is not easy. Representative Brock Adams of Washington underscores certain things which still are not known, as well as those which have been identified:

We cannot yet identify that crucial element which transforms the law-abiding man into a violent criminal in our central cities. We

know the criminal statistically. We can put a profile on his age, his family background, and his economic status. We can in fact pile up a portfolio of data on the chronic offender. But we cannot identify that catalytic agent which turned him to crime in the first place.

While the essence of third problem may be captured in a brief phrase, such as providing "a decent home and a suitable living environment for every American family," its translation into tangible components for subsequent action is more complex. Senator Charles H. Percy of Illinois recognizes that even the most cursory analysis of the national housing problem reveals such tough subproblems as homeownership, rental assistance, creation of new towns, public housing, urban renewal, mortgage financing, and the role to be played by the new National Housing Partnership.

Of course no problem in the urban context really stands alone. The regional coordinator, state planner, or city manager who might attempt to neatly isolate a problem may find himself caught up in a maelstrom of unprecedented capriciousness and severity. Most certainly the implementation of "urban planning" is replete with pitfalls for the unwary and the inflexible. Representative William A. Steiger of Wisconsin believes that the complexity of the problem requires a dual approach:

In the first instance we are concerned with achieving greater rationality in the delivery of public services. In a very real sense we might characterize such programs as remedial or compensatory. . . . Our second concern is more properly characterized as focusing on the evolutionary development of the city. In this area we are not only concerned with better services, but with the development of new goods and services within the city and with basic changes in social, economic, and political activities and institutions.

Since nearly two thirds of all Americans live in metropolitan areas, and since this tremendous concentration of human beings has occurred largely in the past quarter-century, the creation of new governmental entities at the local level to cope with the urban condition was hurried and haphazard. Thousands of special districts have been formed to maintain or improve transportation, water supply, solid-waste disposal, education, and other services. Expediency has led to jurisdictional squabbling, chaotic communications, and frequent impasses which prevent corrective action. In *Building the American City*, a report of the National Commission on Urban Problems, it is pointed out that our metropolitan areas were served in 1967 by 20,745 local governments! What this means when we project a coordinated approach to a multijurisdictional problem can be imagined.

OF POLICIES AND DREAMS

An acceptable grand design for the plight of our urban areas has yet to be announced. A reflection of the thinking of Daniel P. Moynihan, Assistant to the President for Urban Affairs, indicates that such a "national urban policy" is being worked on. The demands of the people, many of whom seek identity as groups as well as individuals, are sustained and intense. It must be recognized that "the 'crisis of the cities' arises from the interaction of these intense new demands and the relative inability of the urban social system to respond to them." He goes on to say that "the issue arises as to whether the demands of the time are not to be met in terms of policy, as well as program." The consensus of the participants in the congressional seminars was that such a step was imperative—that government must perform the soul searching which could lead to a meaningful national policy.

The formulation of a national policy is

more difficult than many think. When we consider a policy which would provide an optimum environmental quality level, for example, we learn that some people have in mind the condition which existed in pre-Columbian days. At the other extreme is the group which opines that man can adjust to his changing environment, and that its deterioration is not a matter for serious concern. President Nixon has determined that useful advice in this problem area should be forthcoming at two levels: from the Environmental Quality Council (at the cabinet echelon) and from the Citizen's Advisory Council on the Environment. It may be anticipated that a national policy for environmental control will follow these steps as enunciated by the President:

First, we should recognize that some problems—like air and water pollution—spill over traditional political boundaries. We must now begin to perfect and expand regional and federal approaches to controlling pollution. At President Eisenhower's urging, the basic federal air pollution law was enacted in 1955, and the Water Pollution Control Act followed in 1956.

Second, we need to accelerate the development of more effective and less expensive pollution control devices. The same technology which caused our pollution problems can correct them.

Third, we need to develop more objective standards for measuring air and water pollution. Our research efforts in this vital effort must be strengthened.

Fourth, we have to develop and implement effective and fair enforcement procedures. The widespread application of proven control devices can reduce pollution sharply, and we must improve our capability for identifying and fixing the responsibility for pollution.

Fifth, to eliminate expensive bureaucratic confusion, duplication, and red tape, we should give careful consideration to the transfer of all related pollution control programs now administered by other federal agencies to the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration. We need to match advances in technology with advances in government.

Sixth, the federal government must set the example by eliminating, as soon as possible, all pollution from federal facilities. The federal government must practice what it advocates.

The expression of a policy may be stipulated in specifics, as illustrated above, or it may take the form, in concept, of a rallying cry. President Johnson, in his March 9, 1966, message to the Congress, stressed the commonality of challenge and responsibility:

The problems of crime bring us together. Even as we join in common action, we know there can be no instant victory. Ancient evils do not yield to easy conquest. We cannot limit our efforts to enemies we can see. We must, with equal resolve, seek out new knowledge, new techniques, and new understanding.

The question may be asked: how can a practical national policy be forged out of an abstract comprehension of a given problem? What mechanism will help us achieve that degree of understanding which will allow the creation of a national policy? In the area of crime, the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice was formed. The report of that commission led to further action in both the executive and legislative branches.

The importance of understanding the many ramifications of the national policy on housing was seen by Senator Percy and Howard R. Moskof who had served as the Executive Director of the President's Committee on Urban Housing. It was noted that the committee's assignment—a reflection of a policy-in-being and a policy yet to reach inception—was to:

. . . harness the productive power of America—which has proved it can master space and create unmatched abundance in the marketplace—to the most pressing unfulfilled need of our society. That need is to provide the basic necessities of a decent home and healthy surroundings for every American family now imprisoned in the squalor of the slums.

It quickly becomes apparent that within our democracy a favorite way of coping with a problem is to organize a committee or a council or a task force and "have a go at it." Considering the multitudinous aspects of urban planning and growth, and the numerous organizations already active in the field, it was not surprising that a National Committee on Urban Growth Policy should be formed. Represented on this committee were The National Association of Counties, The National League of Cities, The United States Conference of Mayors, and Urban America Inc. Unquestionably, the problems concomitant with urban growth transcend the competence of any one individual or single organization. The crux of this "Chinese puzzle" is described by Vice President Agnew in *The New City*:

To those responsible for urban planning and administration, the problems faced by American cities seem an unending chain of crises. Not only are suggested solutions few, but the general ability to think through the intricate maze of political, technical and geographic interrelationships is almost totally lacking. Often the most expert in one problem area find it impossible to compensate for difficulties totally alien to their field of expertise.

And so we are beginning to learn that while some of our dreams become policies, unfortunately some of our policies remain dreams. Our political system has been used to formulating policies in response to a given issue or priority crisis. All too seldom, however, has leadership in government—whether at a federal, state, or local level—generated an overall policy structure that is flexible enough to anticipate the major changes inherent in our present pattern of living.

AN AWAKENING TO THE ROLE OF TECHNOLOGY

While the ingenuity and production methods of American industry are well known, and often seem limitless in their potential, the full impact of technology on society has gained only *gradual* appreciation in many quarters. In particular, the role of systems technology—featuring operations research techniques, systems analysis, PERT/PEP applications, and the diverse uses of computers—is still unfamiliar to a large number of senior management personnel in government and the private sector.

In the last few years, Congress has had its attention forcibly focussed on the benefits and shortcomings of new tools and techniques. Committees in both chambers have come to grips with such pressing civil sector problems as transportation, crime, environmental pollution, urban redevelopment, housing, health services, and education. Individual members of Congress have immersed themselves in studying some of these problems, and are contributing to this seminar series in the belief that bridges must be built between "the analytical community" and the practical politicians.

Indicative of the importance attached to innovative methodology and devices as aids in curing urban ills was the commissioning of a special report by the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. A series of hearings was held from 1965 to 1967 by a special subcommittee on the Utilization of Scientific Manpower, exploring the adaptability of aerospace technology to nondefense problems. Senator Gaylord Nelson of Wisconsin, chairman of the subcommittee, then had the Science Policy Research Division of the Legis-

lative Reference Service at the Library of Congress prepare a milestone study entitled "Systems Technology Applied to Social and Community Problems." In presenting this report to Congress, Senator Nelson iterated his belief that:

The systems approach is no substitute for the political commitment to devote the resources necessary to meet our domestic crisis. But the systems approach already is of decisive help in isolating solvable problems and working out paths to their solution.

Committee activity has concentrated in two broad areas. The planning-programming-budgeting activities which found their genesis in industry have been adopted and refined within the federal framework. The second involved looking at discrete problem-centered developmental activities, which in many cases would cut across governmental lines and include private sector elements. The quartet of subjects selected for exposition in this congressional seminar series has been explored fully—but doubtless will receive future attention—through the media of hearings, seminars, and colloquia.

Legislation has been introduced which would allow the nation to identify, organize, and apply systems technology to the problems besetting our society. One legislative approach, conceived by Senator Hugh Scott of Pennsylvania and Representative F. Bradford Morse of Massachusetts, proposes the creation of a National Commission on Public Management, charged with providing:

... a study with respect to the utilization of systems analysis and management techniques in dealing with problems relating to unemployment, public welfare, education, and similar problems.

Taking a different tack (but one which its author later deemed to be complementary to the Scott-Morse bill) was Senator Nelson's Scientific Manpower Utilization Act, which stressed "... the utilization of the scientific, engineering, and technical resources of the nation" and provided for grants to the states or entering into agreements with universities and other institutions, to determine how systems tools and techniques should be used.

The range of applications for the "models" of the operations research specialist, or the man-machine communications techniques of the computer technologist, is virtually infinite. The orientation and education of congressmen, executive branch decision makers, and their nongovernmental counterparts often is a barely discernible process, but it is ongoing. Members of Congress are concerned with the regular publishing of a machine-stored listing of federal assistance programs; the use of automatic data processing and systems procedures to improve administration of the courts, through action instigated by the Federal Judicial Center, and the necessity of having an "intergovernmental information system" to service states and localities. Representative Daddario's Subcommittee on Science, Research, and Development suggested in its report:

To place pollution abatement on a comparable basis with other national technology programs, systems analysis and management capability should be established within the federal government. This approach should be used along with the "planning, programming, budgeting" technique to organize both near and long-term federal research and operational efforts in pollution abatement.

Congress has begun to perceive, and it now must alert the populace to its perception and concern. Only through a forceful, sustained program of public enlightenment can the federal government derive the support it must have to overcome these all-encompassing crises.

A PERIOD OF ADJUSTMENT

Out of the sessions of this novel forum, where legislators and technologists con-

fronted each other's *raison d'être* and the inescapable need for greater mutual effort, several realizations have emerged:

The esoteric viewpoints and jargon of the lawmaker and the systems analyst (or whatever title he professes) can be overcome and communication can be established.

The horizons of the hardened, and often defense-oriented, operations research analyst can and must be expanded to include social and community problems.

The doubts, and in many cases the cynicism based on experience of the congressman regarding "new ways," are not intractable. Indeed, he would wish to see great expectations fulfilled.

For the most part, the mechanisms for applying systems tools and techniques to our domestic problems have not been developed adequately. Experimentation and evaluation must take place. Government support of these activities is a *sine qua non*.

The responsibility for shaping the future must be shared by all elements in our society. Showing those groups and individuals how to contribute is the lot of Congress and its advisers from all walks of life.

We live in troubled times, and yet our record of inadequacy, tardiness, and incomprehension is not one to be ashamed of. People must adjust to change, and as they do, their institutions, laws, and mores will adapt to the new conditions. John Steinbeck, writing in *America and Americans*, spoke of the wonders of this land—of labor-saving machines, better preventive medicines, and new leisure—but cautioned about the calamity which had accompanied these good things:

We have the things and we have not had time to develop a way of thinking about them. We struggle with our lives in the present and our practices in the long and well-learned past. We have had a million years to get used to the idea of fire and only twenty to prepare ourselves for the productive-destructive tidal wave of atomic fission. We have more food than we can use and no way to distribute it. Our babies live and we have no work for their hands. We retire men and women at the age of their best service for no other reason than that we need their jobs for younger people... To repeat, we have not had time to learn inside ourselves the things that have happened to us.

As we possess a greater capacity to accomplish miracles of production, communication, and construction, the need for introspection, cognition, and perseverance in the face of adversity becomes undeniably apparent. These qualities exist in Americans. At no time in history will they be more critical to the survival of man.

Coping with the human problems of this nation, and the world, causes us to forge an urban control policy that will—and *must!*—be effective. We must harken to the words of President Nixon when he sounded the clarion call for united, responsive action:

If our cities are to be liveable for the next generation, we can delay no longer in launching new approaches to the problems that beset them, and to the tensions that tear them apart.

We have not seen the rebirth of a single major city. But we have seen proof of the failure of the old ways. These old ways are still the conditioned reflex of those whose policy approaches are rooted in the 1930's—the old ways of massive spending piled on massive spending, and of looking to Washington to solve the problems of every locality. In the ruins of Detroit and Watts and Newark lie the ruins of a philosophy of government that has outlived its origin and no longer speaks to its time.

With this concept firmly in mind, and guided by the ideas and actions of congressional leaders such as those who have contributed to this volume, the people of the United States will experience a renaissance of physical well-being, spirit, and hope.

THE END OF AN ERA

HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 6, 1971

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, the death of Hugo Lafayette Black, which followed almost immediately after his retirement from the Supreme Court of the United States, may in time come to be considered as the end of an era. It was 34 years ago, on August 17, 1937, that his colleagues in the other body confirmed his nomination to the highest tribunal in the land.

His appointment was the first of nine made by Franklin Delano Roosevelt during his last 8 years in the White House, one of them being the elevation of an Associate Justice to the position of Chief Justice. Roosevelt had been frustrated in his attempt to increase the size of the Court so as to provide a majority that would uphold the constitutionality of laws passed by a Congress in which his party enjoyed overwhelming majorities. Several major New Deal laws had been voided by the Justices whom his predecessors had appointed.

Some of the men appointed by Roosevelt and his successors did not limit themselves to passing on the constitutionality or unconstitutionality of laws, but arrogated unto themselves the right to make laws on their own. Instead of considering whether a law was in accordance with the Constitution as written and proceeding accordingly, they considered whether it harmonized with the Constitution as it ought to have been written.

Now that President Nixon has the opportunity to make two more appointments for a total of four, we hear suggestions that he should not make appointments consistent with his own political philosophy, which holds that a member of the Supreme Court should be a strict constructionist. These suggestions ought to be rejected outrightly.

From 1937, when Senator Black was named to the Court, until the present time, Democratic Presidents have made 17 appointments and their appointees have served a total of 207 years. Republican Presidents have made seven appointments and their appointees have served a total of 68 years, only a third as long as the Democratic appointees. A little balancing of the scales would be good for the country.

I am sure that many of my friends on the other side of the aisle will be pleased if the President names two strict constructionists. When laws passed by the Congress become the subject of litigation, the question before the court should not be: "Is this law conservative or liberal?", but: "Is this law constitutional or unconstitutional?" The question should not be: "Is this law in accordance with the Constitution as the Constitution ought to read?", but "Is this law in accordance with the Constitution as it does read?"

Hugo Lafayette Black's career was a remarkable example of the American success story. Born in poverty and apparently doomed to a life of obscurity and unrewarding toil, he nevertheless achieved a position of eminence.

I most emphatically disagreed with many of his decisions dealing with constitutional questions. Perhaps some of his opinions in that field were meritorious, and he may have functioned as a balance wheel on a court that for years seemed to lack more than a minimum of judicial restraint. If he kept his brethren from straying too far from judicial responsibility, may it be remembered to his credit.

CALENDAR OF THE SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION, OCTOBER 1971

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 6, 1971

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

CALENDAR OF THE SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION, OCTOBER 1971

SMITHSONIAN POST OFFICE OPENS

An original general store-post office, more than a century old, has been reconstructed as a working exhibit in the National Museum of History and Technology. It will be staffed by Postal Service personnel in period costume and will provide card and letter mail service for the public as well as philatelic services for collectors. The post office will have its own postmark, reading "The National Museum of History and Technology, Smithsonian Station."

The building, constructed during the early 1860's, housed the Headville, W. Va. post office and had remained unaltered in structure, inside and out, from its earliest days. The original counters, shelving, floor, windows, walls and ceilings were intact, as well as the shutters which had inscriptions written by the Civil War soldiers who were stationed in or passed through the area. After the postal activities were moved in 1914, the building continued to serve as the general store for several years. It was eventually closed with the non-perishable stock still on the shelves and as a result the Smithsonian exhibit includes high button shoes, tins of spices, patent medicines, slate pencils and poultry lice medicine.

The exhibit serves as a reminder of the part the postal service played in the growth and development of the United States. Historically, the most representative American post office has been the country store-post office.

Anacostia Neighborhood Museum, 2405 King Avenue, S.E.:

Science: Man's Greatest Adventure. Black scientists are honored with this exhibit, which covers achievements from the earliest times to the present and projects future roles. Through Nov. 7.

Arts and Industries Building, 900 Jefferson Drive, S.W. (Air and Space Museum):

Apollo 11 Artifacts. Command module Columbia, lunar module, space suits and many working tools and support material used in actual flight or in training. Also included are replicas of flag and plaques left on the moon by Apollo 11, 12 and 14 crews. On display indefinitely.

Freer Gallery of Art, 12th and Jefferson Drive, S.W.:

The Eugene and Agnes E. Meyer Memorial Exhibition. Chinese and Japanese objects including bronzes, archaic jades, stone sculpture, paintings and ceramics. On display indefinitely.

Museum of History and Technology, 14th and Constitution Ave., N.W.:

Thomas Nast. Self-portrait of political cartoonist Nast, with several of his cartoons. Hall of Historic Americans. On display indefinitely.

Museum of Natural History, 10th and Constitution Ave., N.W.:

Spiders. Photographs of spiders by Ann Moreton, live specimens and collected webs. Closing indefinite.

A Korean Village: Its Changing Culture. The rapidly changing lifestyle of the Korean people is shown by a comparison of old and contemporary objects. Closing indefinite.

National Collection of Fine Arts, 8th and G Streets, N.W.:

Boris Anisfeld; Twenty Years of Design for the Theater. Retrospective including watercolors, drawings, set and costume designs by Anisfeld, best known for his ballet and opera designs. Through November 7.

National Portrait Gallery, 8th and F Streets, N.W.:

Portraits of the American Stage: 1771-1971. Portraits in various media of personalities that have figured in the history of the performing arts in the United States. Also historic costumes, and other memorabilia. Through October 31.

HOURS

Smithsonian museums are open seven days a week from 10 a.m.-5:30 p.m. in the Museum of History and Technology, a cafeteria is open 11 a.m.-5 p.m.; and a snack bar, 10 a.m.-2 p.m.

National Zoo buildings are open weekdays 9 a.m.-4:30 p.m.; weekends, 9 a.m.-6 p.m. Beginning October 25, weekend hours will be 9 a.m.-4:30 p.m.

Anacostia Neighborhood Museum is open 10 a.m.-6 p.m. weekdays; 1-6 p.m. weekends.

RADIO SMITHSONIAN

Radio Smithsonian, a program of music and conversation growing out of the Institution's many activities, is broadcast every Sunday on WGMS-AM (570) and FM (103.5) from 9-9:30 p.m. The program schedule for October:

3rd—*The Gagliano Trio.* A Smithsonian concert featuring the Trio in C Minor by Beethoven, performed by Jacqueline Anderson, violin; Lane Anderson, cello; and Helen Hollis, piano.

10th—*A Visit with the Spider Lady.* Mrs. Ann Moreton tells how you can learn to love spiders; *What Does a Microlepidopterist Do?* an interview with Dr. Gates Clarke, Senior Entomologist at the National Museum of Natural History.

17th—*Street, Blues and Gospel Music of Washington, D.C.* Experts from a concert presented at the Smithsonian.

24th—*You and Your Teeth,* with Dr. Lucille St. Hoyme, Curator of Physical Anthropology; *The Center for Short-Lived Phenomena,* explained by Robert Citron, Director.

31st—*Can They Survive?* a report on endangered species of wildlife and the efforts being made to protect them.

The program is also heard in the Washington area on WAMU-FM (88.5) Tuesdays at 1:30 p.m.; WETA-FM (90.9), Mondays at 9:30 p.m.; and in New York City on WNYC-AM Sundays at 10 p.m., and FM Mondays at 9 p.m.

Tom Sawyer, an original production designed, constructed and performed by Allan Stevens and Company, which has created 15 new puppets and a multi-media setting for this adaptation of the Mark Twain classic. The show is presented by the Smithsonian Institution's Division of Performing Arts as the first in a series written specifically for the Smithsonian which will be representative of different facets of Americana. Performances are at 10:30 a.m. and 12:30 p.m. Wednesday through Friday; 10:30 a.m., 12:30 and 2:30 p.m., Saturday, Sunday and holidays including Oct. 11 and Oct. 25 in the History and

Technology Building auditorium. Admission: \$1 children; \$1.50 adults; 75 cents group rate per person for 20 or more. For advance sales call 381-5395.

Mailing list requests and changes of address should be sent to the Smithsonian Calendar, 107 Smithsonian Institution Bldg., Washington, D.C. 20560. When applicable, please include old calendar label.

MUSEUM TOURS

Tours for school or adult groups may be arranged for the following museums:

Freer Gallery of Art—381-5344.

National Portrait Gallery—381-6347.

National Collection of Fine Arts—381-6305.

National Zoological Park—332-9322.

Weekend tours and school tours for other museums are scheduled to begin mid-October. Reservations are currently being accepted. Call 381-6471; 5304.

FOREIGN STUDY TOURS

For members of the National and Resident Associates. All 1971 tours are full. For further details on 1972 tours, listed below, write to Miss Kennedy, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C. 20560.

Mexico and Guatemala: Jan. 3-22. A visit to the historic sites including Yucatan, Oaxaca, Mexico City, Tikal, Antigua.

St. Croix and Puerto Rico: Feb. 1-14. A study of early Danish and Spanish architectural heritages.

Australia and New Zealand: Late March-April. Via Fiji and return via Tahiti, with visits to Canberra, the Australian Outback, and Christchurch.

No-Tour Tour: Dulles-Paris-Dulles. May 29-June 19. Air France Excursion. Members make their own arrangements for travel in Europe.

Greece and Yugoslavia: June 15-July 8. Classical tour of Greek archeological sites plus Yugoslavia's Adriatic Coast and inland sites. Romanian churches and other areas may be included.

No-Tour Tour: New York-Frankfurt-New York. July 3-24. Qantas Excursion. Members make their own arrangements for travel in Europe.

King Arthur's England: July 12-Aug. 2. An archeological, architectural and literary adventure. Directed by Mrs. Helen Hill Miller, author of *Realms of Arthur.*

The Pilgrimage Road: Sept. 11-Oct. 9, traversing Burgundy, southwestern France and northern Spain, the route of the medieval pilgrims to Santiago de Compostela.

No-Tour Tour: Dulles-London-Dulles. Sept. 11-Oct. 2, BOAC Excursion. Members make their own arrangements for travel in the British Isles.

Pakistan and Afghanistan: Oct. 7-Nov. 5. Overnight stops en route in London and Paris; motoring through the provinces of Pakistan; tour will be joined by local scholars at the sites.

OCTOBER AT THE SMITHSONIAN

October 1

Folk Sampler: Sampling of music from the diverse talents of members of the Folklore Society of Greater Washington, 8:30 p.m., History and Technology Building auditorium. Sponsored by the Division of Performing Arts and the Folklore Society of Greater Washington. \$1 FSGW members; \$2 non-members. For reservations call 381-5395.

October 2

Bach Concert: *Concentus Musicus Vienna.* 8:30 p.m., Natural History Building auditorium. Tickets \$4; for information call 381-5157. Sponsored by the Division of Musical Instruments and the Smithsonian Associates.

October 3

Workshop: With the *Concentus Musicus Vienna*, 3 p.m., Hall of Musical Instruments, Museum of History and Technology. Free; for information call 381-5010.

October 4

Italian Baroque Concert: *Concentus Musicus Vienna*, 8:30 p.m., Natural History Building auditorium. Tickets \$4, for information call 381-5157.

October 6

Free Film Theatre: *Einstein and Fermi*—biographical films. Einstein's friends tell of his loneliness and isolation and of his contribution to "a new Universe"; Fermi's life is traced from childhood in Italy to his contribution in the first controlled nuclear reaction, 12:10 and 1:10 p.m., Natural History Building auditorium.

Exhibition: *Lee Gatch (1902-1968)*. Thirty of Gatch's works from stylized abstraction to collages of stone, canvas, and paint. National Collection of Fine Arts, through November 29.

October 7

Free Film Theatre: *Einstein and Fermi*—biographical films. Repeat. See October 6 for details.

The Graphic Art of Felix Vallotton. Woodcuts and other graphics by this Swiss artist, who contributed to the revival of the woodcut as an artistic expression. Organized by the Smithsonian Traveling Exhibition Service with the cooperation of Maxime Vallotton; sponsored by the Ambassador of Switzerland. University of Maryland Art Gallery, through Oct. 17.

October 8

Folk Concert: *Country Music and Old Time Fiddling*, 8:30 p.m., History and Technology Building auditorium. Sponsored by the Smithsonian Division of Performing Arts and the Folklore Society of Greater Washington. FSGW members, Free; non-members, \$1. For reservations call 381-5395.

The Proposition: A completely improvised show—people, places, situations, music and lyrics are created spontaneously by the actors and musicians, built on audience suggestions, phrases, psychological problems, political issues or public personalities. No two shows are alike. Sponsored by the Division of Performing Arts and the Smithsonian Associates, 8:30 p.m., Natural History Building auditorium. Tickets: \$5 general public; \$4 Resident Associates. For reservations call 381-5395.

October 9

The proposition: Repeat. See October 8 for details.

The Proposition Circus: An improvised review for children using music, games and stories to interpret their suggestion. 1:30 and 3:30 p.m., Natural History Building auditorium. Sponsored by the Division of Performing Arts and the Smithsonian Associates. General public: \$2 children, \$3 adults with children; Resident Associates: \$1.50 children, \$2.50 adults with children. For reservations call 381-5395.

October 11

Lecture/Film: *Wildlife of Southern and Eastern Africa*, by Dr. Donald H. Messersmith, professor of entomology, University of Maryland. The program is based on tours of Africa during which Dr. Messersmith photographed wildlife and collected exotic specimens of insects, some of which will also be on display. Sponsored by the Audubon Naturalist Society. 5:15 and 8:30 p.m., Natural History Building auditorium. Free.

October 12

Lecture: *Shiba Kokan, an Uncommon Man*, by Professor Calvin French, University of Michigan. Dr. French discusses the activities of Shiba Kokan, an 18th century Japanese artist and colorful forerunner of modern Japan. First in the 19th annual series illustrated lectures sponsored by the Freer Gallery of Art. 8:30 p.m., Freer Gallery. Free.

October 13

Free Film Theatre: *Images Medieval*. Miniature paintings and illuminated manuscripts of the 14th and 15th centuries and musical background of original medieval melodies reflect life in the Middle Ages; *Vivaldi's Venice*. The beauty and poetry of Venice portrayed through the photography of Carlo Baragnoli, accompanied by Vivaldi concerti. 12:10 and 1:10 p.m., Natural History Building auditorium.

Informal Concert: *Music from Woodlawn*. Works by J. C. Bach and Haydn, performed by Jean Hakes, soprano; Robert Sheldon, flute and John Fesperman, harpsichord and piano. 1:30 p.m., Hall of Musical Instruments, History and Technology Building. Free.

October 14

Creative Screen: *Permutations*—Computer/graphics create a diversity of abstract graphic forms; *Printmaking: Four Artists, Four Media*—Techniques in silkscreen, woodcut, lithograph and intaglio are demonstrated. Continuous half-hour showings 11 a.m. to 2 p.m. *The Look of a Lithographer*—Techniques used by well-known artists and printers. One showing 2:30 p.m., National Collection of Fine Arts. Free.

Free Film Theatre: *Images Medieval: Vivaldi's Venice*. Repeat. See October 13 for details.

October 15

Film: *Canny—The Life of a Wild Coyote*. Gerald L. Coward's photography, in the Puente Hills of California, offers a significant contribution to the understanding of coyote behavior. Sponsored by the National Parks and Conservation Association. 8 p.m., Natural History Building auditorium. Free.

October 16

Printmaking Day: *Demonstrations* of silkscreen, woodcut, etching and lithography by John C. Sirica, NCFCA artist-in-residence, and other local printmakers. NCFCA Education Department's Print Workshop. *Tours* of NCFCA print collection, print study room and workshop begin in the Granite Gallery. 11 a.m. to 3 p.m., National Collection of Fine Arts. Free.

Creative Screen: *Permutations; Printmaking: Four Artists, Four Media; The Look of a Lithographer*. Repeat. See October 14 for details.

October 18

Botany Seminar. *Ethnobotany of the Cuna Indians in Panama*, by Dr. J. A. Duke, ARS-USDA. 6 p.m., Natural History Building Room WW531. Free.

October 19

Illustrated Lecture: *Designs on the Postage Stamp*, by Stuart Rose, Design Director of the British Postal Service. Sponsored by the Smithsonian Associates and the Division of Postal History. 8:30 p.m. History and Technology Building auditorium. Free.

October 20

Free Film Theatre: *Fra Angelico at San Marco*. The convent in Florence where the artist lived and painted is shown now as the Fra Angelico Museum; *Michelangelo: The Medici Chapel*. Analysis of the gigantic marble figures by Michelangelo in the New Sacristy of San Lorenzo; *Florentine Workshop of the Pietre Dure*. The process of the workshop, active 1558 to the present, in creating objects of marble and semi-precious stones. 12:10 and 1:10 p.m., Natural History Building auditorium.

October 21

Free Film Theatre: *Fra Angelico at San Marco; Michelangelo: The Medici Chapel; Florentine Workshop of the Pietre Dure*. Repeat. See October 20.

October 27

Free Film Theatre: *The Rise and Fall of the Great Lakes*. A hilarious but pointed ecology lesson; *Teamwork on the Potomac*. A source of comprehensive new ideas in conservation with visits to several river-bank plants. 12:10 and 1:10 p.m. Natural History Building auditorium.

Informal Concert: *Howard Bass*, lute and guitar. Works of Dowland, Byrd, Manén and Poncé. 1:30 p.m., Hall of Musical Instruments. History and Technology Building. Free.

October 28

Creative Screen: *A Trip to the Moon (1902)*. Produced by French pioneer filmmaker George Méliès, this was the first film to portray a possible voyage of a manned rocket; *Echoes, A Voyage to the Moon (1970)*. National Geographic film by John Lavery using still photos to convey the sensation of motion and weightlessness in space. Continuous half-hour showings from 11 a.m. last showing at 2:30 p.m. National Collection of Fine Arts.

Free Film Theatre: *The Rise and Fall of the Great Lakes; Teamwork on the Potomac*. Repeat. See Oct. 27.

October 30

Lecture: *Lee Gatch and His Contemporaries: Abstract Expressionism in the 40's*. Dr. Ben Summerford, Chairman, Department of Fine Arts, American University. 3 p.m., Lecture Hall, National Collection of Fine Arts. Free.

Creative Screen: *A Trip to the Moon (1902); Echoes, A Voyage to the Moon (1970)*. Repeat. See October 28 for details.

Dial-A-Museum—737-8811 for daily announcements on new exhibits and special events.

Dial-A-Phenomenon—737-8855 for weekly announcements on stars, planets and worldwide occurrences of short-lived natural phenomena.

DEMONSTRATIONS

Museum of History and Technology

Musical Instruments, from the Smithsonian's collection. Monday, Wednesday, Friday, 3 p.m., Hall of Musical Instruments, 3rd floor.

Music Machines—American Style. Mechanical and electronic music machines. Monday, Tuesday, Thursday and Sunday, 1:30 p.m., 2nd floor.

Spinning and Weaving. Tuesday, 10:30 a.m.—12:30 p.m.; Wednesday through Friday, 10:30 a.m.—12:30 p.m. and 1:30-3:30 p.m.

The Smithsonian Monthly Calendar of Events is prepared by the Office of Public Affairs. Editor: Lilas Wiltshire. *Deadline for entries in the November Calendar*: October 5.

FREE FILM THEATRE

A potpourri of films has been scheduled by the Women's Committee of the Smithsonian Associates. The programs will be presented through December in the auditorium of the Natural History Building at 12:10 and 1:10 p.m. each Wednesday and repeated the following day. The schedule for October is listed in this Calendar.

CLASSES AND WORKSHOP

(Sponsored by the Smithsonian Associates) (By Subscription Only—Call 381-5157)

Fall Classes begin October 4 for adults and children.

Adults (10 weekly sessions): Oct. 4—*Design, Ancient Peruvian Art; Basic Photography*.

Oct. 5—*Medical Technology; Etching; Stitchery I; Stitchery II*.

Oct. 6—*French Cinema (began Sept. 15); History in American Art; Fabric Construction Workshop; Fabric Design I; Fabric Design II; Intermediate Photography*.

Oct. 7—*Anthropology of Greater Washing-*

ton; Gemology; Design in Enamel I; Design in Enamel II; Stitchery I; Basic Photography; Advanced Photography Workshop.

Oct. 8—Basic Film Making; Darkroom Workshop.

Oct. 9—Ecology; Teenage Photography. Young People (8 weekly sessions):

Art, Botany, Magic of Sound, Mammal Laboratory, Architectural Workshop, Atoms and Molecules, Ecology of Marine Life, Embryology, Sculptural Design, Systematics of Mammals, Trip to the Moon (and Back).

Workshops for adults and young people. Adults:

Oct. 15—Leatherwork, by John Carter. Oct. 16—Leatherwork.

Oct. 29.—Raku, by Martin Amt, Anthony and Trew Bennett.

Oct. 30—Raku. Young People:

Oct. 17—Printmaking, by Harold Isen. Oct. 31—Nonloom Weaving, by Thurid Clark.

U.S.A. AND THE SOVIET MYTH

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 6, 1971

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, although in the area of foreign policy much of our attention has been focused on events and developments in Asia, the Middle East, and Western Europe, the changes and frictions taking place in Eastern Europe, including the major part of the Soviet Union, have even far greater meaning and significance for our national security in the future. Lest we forget, the power center of the dominant threat to our Nation resides in the Soviet Union itself. The multiple drives of Soviet Russian imperio-colonialism are meeting with increasing resistance by non-Russian nationalism within the Soviet Union, not to speak of counterforces in other areas of Eastern Europe.

For an appreciative understanding of the glaring vulnerabilities of Moscow, the current work "U.S.A. and the Soviet Myth" is, as one commentary puts it, "highly recommended." Authored by Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, of Georgetown University, the book provides background insights, and perspectives that are not generally found in analyses pertaining to U.S.S.R.-U.S.A. relations. In addition to the numerous reviews of this book, the following commentaries in Freedom's Facts, a publication of the All-American Conference to Combat Communism, in the selection of the book by the Anti-Communist Book Club in Washington, and in a KACE radio editorial in southern California should be of considerable interest to concerned Americans:

U.S.A. AND THE SOVIET MYTH

Is the Soviet Union invincible? Must America give in bit by bit until Communists triumph all over the world? Are the only American alternatives capitulation or conflict?

Not so, says Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, of Georgetown University, in his exciting new book, "USA and The Soviet Myth" published by Devin-Adair.

The Soviets are vulnerable, says this world renowned authority on the Soviet world. Their greatest vulnerability is the strong nationalist sentiment of non-Russians held captive in the Communist Empire. This book points one practical way to peace without world war. It's highly recommended.

U.S.A. AND THE SOVIET MYTH

(By Lev E. Dobriansky)

"In this struggle for keeps . . . the only alternative to victory over Soviet Russian imperio-colonialism is disastrous defeat for ourselves. The historical dynamics of our time disallow any middle ground."

Here, in a penetrating analysis of America's foremost adversary, Dr. Dobriansky gives expert data which explains the dangers of our current policy of "peaceful coexistence" with our enemy.

The author shows how many American leaders have ignored the imminent danger to U.S. security. His chapters deal with such issues as—

- "The Russian Problem"
- "Seeing Russia in Toto"
- "The ABCs on Russia and the USSR"
- "U.S. Illusions on the Captive Nations"
- "The Russian Trade Trap"

Dr. Dobriansky pointedly demonstrates that today's Soviet government has never stopped following Czarist ideas of expansion. The Russians have thrust westward into Europe, eastward to the Pacific and south to the Middle East, Africa and even South America.

The United States and Russia are on a collision course today because only a powerful America is capable of stopping the Kremlin conspirators from carrying out their designs of world-wide empire.

There is nothing new about the Russian urge for domination over others. Even in the 12th and 13th centuries, the Duchy of Moscow (originally founded by invading Vikings from Scandinavia) began conquering and absorbing neighboring states.

Russian expansion itself started long ago with attacks on Lithuania and other Baltic states. Today 1/6 of the total area of the globe is under direct Russian control and the Russian empire straddles the globe from the Baltic to the Sea of Japan.

Unlike the United States, an association of freedom-loving peoples, Russia has long been a despotic dictatorship dominated by a relatively small number of Russians who rule over Rutherians, Ukrainians, Estonians, Latvians, Georgians, and more than 100 other separate nationalities which are captives of the Red Empire.

Dobriansky pays special attention to the role of these Captive Nations. He effectively argues for freeing the Captive Nations including The Ukraine—as a key to dismantling the Russian Empire.

These peoples and lands cannot be compared with American states such as Pennsylvania and Wyoming, because they are truly conquered nations. Some of these nations, including The Ukraine, regained a brief independence following World War I—until they were once again forcibly annexed into the Soviet Russian Empire.

Dr. Dobriansky makes an ironclad case for the fact that Soviet Russia's empire building and imperial ambitions are an implacable foe of the U.S.A. He points out the absolute necessity for a policy towards the Soviet Union based on realistic facts rather than wishful State Department thinking. He further points out that if America could work for the independence of the Captive Nations of the USSR, the Russian colossus might eventually be brought to its knees. As Dobriansky explains, these non-Russian nations in the USSR are of crucial, strategic importance in the overall patterns of power distribution in the world.

This is a disturbing book. But it is one that had to be written. For the first time, it points out why the Russians, no matter how friendly they may try to appear are determined to eliminate the United States as an obstacle on their path to world domination.

KACE EDITORIAL

Here is today's KACE editorial. What can we do about today's greatest menace to the United States . . . the Soviet Union. Nu-

merous solutions have been offered, most of them unfortunately along the lines of compromise, arguments about live and let live . . . as though the Kremlin will permit us to do that . . . and so on. One offering the most commonsense analysis and solution to the problem is Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, a brilliant writer and analyst who is of Ukrainian origin, Professor of Economics at Georgetown University, Director of the Institute on Comparative Political and Economic Systems of Georgetown, a lecturer before the Naval War College and other armed forces institutions, and author of numerous articles and books on East Europe as well as author of the Captive Nations Week resolution, and president of the Ukrainian Congress Committee.

Dr. Dobriansky propounds his solution in his newest book entitled, the U.S.A. and the Soviet Myth. The Soviet myth he says is the common belief held widely in this country that the Soviet Union is a powerful nation of Russians. He says we have failed to recognize the real enemy, which he describes as a Soviet Russian "imperio-colonialism." Dr. Dobriansky points out that the Kremlin finds it useful to wear a mask of communism and to espouse what we label as "Marxist propaganda" when in actual fact they pursue the path of world empire, blocked only by the powerful United States. To that end, they foster illusions voiced by at least two United States presidents, that the U.S.S.R. is a nation of "two hundred million Russians" . . . according to another recent United States president: "The common interest of the peoples of Russia and the United States are many . . . and this I say to the people of the Soviet Union: 'There is no American interests in conflict with the Soviet peoples anywhere'".

Dr. Dobriansky adds: "Whoever wrote this for the president should have been fired. Too much is at stake to tolerate such gross incompetence."

There are not two hundred million Russians in the universe, much less in Russia. Actually there are 120 million non-Russians peoples in the U.S.S.R., and most of these non-Russians want out, among them are the Ukrainians, the White Luthenians, the Georgians and other non-Russian nations held captive in the Red Empire. Dr. Dobriansky offers two solutions: One, a positive political trade policy which he calls "pol-trade," in which we offer to trade with our communist "friends" only in exchange for political concessions, and secondly, the dismemberment of the Soviet Union. He does not advocate war . . . and never has . . . no sensible man would do so in this atomic age.

Moreover the methods of encouraging non-Russian peoples to struggle for independence are numerous, and trade is one of them. Once the non-Russians within the Soviet Union achieve their independence, then we can discuss a European and an Asiatic Federation of free nations.

Dr. Dobriansky's book U.S.A. and the Soviet Myth is a welcome contribution to this subject. It should be must reading for every policymaker in Washington.

Any responsible views opposing those expressed in this editorial are welcome.

HON. JAMES S. GOLDEN, SR.

SPEECH OF

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 6, 1971

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, the State of Kentucky lost a fine leader with the passing of the late Honorable James S. Golden, Sr., who represented the people of the Fifth Congressional District here for 6 years. Jim

Golden left a distinguished law career to serve in the House of Representatives. His service here was an extension of that outstanding record. He worked hard for rural development and compiled an outstanding record. He was a congenial man of integrity and honor—a true gentleman. These attributions earned him many friends here in the House. I join in expressing our sympathy to his bereaved ones.

MEADOWLANDS SPORTS COMPLEX

HON. HENRY HELSTOSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 6, 1971

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, as the Representative from the congressional district where a proposed Meadowlands sports complex is to be located, I feel it my duty to register the strong opposition to this project reflected by many of my constituents. Plans call for vast construction, including a football stadium, a racetrack, a baseball park, and an indoor coliseum. The New Jersey Sports and Exposition Authority, circumventing the State constitution through the enabling legislation, is currently undergoing judicial review. It deleted the constitutional requirement that a referendum be held on the racetrack. As a result, many of my constituents in the immediate vicinity of the site will not be given the opportunity to voice their reactions to the plans. Second, my constituents reflect a serious concern about the environmental impact of this proposal which will add additional problems to this densely populated area.

Under the new legislation, the Sports and Exposition Authority, created last May 10, would build the complex, issuing bonds to defray the construction costs. Betting taxes from the racetrack would pay the bondholders. However, the New Jersey constitution prohibits the use of tax revenues to support private enterprises. Were this to be permitted, the State has little to gain from this questionable venture: Although the State usually earns a 9-percent return from racetrack revenue, it will only get one-half of 1 percent from the Meadowlands track because the bulk of the revenue will be used to pay bondholders. In addition, property taxpayers will suffer, as many potentially lucrative tax ratables will be preempted.

In my view, two articles by Alex Michelini, which appeared in the New York Daily News on September 28 and 29, effectively describe the issues raised by the sports complex. The articles, entitled "The Giant Game Plan for the Meadowlands" and "Meadows Project is a Gamble on a Racetrack," appear below:

THE GIANT GAME PLAN FOR THE MEADOWLANDS
(By Alex Michelini)

The furor over the future of the Yankees—and Yankee Stadium—has swung public attention away from what triggered the debate in the first place: the decision by the football Giants to move to a promised sports complex in the New Jersey Meadowlands. This

week, however, the ambitious land development will be back in the news when it meets its first serious challenges in the Jersey courts. How did the Meadowlands scheme really get started? Who were the men who pushed it through the Legislature? Who stands to benefit if it succeeds? These and other searching questions are answered by The News in a two-part series starting below.

Joe McCrane loves football. Back in the late 1940s, Joe played football at West Point. In 1963, Joe tried to buy the Philadelphia Eagles. It didn't work out, however, because another football buff by the name of Jerry Wolman showed just as much fondness for the game and a lot more cash.

But Joe McCrane never stopped trying.

On a frigid, windy January afternoon last year when William Thomas Cahill was inaugurated governor of New Jersey, McCrane became state treasurer, and took his seat at the right hand of the governor, his long-time friend and political ally. In a little more than a year, McCrane achieved in government what he couldn't do in private life. He finally got a football team. He got the Giants.

"It's Joe McCrane Day," beamed Cahill on Aug. 26, as he watched the signing of the contract that will bring the football Giants to the Hackensack Meadowlands no later than 1975, and maybe as early as 1973. For it was McCrane, more than anyone else, who has masterminded one of the biggest coups in sports history.

GLITTERING GEMS

His instrument was the New Jersey Sports and Exposition Authority, born only last May 10. It was created by the Legislature with the express purpose of turning 750 acres of marshes into a mammoth sporting complex.

On the drawing boards, Giant Stadium is the hub of the complex, the center jewel of a sports crown bedecked with other glittering gems—a racetrack, a baseball stadium, a coliseum for basketball and hockey, and even an aquarium.

Even more important than making New Jersey No. 1 on the sports pages, Cahill sees in the ambitious plan a greater purpose. It will serve, he says, as the "catalyst" for development of the entire meadowlands, 19,600 acres of soggy earth overlapping 14 communities, an expanse larger than the island of Manhattan and a territory considered to be "the most valuable undeveloped real estate in the world."

This Thursday the scheme faces a major legal hurdle. Superior Court Judge Morris Pashman will hear a package of law suits challenging the constitutionality of the Sports Authority. Judging by past performance, Joe McCrane is apt to glide smoothly over this latest obstacle.

However, let's go back to the beginning of McCrane's dream—to Feb. 12, 1970, in fact. On that day, Lincoln's Birthday, most New Jersey officials were on holiday.

But Joe McCrane was working. He hustled to New York for an appointment with Wellington Mara, owner of the Giants. Several hours later, he had what he wanted: encouragement from Mara. The Giants were ready to move if the deal was right.

Immediately, McCrane, together with Cahill, legislative leaders and an old sports pro named David (Sonny) Werblin went to work and by March 29 of this year, the blueprint was ready for the State Legislature.

PAY THEM OFF

Under the legislation, the New Jersey Sports and Exposition Authority would build the complex. It would cost somewhere between \$150 million and \$200 million. The authority would issue bonds to pay for the construction, and then use the betting taxes from the racetrack to pay them off. While the state normally gets 9 percent of the revenue from racetracks, it would put only one-half of one percent into the treasury, and use the rest to pay bondholders.

What about the law requiring a referendum on racetracks? The legislation creating the authority would delete the requirement, and it would also dictate to the State Racing Commission the number of dates for the new track—100 days for harness racing and 56 for thoroughbred racing. It had to be that way, McCrane and his strategists figured, because of the lesson of Secaucus, where in 1967 the voters went to the polls and scratched a plan for a harness track.

Sen. Fairleigh S. Dickinson (R.-Bergen) was among the early dissenters. He became so angered over the elimination of a referendum on the racetrack that he erased his name from the list of sponsors. "I don't see any compelling reason to push this bill through when the difference in waiting for a referendum amounts to about six weeks," said Dickinson.

On the exclusion of Civil Service jobs in the proposed sports complex, the state's Civil Service Association declared: "Of all the barefaced, unashamed steals in behalf of the restoration of the century-long discredited political spoils system, this is about the worst in New Jersey's history."

On the use of betting taxes to pay off the bonds, Alfred Porro, an attorney handling the current suits against the authority, said it for all of them: "It's illegal. It violates the constitution of New Jersey because you can't use tax revenue to support private enterprises."

The legislative opposition, however, never really got off the ground.

For the 120 members of the Legislature, 1971 is an election year, and the idea of getting the Giants to move to New Jersey appealed to not a few of them. "Everybody wanted to get behind the bill," said Sen. Frank X. McDermott, (R.-Union). "You know, everybody wants to be in favor of motherhood."

Acting with a speed rarely seen in the old statehouse, the Assembly approved the authority bill on Apr. 26. The Senate gave its okay May 3. Cahill signed it into law May 10. Passage was so swift that the New Jersey State Chamber of Commerce never had time to draw up a position on the plan.

The blueprint for Giant Stadium is impressive. Consisting of three separate levels, the stadium will accommodate 75,000 to 80,000 fans in deep-cushioned, theater-type seats.

Outside, there will be parking space for 25,000 cars. According to the authority, the stadium will be 14 minutes from the Verrazano Bridge. A network of approved highways will carry cars and buses to the site, with a rail link a possibility in the future.

For McCrane, 44, the creation of the authority was his biggest success. In his private life, he had managed Garden State Racetrack, owned by his father-in-law, Eugene Mori. He had headed the law firm of McAndrews and Forbes, and he had served as chief fund-raiser in Cahill's winning gubernatorial election. But McCrane still didn't have the Giants. There was the matter of a lease.

President Nixon's old law firm, Mudge, Rose, Guthrie & Alexander, was enlisted to help draw up the lease.

And the negotiations were strictly private. Asked if he had seen the lease, one Senator remarked: "Not at all. We weren't privy to it. It was handled by McCrane."

The result is a 30-year pact, under which the authority will receive 15 percent of the gate receipts plus 50 percent of the concessions. According to McCrane, the authority should come out with an estimated \$1 million a year. But he could offer no estimate on how much the authority would have to shell out to keep up its end of the agreement after the stadium is built.

Clearly, the authority gave what it had to give in order to make the pie sweet enough for the Giants to bite.

For one thing, the lease stipulates that if the team moves into the meadows before

1974, the expiration of its lease at Yankee Stadium, it will receive "an appropriate" reduction in rent to offset the rent it must pay at Yankee Stadium. And, if the meadows stadium is not ready for occupancy in 1975, the Giants may extend their Yankee Stadium lease and receive a rent reduction from New Jersey to underwrite the extension.

A WORD FROM LINCOLN

While the two will go 50-50 on many of the concessions, the Giants will keep all the proceeds from programs, souvenir books and year books. And they'll get half of the revenue from most of the stadium advertising; 25 percent of the parking lot revenue; all revenue from stadium club membership fees, and all of the radio and TV take.

Literally, all the Giants will have to do is show up to play football.

The authority will be responsible for hiring—and paying—ushers, ticket sellers and takers, maintenance, repair and cleanup personnel and security guards. And it will also be responsible for paying for the materials that go into keeping a field and stadium in shape.

Almost comically, the lease adds, that the authority will not be responsible for providing or paying for "football officials, players, training or coach personnel."

When you walk into McCrane's Trenton office, a stack of leaflets containing a quote from Abraham Lincoln sits on his desk. When you leave, Joe hands you one of them. On it is written: "I do the very best I know how, the very best I can and I mean to keep doing so till the end; and if the end brings me out all right, what is said against me won't amount to anything."

Maybe so. But some people are raising some serious questions about McCrane's cherished project.

MEADOWS PROJECT IS A GAMBLE ON A RACETRACK

(By Alex Michelini)

The ambitious master plan for a sports kingdom in the Jersey meadows includes, apart from a new home for the football Giants, a racetrack—and it is a vital aspect. Reason: the fledgling New Jersey Sports and Exposition Authority will use betting revenue from the track to finance construction of the whole sports complex. Indeed, the track was the key from the start, although nobody ever told Robert Baumann about it.

Baumann is a self-made millionaire from Oceanside, N.Y. He played a little pro football for the Pittsburgh Steelers back in 1945, but he accumulated his wealth from busing kids to schools on Long Island. In 1969, Baumann had a dream. He wanted to build a \$30 million harness track in the meadows of Carlstadt, N.J.

The State Racing Commission, however, scratched his bid because of "insufficient financial backing." Baumann applied again in 1970, and although he produced new support willing to shell out \$22 million, he was rebuffed again on financial grounds.

The second rejection came on Sept. 24, 1970. What Baumann didn't know was that his dream already had run out of the money at least as far back as Feb. 10, 1970, for it was then that Joe McCrane, the state treasurer and brains behind the meadows scheme, was shuttling to and from New York convincing the Giants to take a one-way ride to Jersey. And since McCrane's strategy centered around a racetrack to finance a stadium, Baumann's bid clearly was doomed from the start—along with \$200,000 Baumann spent to organize his venture.

Furthermore, the Hackensack Meadows Development Commission, a state agency which regulates what can and cannot be built in the meadows, had dealt the Baumann plan a staggering blow by labeling it "incompatible" with the plans for the meadows. Curiously, it was later to give its

full support to the proposal that would establish the sports complex track only a few miles from Baumann's Carlstadt site.

NOT A BONANZA

Under the Baumann proposal, it was estimated that New Jersey would receive \$11.3 million a year in betting taxes. In addition nearly \$3 million would be paid annually for supplies and services, another \$20 million would be generated for the area's economy, and countless thousands would be paid in property taxes.

The state can expect no such bonanza under the plan for the authority-operated track. In an interview, McCrane conceded that the state will receive less revenue for the general state fund which finances education, housing and other services. But he insisted that it will get more "over the long run." What he was saying, of course, is that the state should realize more revenue after the bonds financing the sports palace are paid off, and that could mean 40 years, or longer.

Phillip H. Iselin, president of the Monmouth Park Jockey Club, is among those who believe the state is going to wind up a loser.

Here's some of his reasoning:

The tracks (Monmouth, Garden State Park, Atlantic City Raceway and Freehold Raceway) are not exactly knocking 'em dead in attendance, and consequently in handle.

The state's revenue from the existing racetracks—9% of the handle—amounts to about \$37 million a year. It will be reduced, however, because the proposed new state track will cut into the attendance of the others, thus shrinking the tax share to the state. The new track cannot overcome the expected losses either, because only one-half of 1% will be funneled into the general revenue fund. The rest of the 9% goes for subsidizing the sports complex.

"We believe," concluded Iselin, "that the new racetrack will do irreparable economic harm to other tracks."

Groundbreaking for the complex could come as early as the spring, but there are a lot of big "ifs" to consider. There is the financing to be worked out. There is the package of lawsuits seeking to knock out the authority. And there is the question of who really owns the site, something the courts will ultimately have to settle.

The state claims ownership of about half of the acreage by virtue of riparian right, a legal hook which gives it all land which was or is washed by tidal water. Even if upheld on this score, the authority would still have to condemn the half the state doesn't own, and that means spending millions.

Sixty owners claim a piece of the tract. It is assessed for \$7.7 million. In addition, buildings and other improvements are assessed at \$5.8 million. Some feel the site is too valuable to be used for the sports complex, since the authority will not pay property taxes but an amount, considerably lower, in lieu of taxes.

State Sen. Fairleigh S. Dickinson, (R-Bergen), is among the critics. He favors a section of the meadows in Kearney because the East Rutherford location represents a high potential for more valuable ratables. Actually, the Kearny location, mostly undeveloped acreage, was prominently pinpointed as the place for the stadium when the land use plan for the meadows was released in 1969.

Figures by the Kearny tax assessor's office show that acreage there is assessed between \$5,000 and \$30,000, while in East Rutherford the figure is between \$50,000 and \$60,000. Supporters of the Kearny site also point to the proximity to the new interchange 15W of the New Jersey Turnpike and rail lines of PATH, the Penn Central and the Erie Lackawanna.

McCrane, however, said the authority surveyed six sites in the meadows, and found the East Rutherford spot the most feasible.

Soil stability is better, he says, and improvements planned on area highways "will be more than adequate to handle the maximum requirements" of the sports complex.

WHO WILL PROFIT?

The signing of the lease with the Giants was cause for jubilation by landowners around—but not actually part of—the complex site. One realtor bubbled that land value in the vicinity probably will zoom up to nearly \$90,000 an acre. Who will profit?

Well, more than 3,000 parties claim pieces of varying size in the vast, 19,600-acre meadowlands. The biggest chunk, 750 acres in North Bergen and Secaucus, is owned by McCrane's father-in-law, Eugene Mori, together with Mrs. Joan Galbreath Phillips, daughter of millionaire developer John W. Galbreath.

Mori, 75, who controls the Garden State track and Hialeah in Florida, has owned the land for more than a dozen years under the corporate name of Cromakill Realty. It is situated about two miles east of the proposed sports complex. The section in Secaucus had been selected for a racetrack in 1967, a venture that included in its complexities none other than Hudson County political boss John V. Kenny, but while the racing commission and county voters approved the plan, the home folk in Secaucus turned it down.

Six days after the lease signing last month, the Mori-Galbreath combine unveiled plans before the meadowlands commission for a \$50 million residential-business-commercial development to be known as "Metro Meadows." But since then, a Mori associate insisted privately that Mori has no intention of building the complex, and instead plans to sell the tract to United States Steel. Mori, the associate confided, already has a contract with the giant steelmaker.

George Hess, a spokesman for U.S. Steel in New York, says he knows of no contract, but he confirmed that the company has "looked at the property, but we've done nothing with reference to any development plans." He added that "many problems would have to be resolved before we'd even consider" the project.

TRACE OF IRRITATION

McCrane sees no conflict of interest in his role as prime mover of the sports complex and his kin's real estate ventures. "People who want to believe evil are going to believe evil," he says, with a trace of irritation. "What should I have done, married an Italian shoemaker's daughter?"

Whatever the effect of the sports complex on surrounding real estate, one thing is sure; simply financing the complex itself is apt to be a complicated and expensive affair.

The estimated price tag on the entire complex is \$150 million to \$200 million. And the interest rate of the bonds will run one to two percentages higher than municipal bonds, because the authority will not have the benefit of the state's credit or "pledge of faith" behind them.

"They're going to pay through the nose," says investment executive George J. Haney of A. G. Edwards & Sons, Inc., Clifton, N.J.

But Elliot Friedman, president of J. B. Hanauer Co., East Orange, N.J., the state's oldest and largest investment firm, says he sees no difficulty in marketing the bonds.

Friedman, who has been talking with the authority about the financing and expects to play a role in the bonding plans, cited two major reasons for his optimism. First, he says New Jersey governmental agencies, including the Turnpike Authority and the Garden State Parkway, have established "excellent credit reputations throughout the country." And second, the complex is a glamorous issue which should be much sought after.

"Who doesn't want to own a piece of the Giants?" he asks.

McCrane hedges on the bonding question.

He said that if the bond market is too high, the authority may turn to temporary financing, that is utilize bond anticipation notes which are taken out for periods of a year or so.

Whatever the course, it all must await the showdown on the lawsuits set for tomorrow in Bergen County Superior Court, Hackensack where Joe McCrane will find out if his touchdown in landing the Giants will stand or if it will be nullified by a legal penalty.

TAX INCENTIVE FOR MORE JOBS

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 6, 1971

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago I entered into the RECORD for my colleagues' study a proposal for a tax credit aimed at giving employers an incentive to hire people, rather than an incentive to hire machines as in the case with the investment tax credit.

I am today introducing into the House a bill which would provide such an employment incentive. I am including here a copy of the bill and an explanation of it. I invite my colleagues to consider the bill carefully and to see it in the light of the paper by Professors Roberts and Thunen which I put into the RECORD on October 1, 1971, on page 34584.

The bill I have introduced is very close to the bill introduced in the Senate by Senator JACOB JAVITS and 12 others. The principle difference in the two bills is that my bill contains the \$25,000 limit on the full tax credit, whereas the Javits bill contains no limit:

THE EMPLOYMENT TAX CREDIT BILL

A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a tax credit for the expansion of employment

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) subpart A of part IV of subchapter A of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to credits against tax) is amended by renumbering section 40 as 41 and by inserting immediately after section 39 the following new section:

"Sec. 40. Expansion of employment.

"(a) General Rule.—For purposes of encouraging the expansion of employment, there shall be allowed to a taxpayer as a credit against the tax imposed by this chapter an amount determined by multiplying 4 dollars by the number obtained by subtracting the total number of man-days worked by all of his employees during the base period from the number of man-days worked by all of his employees during the current taxable year.

"(b) Limitation Based on Amount of Tax.—Notwithstanding subsection (a), the credit allowed by this section for the taxable year shall not exceed—

"(1) so much of the liability for tax as does not exceed \$25,000, plus

"(2) 50 percent of so much of the liability for tax as exceeds \$25,000.

For purposes of this subsection, the liability for tax for the taxable year shall be the tax imposed by this chapter for the taxable year, reduced by the sum of the credits allowed under section 33 (relating to foreign tax credit), section 35 (relating

to partially tax exempt interest), section 37 (relating to retirement income), and section 38 (relating to investment in certain depreciable property).

"(c) Definitions.—

"(1) Base period.—As used in this section, the term 'base period' means the taxable year immediately preceding the current taxable year.

"(2) Man-days.—As used in this section, the term 'man-day' means a calendar day on which at least 7 hours of work is performed by one employee; except that, in the case of employees working less than 7 hours per day, each 8 hours worked by one or more such employees shall be counted as one man-day.

"(d) Special Rules.—

"(1) New businesses.—A taxpayer who had no employees during the base period, or who was not engaged in business during the full base period, shall determine the credit allowable to him under subsection (a) in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate.

"(2) Merger consolidations, etc.—Whenever a taxpayer increases the total number of man-days worked by his employees during the taxable year by purchasing or otherwise acquiring the business operations of another taxpayer, he shall adjust his base period in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate in order to determine the credit allowable to him under subsection (a) for that and subsequent taxable years.

"(3) Minimum pay.—No credit shall be allowed under this section for any man-day worked by any employee unless such employee was paid for his work during such man-day at a rate not less than the minimum rate of pay then prescribed under section 6(a)(1) of the Fair Labor Standards Act.

"(e) Regulations.—The Secretary or his delegate is authorized to prescribe such regulations as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section."

(b) The table of sections for such subpart is amended by striking out "Sec. 40. Overpayments of tax." and inserting in lieu thereof:

"Sec. 40. Expansion of employment.

"Sec. 41. Overpayments of tax."

(c) The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1971, and before December 31, 1972.

Let me, at this point, offer an analysis and explanation of the bill. This legislation would create a new section of the Internal Revenue Code, entitled "Expansion of Employment." The purpose of the bill is to encourage employers to expand their job opportunities. This is done by offering the employer a tax credit of \$4 for every day of full-time work by employees who are net additions to that employer's labor force of the previous year.

The bill limits the amount of the full credit to \$25,000. Over that amount the employer would be entitled to half of the normal credit.

I am well aware, Mr. Speaker, that many people will raise the issue of the amount of funds lost to the U.S. Treasury by this measure. I answer this criticism by pointing out that the Treasury will indeed lose money through the tax credit—when someone leaves the welfare or unemployment rolls and starts collecting a paycheck, and paying taxes. I am confident that the reduced drain on the unemployment rolls and the increase

in tax-paying wage earners will easily offset the amount of tax credit involved.

In order to qualify for a tax credit under this bill, Mr. Speaker, an employer must be able to show an expansion of employment over the previous year. A credit cannot be earned by firing a man in December and rehiring him in January. The credit applies only to net additions of employment.

A "man-day" is the unit of measure against which the credit is applied. The bill defines a man-day as 7 hours of work performed by one man or 8 hours performed by two or more persons. The bill allows credit for an employer who wishes to take additional workers on a part-time basis.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, let me say that the enactment of the investment tax credit as recommended by the distinguished members of the Committee on Ways and Means does not preclude favorable action on an employment tax credit. Indeed, the enactment of the latter may provide the insurance that the investment tax credit will be used for the purchase of new machines for new employees to operate, rather than for the purchase of machines that put more people out of work.

MORE ON THE PRAYER AMENDMENT

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 6, 1971

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, opposition to the proposed constitutional amendment regarding prayer in public buildings continues to grow as evidenced by the following editorial which appeared in the September 24 issue of the Washington Daily News:

THE PRAYER AMENDMENT

Congress should reject as unwise the latest proposal to bring religious ritual back into the public schools.

Over the objections of its own Judiciary Committee, the House has agreed to vote Nov. 8 on a constitutional amendment permitting "nondenominational prayer"—whatever that is—in schools and other public buildings.

This is the same amendment the late Sen. Everett McKinley Dirksen championed without success in the 1960s. And it has no more merit now than it had then.

The Supreme Court ruled in 1962 and 1963 that neither the recitation of prayer nor the required reading of Bible passages has any place in the nation's public schools.

Such ceremony is a clear violation of the separation of church and state and, in many cases, a ritual that tends to degrade religion rather than glorify it.

The prayer amendment is opposed by many churches as a government intrusion into the religious affairs of the people.

Yet the amendment seems to have a good chance of passing the House, and at least a fair chance of getting the necessary two-thirds approval in the Senate.

This would be an appropriate time for Congress to put an end to such controversy—once and for all—and turn its attention to more urgent public business.

AGRIBUSINESS THREATENS
FAMILY FARM

HON. DAVID R. OBEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 6, 1971

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, for the past 3 days the Washington Post has run an excellent series of articles by Nick Kotz on the threat corporate agriculture poses to this country.

I say to this country, Mr. Speaker, because if conglomerates are allowed to force farmers off their land, and the "family farm" is eliminated, every citizen—urban and rural—will be affected. Our cities will become more crowded, our rural areas will become ghost towns, our food will cost more and, as Mr. Kotz pointed out, it may even be less nutritious and tasteless.

Some States have attempted to control the corporate takeover of agriculture by legislating in this area. Others should do so. No doubt the Congress should look into this also. In any event, Mr. Kotz has performed a public service by pointing out so well the problems facing the family farmer today:

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 3, 1971]
FARM-TO-MARKET CONTROL: CONGLOMERATES
RESHAPE FOOD SUPPLY
(By Nick Kotz)

The name "Tenneco" is not yet a household word to American consumers, but it weighs heavily on the minds of the nation's embattled farmers and of government officials who worry about the cost of food and the fate of rural America.

For Tenneco, Inc., the 34th largest U.S. corporation and fastest-growing conglomerate, has become a farmer.

Its new activities symbolize an agricultural revolution that may reshape beyond recognition the nation's food supply system. Dozens of the largest corporations with such unfamiliar names as Standard Oil, Kaiser Aluminum and Southern Pacific have diversified into agriculture.

What concerns farmers, processors and wholesalers is that the new breed of conglomerate farmers does not just grow crops or raise cattle. The corporate executives think in terms of "food supply systems," in which they own or control production, processing and marketing of food.

"Tenneco's goal in agriculture is integration from seedling to supermarket," the conglomerate reported to its stockholders. Its resources to achieve that goal include 1970 sales of \$2.5 billion, profits of \$324 million and assets of \$4.3 billion in such fields as oil production, shipbuilding and manufacturing.

The conglomerate invasion of agriculture comes at a time when millions of farmers and farm workers have already been displaced, contributing to the problems of rural wastelands and congested cities. More than 100,000 farmers a year are quitting the land, and more than 1.5 million of those who remain are earning less than poverty-level farm incomes. Their plight is severe.

Although the U.S. census still counts 2.9 million farmers, 50,000 grow one-third of the country's food supply and 200,000 produce more than one-half of all food. The concentration of production is especially pronounced in such crops as fruit, vegetables and cotton.

In 1965, 3,400 cotton growers accounted for 34 per cent of sales, 2,500 fruit growers had 46 per cent of sales and 1,600 vegetable growers had 61 per cent of the market.

The medium to large-size "family farms"—annual sales of \$20,000 to \$500,000—survived earlier industrial and scientific revolutions in agriculture. They now face a financial revolution in which traditional functions of the food supply system are being reshuffled, combined and coordinated by corporate giants.

"Farming is moving with full speed toward becoming part of an integrated market-production system," says Eric Thor, an outspoken farm economist and director of the Agriculture Department's Farmer Cooperative Service. "This system, once it is developed, will be the same as industrialized systems in other U.S. industries."

Efforts to bar large corporations from farming have come too late, says Thor: "The battle for bigness in the food industry was fought and settled 35 years ago—chain stores versus 'Ma and Pa stores.'"

* * * question is whether large-scale industrial food systems provide cheaper food for consumers. Corporate takeover of the poultry industry did result in lower consumer prices. But for numerous food products, corporate farming has not lowered grocery costs, because the price of raw food materials is not a significant factor in determining final retail prices. For example, the cost of a food container is sometimes more than the farmer receives for the food packaged in it.

The new corporate farmers account for only 7 per cent of total food production, but they have made significant inroads in certain areas. Twenty large corporations now control poultry production. A dozen oil companies have invested in cattle feeding, helping shift the balance of production from small Midwestern feed lots to 100,000-head lots in the High Plains of Texas. Just three corporations—United Brands, Purex and Bud Antle, a company partly owned by Dow Chemical—dominate California lettuce production. The family farmer still rules supreme only in growing corn, wheat and other grains, and even here constantly larger acreage, machinery, credit and higher prices are needed for the family farmer to stay profitable in business.

Tenneco hopes that its new brand name, "Sun Giant," will one day become for fresh fruits and vegetables what "Del Monte" now means for canned foods. It hopes housewives will pay premium prices to buy its nationally advertised specially packaged fresh produce.

Tenneco, which started out as Tennessee Gas Transmission Co., says it made "giant strides" in 1970 toward its agriculture goals.

Resources rapidly accumulated by the giant conglomerate include: Kern County Land Co., which controls 1.8 million acres of land in California and other states; J. I. Case Co., a manufacturer of farm machinery; Packaging Corp. of America, which makes food containers; Tenneco Chemicals, a producer of pesticides, and Heggblade-Margoleas, the nation's largest processor-marketer of fresh fruits and vegetables.

Even the largest independent California farmers question how they can compete with a corporation which can, at least in theory, own or control virtually every phase of a food supply system. Tenneco can plant its own vast acreage. It can plow those fields with its own tractors, which can be fueled with its own oil. It can spray its crops with its own pesticides and utilize its own food additives. It then can process its food products in its own plants, package them in its own containers and distribute them to grocery stores through its own marketing system.

Financing the entire operation are the resources of a conglomerate with billions in assets, hundreds of millions in tax-free oil income and interests in banking and insurance companies. Tenneco, according to reports filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission, had 1969 gross income of \$464 million and taxable income of \$88.7 million.

Yet due to federal tax breaks, Tenneco not only paid no taxes on that income, but had a tax credit of \$13.3 million.

Tenneco officials—who don't want to be named—acknowledge they are building a vertically integrated food delivery system, but they deny any plans for coordinated use of the conglomerate's total resources. Each company must compete and earn a profit separately, they say. Nevertheless the Federal Trade Commission is actively scrutinizing the corporation's agricultural activities for possible antitrust violations.

Tenneco is reluctant to discuss details of its finances in agriculture, but available information indicates the scope of its present agricultural interests.

In 1970, Tenneco reported agricultural and land development sales of \$107 million and profits of \$22 million. It farmed 35,000 acres directly and 95,000 acres through 324 tenant farmers. It produced 2 million boxes of grapes, 1.5 million boxes of strawberries and large amounts of other fruits and vegetables. But that is only the beginning.

MARKETING FIRM

Heggblade-Margoleas, Tenneco's processing and marketing firm, sold its own products and those of about 2,000 other farmers. Heggblade-Margoleas is the nation's largest marketer of fresh fruits and vegetables and the world's largest marketer of table grapes. Its processing facilities include a new 8-acre plant and the world's largest date processing plant. Tenneco even has its own farm lobbyist in Washington.

Tenneco agricultural operations employ 1,100 full-time workers and 3,000 at the peak of harvest. Faced with a boycott of its other products, Tenneco last year signed a contract with Cesar Chavez's United Farm Workers Organizing Committee.

The 1970 contract signed with Tenneco and other grape growers raises basic wages to \$1.75 to \$1.80 an hour and provides a piece-work bonus that can add another \$1 an hour during harvest season. Before Chavez's union began its grape strike, wages averaged between \$1 and \$1.25 an hour. The contract also established a medical care fund, an economic development fund and safety precautions to protect workers from pesticide poisoning.

Tenneco's future plans include development of its Sun Giant brand produce and putting into production 30,000 newly irrigated acres.

FARMERS OVERPOWERED

The type of food system being put together by Tenneco and other conglomerates frustrates and frightens independent farmers. They see every element of the food business acquiring market power but themselves. On one side, they confront the buying power of giant food chains. Now they must compete with conglomerates that can take profits either from production, processing, or marketing. The individual farmer usually does not have such options. The giant competitors also benefit most from a variety of government subsidies on water, crops and income taxes.

Contrary to popular notion and most galling to the efficient, large, independent farmer, the corporate giants generally do not grow food cheaper than they do. Numerous USDA and university studies show that enormous acreage is not needed to farm efficiently.

For example, maximum cost-saving production efficiency is generally reached at about 1,500 acres for cotton, less than 1,000 acres for corn and wheat, and 110 acres for peaches. Thousands of independent family farmers possess such needed acreage, and farm it with the same machinery and techniques used by their new rivals.

In fact, studies show that the largest growers incur higher farm production costs

as they employ more workers and layers of administrators.

A full-scale economic battle between the conglomerates and independent farmers is now unfolding in the nation's single most important farm area, the rich central valleys of California, which far outdistances Iowa as the first-ranked state in farm sales. California farms grow 40 per cent of the nation's vegetables, fruits and nuts. The state produces at least 90 per cent of the country's supply of 15 crops and leads the nation in 25 others.

"If the Tenneco operation is allowed to go unchecked, it can change the whole complexion of farming in the valley," says Fresno attorney Donald Thuesen. "They have the marketing power to make or break the market. They can sell below cost, as a loss leader, to get other business, and sustain losses that no farmer can afford."

Thuesen represents a large grape grower who claims Tenneco forced him into bankruptcy by selling the grower's grapes below the market price. A former Tenneco tenant farmer makes similar claims involving the marketing of his potatoes. Tenneco denies these charges.

"Tenneco sells their produce first and you get what's left over," contends John Giacone, who grows cantaloupes in the San Joaquin Valley.

In an effort to market his own cantaloupes, Giacone built a plant to box and market his produce. But now he finds supermarket chains will not buy his cantaloupes unless he uses a different kind of container. The chains have changed their container specifications deciding that another kind of box is more convenient for their retail operations.

Remodeling his shed for the newly required packing process would cost \$500,000, says Giacone, and that "will take the family jewels and then some."

At a time when they are confronted with overproduction in numerous crops, California's independent farmers are distributed to see the conglomerates, with taxpayer's help, each bringing into production 5,000 to 100,000 newly irrigated areas.

A California state water project will irrigate 450,000 new acres for crops. A Ralph Nader task force calls the waterproof an unwarranted, \$1,000-an-acre "welfare scheme" for a few big landowners. Tenneco plans to grow fruits and vegetables on 30,000 of these areas. Other major beneficiaries include Southern Pacific, Standard Oil of California and Belridge Oil Co.

INEFFICIENT FARMING

"Belridge Oil Co. is spending \$185 million to develop 20,000 acres of fruit and vegetables," says Jack Bowen, a peach grower in Modesto. "They grew 640 acres of peaches last year just to see whether they wanted to grow them. If corporations like that get serious, we've had it. "We can produce more efficiently than these corporations but we may not be around long enough to prove it."

Bowen is not a small peach grower. A sign outside his spacious 350-acre orchard proudly proclaims "A Family Business for Four Generations." His annual sales exceed \$300,000. He replaced the jobs of several hundred non-union migrant workers with a giant machine, which clutches peach trees by their trunks, then shakes off the peaches into a conveyor and onto trucks.

As a practical matter, Bowen and other California peach growers have become too efficient for their own good. Faced with ruinous prices last year, they destroyed 40 per cent of their harvest.

"We only have 53,000 acres of peaches in production," says Ugo Caviani, president of the California Peach Canning Association. "One big corporate grower like Tenneco could wipe us all out."

Caviani says the number of California cling peach growers has declined from 2,200 to 1,700 in only three years, while the number of canners has dropped from 40 to 14.

The nation's fruit and vegetable growers are not strangers of the tough competition of agribusiness. For many years, they have wrestled with the market power of chain stores and major food processors. They sell to canners such as Del Monte, Libby-McNeil & Libby, Green Giant Co., H. J. Heinz Co. and Minute Maid Corp. (a subsidiary of Coca Cola). Each of these canners also competes with the independent farmer by growing large amounts of its own food supply.

But the new conglomerate represents a different kind of competition. The older agribusiness corporations are primarily food companies and must make money somewhere in the food distribution system. Such is not necessarily the case with the new conglomerate farmers, for whom millions of dollars of agribusiness investment may represent only a fraction of their total holdings. Only 4 per cent of Tenneco's sales are from agriculture.

In fact, the conglomerates may find their food investments profitable even without earning anything from them. The profits may come from land speculation, federal crop subsidies, or generous federal tax laws. Tenneco received almost \$1 million in 1970 cotton and sugar farm subsidies.

The new conglomerates utilize a variety of federal tax provisions that permit them to benefit from tax-loss farming and then profit again by taking capital gains from land sales. Tenneco, for example is now developing six new California suburban communities on former farm land.

Tenneco officials insist they are farming to make money, to serve the consumer quality products and to help strengthen American agriculture.

"LAND AS INVENTORY"

However, Simon Askin, Tenneco's executive vice president for agriculture and land development, recently told the Los Angeles Times: "We consider land as an inventory, but we're all for growing things on it while we wait for price appreciation or development. Agriculture pays the taxes plus a little."

The federal government has been hesitant to bring antitrust actions against conglomerates that move into farming. So farmers and corporations are watching closely a key test case that is developing in California's Salinas Valley, the lettuce and celery capital of the country.

The Federal Trade Commission has charged both United Brands, the 81st largest U.S. corporation, and Purex Corp., the 316th largest, with seeking to monopolize the production and supply of fresh vegetables.

The FTC is negotiating a settlement with Purex but the United Brands case is in federal court. The government charges that United Brands is transforming the lettuce and celery business from a competitive one of small, profitable, independent growers into a non-competitive industry dominated by large conglomerates. The FTC will seek to prove that United Brands cannot grow lettuce more cheaply and that it provides no price benefits to consumers.

In its reply to the FTC complaint, United Brands contends that the country needs large corporations in the farming business. United Brands, represented by President Nixon's former law firm, states:

"Although there may be some nostalgic desire to see a market composed of many small growers, that structure cannot survive against a market buyer (chain stores) that is composed of fewer and fewer companies with larger and larger market shares."

"SMALL FARMERS"

United Brands contends there is no economic justification for "a lettuce market composed of many small farmers who all are at the mercy of the buyers."

The FTC case illustrates dramatically the vastly different concepts by which industry and farmers measure bigness in agriculture.

Most of the "small farmers" referred to by United Brands, are by present farm standards, among the largest independent farmers in the country. Their annual sales range from more than \$100,000 to several million dollars.

Although admitting the increasing concentration of corporate power in fruit and vegetable production and the corporate takeover of poultry farming, USDA officials generally contend that this phenomenon will not spread to other farm products.

Many Midwestern cattle, hog and grain farmers disagree.

The fear that the cattle and hog feeding businesses, their best source of income, may follow the pattern in which independent poultry growers were wiped out.

About 20 corporations including Allied Mills, Ralston Purina and Pillsbury Co., originally went into poultry production as a means of developing markets for their feed. Farmers were signed up to grow the corporations' poultry, using their feed.

According to USDA studies, the poor but once independent poultry farmers are still poor as contract workers, earning about 54 cents an hour. A Ralph Nader task force on agriculture called this corporate farm system "poultry peonage."

The corporations, however, contend that they have benefited small farmers with a steady, if small, source of income. And, they say, they have given consumers lower priced chicken and turkey.

The farmer sees everyone he must deal with in the food production system acquiring more power except him. The supermarket chains, the grocery manufacturers and the new conglomerate farmers all have economic clout in the marketplace and political influence in Washington. Even migrant farm workers, still the lowest paid laborers in the country, have made some progress, signing contracts with the new conglomerate farmers, who are vulnerable to boycott of their brand products.

Only the individual farmer, with the exception of powerful cooperatives in a few crops, remains unorganized in the marketplace.

A battle to achieve market power now pits rival farm producer groups against each other, farmers against processors and farmers against migrant farm workers.

The battle has produced some strange new alliances and has strained old ones. It is now being fought with strikes and boycotts and in the halls of Congress.

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 4, 1971]

AGRIBUSINESS THREATENS FAMILY FARM (By Nick Kotz)

Thomas Jefferson: "Those who labor in the earth are the chosen people of God—his peculiar deposit for substantial and genuine virtue."

Joseph Weisshaar looks the part of Modern American Farmer, textbook version: educated at Iowa State, conservative in speech and manner, efficient in the latest technology, industrious as a businessman, proudly independent.

He is 39 years old and grossed more than \$100,000 last year selling hogs. He has presumably "made it." But in fact he is a troubled man, fearful that he and thousands of farmers like him in this country cannot survive the industrial and financial upheavals in American agriculture that have been brought about in recent years by the emergence of enormous "agribusiness" corporations.

So he has become a "militant" of sorts, a card-carrying member of the hell-raising National Farmers Organization which is using collective bargaining, law suits, strikes, boycotts, crop dumping and even occasional violence to win higher farm prices for its growing membership.

The NFO's ultimate goal is to protect the

"family farmers" of the world from forces over which they have minimal control—giant food chains, food manufacturers and conglomerates that are attempting to bring to agriculture the industrial bigness, efficiency and control that characterizes much of the American economy.

The threat to the "family farm," and the way of life it represents, is so strong that even the American Farm Bureau Federation, the nation's largest and most conservative farm organization shows symptoms of upheaval. In the past, the AFB has consistently and vigorously opposed federal intervention in the farm economy. But today it is swallowing its ideology and asking for federal laws to strengthen individual farmers in dealing with the new corporate forces in agriculture.

The stakes in this struggle between farmers like Weisshaar and the giant new farm corporations are immense:

Food is the nation's largest business with \$114 billion in annual retail sales. More than \$8 billion in annual farm exports keep the U.S. balance of trade from becoming an economic disaster. The question of who in agriculture is to share in this bounty and on what terms is at the root of the NFO's militance and the Farm Bureau's philosophical turnaround.

Will the family farm survive in the years ahead? Or will agriculture become—like steel, autos, and chemicals—an industrial dominated by giant conglomerate corporations such as Tenneco, whose operations were described in an article yesterday? In that case, the nation will have lost its prized Jeffersonian ideal, praised in myth and song, of the yeoman farmer as the backbone of America.

What will become of rural America if the greatest migration in history—40 million to the cities in 50 years—is further accelerated? Farmers have provided the economic base of the small towns and that base is becoming perilously small.

What will be the effect of a rural wasteland on the American political system? The power of all the farm lobby and the small towns, already in sharp decline, has traditionally provided a counterbalancing force to the politics of the big cities.

How will the nation's food supply be affected? Production efficiency of the family farmer and general affluence have made food a relative bargain in the United States. Can the conglomerates glance at unfavorable provide a steady, efficient supply of food?

FAMILY UNITS DOWN

On all these questions, the symptoms are not encouraging for the family farm system. A million farms are eliminated every 10 years and only 2.9 million remain.

The average farmer today is 58 years old—compared to a median age of 38 for all Americans in the work force. Young aspirants who would like to fill the retiring farmer's shoes can't get capital. And many who start farming soon quit, discouraged by low returns and mounting debts.

The contest between the family farmer and the conglomerates is, on the surface, incredibly unequal. There is Tenneco with its \$4.3 billion in assets and its ability to employ its own land, tractors, pesticides, oil, processing plants, and marketing system. On the other side, there is Joe Weisshaar trying to hold on. Weisshaar has not quit, but he is perplexed about what it takes to earn a decent living farming.

GOAL REACHED

After 10 years applying the lessons taught him at agriculture college, Weisshaar last year reached his personal goal—the magic circle of 50,000 farmers who sold at least \$100,000 worth of farm products and produced one-third of the nation's food.

It was not a happy experience.

"I figured I would have it made when I reached the \$100,000 mark." (in sales) says Weisshaar, 39, who farms 540 acres near Creston, Iowa, "but I ended up \$1,300 further in debt. It seems like the bigger you get, the harder you fall. You depend heavily on credit and with one bad year of hog prices you are in deep trouble."

The Weissshaars have taken only one vacation in 10 years. The family bought only one costly item last year, a new refrigerator. Mary Jane Weisshaar, an attractive college graduate and mother of three young children, paid for it by driving a corn-hauling truck in a job that begins at 5 a.m.

"All that talk in the cities about free time and recreation?" questions Weisshaar. "I wonder whether we farmers aren't subsidizing that recreation."

With his credit already stretched to meet operating expenses, including payments on expensive farm machinery, Weisshaar must farm leased land, rather than buying his own.

"The doctor and lawyer uptown are buying up the farm land as a tax write-off and a hedge against inflation," he complains. "When they get done with it, there is only one place it can go—to the farm corporations."

INVESTMENT IN YOUTH

"This country is going to wake up one day and discover that the price of food has doubled," says Weisshaar's banker, Charles Ehm, who worries that young men can't get a start in farming. "We decided to start out five young farmers a year—a good investment for the community. It's not working and it just tears my heart."

"The worst part of it is that they are not 'pool hall boys.' They work night and day. They are efficient, good farmers. I could name at least a half dozen who will sell out this winter, and they shouldn't have to."

Ehm says the family farm will soon disappear unless farmers get higher prices, and the government provides special financial credit for beginning farmers.

Weisshaar worries that Midwestern farming will be taken over by "vertically integrated" corporate farms, similar to ones that now dominate California agriculture.

While the Tennessees haven't yet moved into Iowa on the grand scale they have spread through California's central valleys, you can almost hear their footsteps.

Feed manufacturers, processors and other corporations already have taken over poultry production, and are now applying similar tactics to move in on hog and cattle feeding—the midwestern farmer's best source of income.

Ralston Purina Co., a leader in the corporate takeover of poultry, has made a pitch to Weisshaar, offering to finance his hog operation, if Weisshaar will buy the corporation's feed and grow its hogs on contract. Remembering what happened to the once independent poultry grower, Weisshaar doesn't want that kind of partner. He doubts the advertisements of Kleen-Lean, Inc., the Ralston Purina subsidiary, which beckon him with "Swine Leasing Will Work for You."

THE PROFITCHAIN

But Weisshaar is faced with a dilemma. If the processors and conglomerates gain control of hog and cattle feeding, then Midwestern family farmers will have to get all their income from growing corn, wheat, and soybeans. Farmers fear they cannot survive, if their only function is to provide grain for an integrated food system in which most profits are taken further up the food chain of animal feeding, processing, marketing and retail sales.

"It doesn't matter whether there are 500,000 of us left or 50,000," says the muscular but soft spoken Iowa farmer. "If we are powerless in the marketplace, we'll just keep on overproducing and killing each other off."

Out of this dilemma, the NFO arose and the Farm Bureau began rethinking its strategy. Farmers started turning up in unfamiliar places—with picket signs at packing plant gates, and with highway barricades seeking to bar farm products from going to market at low prices.

The NFO plan for saving the family farmer includes legislation prohibiting farming by large conglomerate corporations, closing loopholes that promote tax-loss farming by non-farmers, and providing easier financial credit for young farmers.

But the NFO has little confidence in getting help from a Congress in which the farm vote has shrunk into political insignificance.

Its basic strategy is to organize farmers into bargaining blocks of sufficient power to raise prices for their beef, hogs, grain, and other commodities. When buyers refuse to bargain or market prices get too low, the NFO tries to withhold commodities from the marketplace.

Weisshaar believes that an NFO-bargained contract with the John Morrell Co. will mean high prices this year for his hogs and better income to support his family.

"The NFO is the only hope we've got," he says. "We've got to block together our production and demand prices that will give us a decent living."

The Farm Bureau has called for relatively mild legislation that would require processors "to bargain in good faith" with farm groups representing a significant number of farmers. A three-man board, appointed by the President and approved by the Senate, would approve the farmer bargaining agents.

The Farm Bureau legislation, introduced by Rep. B. F. Sisk (D-Cal.), represents, at least in part, a response to the competition of the NFO.

BUSINESS BALKS

Several years ago the Farm Bureau organized voluntary bargaining associations, but learned to its surprise that its old friends and philosophical allies in agribusiness were not cooperative. Agribusiness corporations such as Campbell Soup Co., Green Giant Co., Del Monte Corp., and Pillsbury Co. flatly refused to sit down at the bargaining table.

Many Farm Bureau members suddenly looked at their prestigious organization in a different light. The Farm Bureau had built a \$4-billion empire selling life insurance and supplies to farmers. But what, asked farmers, had the Farm Bureau done for them?

So John Kuhfuss, Illinois farmer and Farm Bureau President, went to a House Agriculture Subcommittee to complain. Agribusiness will not bargain with the Farm Bureau, he said, but insists on buying from individual farmers on "a take-it-or-leave-it basis—a one-sided process that is getting more one-sided as changes continue to occur in American agriculture."

Still another approach to increased farmer power is taken by advocates of giant cooperatives, which already are powerful in the dairy industry and in California citrus. The coops believe farmers must compete by creating their own vertically integrated systems of production, processing and marketing.

The giant dairy coops also seek to win higher prices under government-approved marketing orders by exercising political muscle in campaign financing. The dairy coops already have poured \$170,000 into a 1972 Republican campaign chest for President Nixon's re-election.

"Agriculture is acting a great deal like the buggy whip industry acted at the turn of the century," says Eric Thor, director of the Agriculture Department's Farmers Cooperative Service and an advocate of giant, integrated coops. Instead of trying to reduce costs and sell cheaper buggy whips, says Thor, that

outmoded industry should have become a manufacturer of fan belts or air cleaners.

Similarly, Thor says "the family farm could disappear" unless farmers compete collectively as processors and marketers of food. He believes farmers are wasting time concentrating all their energy on production efficiency, at a time when food industry profits are controlled in food marketing.

COOPS BIG TOO

Some farmers complain, however, that the "super coops" have become just another kind of conglomerate giant from which they get few benefits. For example, Sunkist Growers, Inc., which dominates 80 per cent of California citrus, is a many-layered, pyramid-shaped corporation. Small growers are at the bottom. Contrary to general knowledge, the processors at the top of this "super coop" include major private corporations as well as farmer-owned processors. Critics contend that decisions are made and profits are taken at the top of the pyramid, with too little consideration paid to the economic interests of the small grower.

Iowa farmer Weisshaar is not eager to have his interests buried in such coops. "If I wanted to go into something like that," he says, "I would have gone into meat packing or the grocery business. I like being a farmer."

The various plans of farm groups to save the family farm face an uncertain future.

Their legislative and organizational prospects are seriously weakened by traditional divisions in their own ranks. The NFO is suspicious of the Farm Bureau and is itself distrusted as too "radical" by other farmers. The National Farmers Union, which represents midwestern grain producers, has its own legislative goals.

Other farmers, including cattlemen, fear that mandatory bargaining—a Farm Bureau proposal—will merely stimulate further vertical integration by the conglomerates. Faced with the prospects of collective bargaining, giant meat packers, canners and sugar refiners may respond by growing even more of their own raw food materials.

It is difficult to design legislation to meet the differing problems of Iowa corn producers or California fruit growers.

Furthermore, the agriculture committees of Congress are confronted with new conflicts of interest. In the past, these committees had little trouble satisfying both big farmers and corporate food processors.

The big farmer and conglomerate both benefitted from farm subsidy payments, a cheap labor supply, and foreign aid food programs.

But now the Senate and House Agriculture Committees are faced with difficult choices—resolving new conflicts between independent farmers and the corporations. Agribusiness, led by the National Canners Association, National Broiler Council, and the American Meat Institute strongly oppose bargaining legislation.

These committees give considerable weight—as do many economists—to the agribusiness argument that farm commodity prices are determined on a day-to-day basis in a highly competitive world market and that rigid bargaining legislation might well weaken the ability of American agriculture to compete in world trade.

They are concerned, too, about maintaining the vigorous competition that now exists among food processors who fight for position in retail stores and who seek to satisfy shifting consumer preferences that often are geared to price. Processors want to retain this pricing flexibility and fear the rigidities that could come from enforced bargaining.

MANY LOBBYISTS

In terms of effective political power, 200 Washington lobbyists representing the food industry are far more influential than farmer lobbyists. Food processors have plants scat-

tered all over urban America and can appeal to urban as well as rural Congressmen. For example, the Grocery Manufacturers of America maps out its legislative campaigns with charts showing the location of food plants in each congressional district.

"Most members of the Agriculture Committees wish this farm bargaining issue would just go away," says one agribusiness lobbyist. "Whatever they do, the politicians figure they will make one friend and six enemies."

The Nixon administration also feels and reflects the conflicting pressures from farmers and food manufacturers. The administration has tentatively supported the Farm Bureau bargaining bill. But a high administration source confides:

"The White House owes a political debt to the Farm Bureau, but we aren't very enthusiastic about this legislation. If you look at our proposed qualifying amendments, you'll see there really isn't much left."

The political disputes and maneuvering are still largely regarded by consumers, urban politicians, and the news media as intramural issues involving "the farm problems."

But the broadest issue involves the future shape of America and of its rural communities.

There is the strong, compelling desire in rural America to maintain the family farm and the small town.

Joe Weisshaar questions whether a way of life his family loves will be replaced by another industrialized system, administered by the forces of big labor and big industry.

And migrant farm workers struggling to organize, question whether society does not have some obligation to help the lowest-paid worker who is being replaced by machines.

WHY BIGNESS?

Creston banker Charley Ehm asks: "Why is this country so obsessed with bigness? Why can't a young fellow farm 300 acres and make a living? We need to replace the economists and corporate planners with someone who has a concern for human beings."

Even assuming that industrial agriculture can be more efficient. Don Paarlberg, the Agriculture Department's chief economist, says: "People are asking, whether in as affluent a country as the United States, efficiency should be the sole criterion for the form of agriculture we are going to have. We now supply ourselves with food—the best diet ever, anywhere, with 17 per cent of our income. How much is it worth to drive that percentage down to 15 or 12 or 10?"

"Should we sacrifice a form of agricultural production that has served us well, that has produced good people as well as good crops and livestock?"

Paarlberg had no answer for the question.

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 5, 1971]

U.S. POLICY HANDCUFFS SMALL FARMER

(By Nick Kotz)

Tereso Morales has struggled all his life at the bottom of the richest agricultural system in history. Since he was nine years old, he has stooped in fields from Oregon to Texas, harvesting wealth owned by big farmers, retail food chains, canners and now, by agribusiness conglomerates.

Morales, 35, is still breaking his back in the fields, but with new purpose. His mind is now fired with a dream at sharing in some of the richest of American agriculture. He has joined with 30 other migrant workers and small farmers to grow strawberries in Watsonville, Calif. He hopes to earn \$10,000 a year to raise his 11-member family in some place other than a labor camp or a big city slum.

The 31 families of Cooperativa Compesina in many ways symbolize the problems and aspirations of 13 million poor rural Americans. They are among the 1.5 million small farmers and more than one million migrants

who now work the land at far less than poverty-level incomes. They contribute to national statistics one-half of the nation's poverty and substandard housing.

The cooperative movement may give some of these people a way out of poverty. But the odds on their success are small.

They are competing—like the "family farmers" of the country—against powerful, efficient and aggressive "agribusiness" corporations that have moved into American agriculture on a large scale.

Morales and the other families of Cooperativa Compesina, for example, are competing in the California strawberry market with Tenneco, Inc., a \$4.3 billion conglomerate corporation, and with S. S. Pierce Co., which both grows and distributes its own brand of premium-priced foods.

They are competing, in a larger sense, with political forces that have shaped federal agricultural policies in ways that favor the largest and most efficient interests in agriculture.

For more than 35 years—to take the most obvious case in point—American industrial workers have been represented by powerful labor unions that have secured minimum wage legislation, unemployment compensation, child labor regulations, workmen's compensation for injuries on the job, collective bargaining right and so on. Farm workers, like Morales, generally enjoy none of these rights and benefits.

UNDERCUT BY GOVERNMENT

When the United Farm Workers Organizing Committee, led by Cesar Chavez, sought to achieve some of the same benefits, government responded by undercutting the movement with policies permitting employers to import cheap labor from Mexico and Puerto Rico. When Chavez and his union sought to gain bargaining rights with a retail boycott of grapes and lettuce, the Defense Department increased its purchases of grapes and lettuce.

At the same time, the government has continued its subsidies to large farm operations through the provision of low-cost irrigation water, the development of labor-displacing machinery and generous tax laws.

The U.S. Department of Agriculture, through various policies and actions, has discouraged the development of cooperatives for low-income farmers on grounds that the industrialization of agriculture and the elimination of stoop labor is in the interests of both country "Government," says James Hightower of the Agribusiness Accountability Project, a foundation-financed operation, "has provided socialism for agribusiness and free enterprise for the small farmer and farm worker."

The problems created in "rural America" by these policies have prompted politicians and residents to come up with new programs and new rhetoric to "save" the small towns and the small farms of the country. There have been, in recent years, "wars on poverty," "rural development" schemes and concept of "balanced national growth". But thus far, the powerful and impersonal forces of corporate agriculture have been the dominant factors in the changes sweeping the farm economy.

TREND REVERSES ABSENT

The measures that might reverse the trend—strong farm worker labor unions, generous subsidies to small cooperatives, the redistribution of land from corporate farmers to individual farm entrepreneurs—have not been undertaken.

What is happening in American agriculture—bigness concentration, and the efficiency these things produce—may be good or bad for the country in the long run. But the implications of these tendencies transcend the question of whether Tenneco, Inc., or Tereso Morales will harvest strawberries in California. These implications include the following:

The future shape of the American landscape. Already in this country 74 percent of the population lives on only 1 percent of the land. If present trends continue, only 12 percent of the American people will live in communities of less than 100,000 by the 21st century—60 percent will be living in four huge megalopolis and 28 percent will be in other large cities.

Rural life, already seriously undermined by the urban migration, will be further eroded. Today, 800,000 people a year are migrating from the country side to the cities. Between 1960 and 1970 more than half of our rural counties suffered population declines. One result is the aggravation of urban pathology—congestion, pollution, welfare problems, crime and the whole catalogue of central city ills.

The domination of what is left of rural America by agribusiness corporations is not only accelerating the migration patterns of recent decades but raises the spectre of a kind of 20th century agricultural feudalism in the culture that remains.

In response to this vision of the future, the federal government in the 1960s undertook limited measures to stimulate the survival of the small farm and the small towns of America. The antipoverty programs administered by the Office of Economic Opportunity touched the problem in certain ways.

A START THROUGH OEO

Tereso Morales, for example, learned to read and write in an adult education course sponsored by OEO for migrant workers. He learned, too, that he and other farm laborers might earn a living growing high-value fruits and vegetables. So he persuaded three of his OEO classmates to join him in putting up \$500 apiece to launch *Cooperativa Compesina*, with Morales as president.

Working from sunup to dark in the coop's 140-acre leased fields, Morales has little time or patience to talk with visitors about abstractions. He is laying several miles of irrigation pipe, and supervising the leveling of irrigation ditches. It is an exacting job. If the irrigation troughs vary by more than one inch in 100 feet, water may slop over and mildew the precious strawberries.

The dream or heartbreak at the end of this labor will come next year. If all goes well, each acre of strawberries should produce gross sales of about \$9,000. Then the cooperative will find out whether corporate competitors attempt to frustrate its marketing plans.

"In a good year I could earn \$5,000 as a migrant," relates Morales, "but that meant traveling for 12 solid months. It's very hard on the family. How are you going to do that and raise nine kids, send them to school, give them a chance? You can't keep running forever. I'm not moving anymore."

KEYED TO FAMILY

The coordination of cooperative farming is no easy matter, and has produced some failures. *Cooperativa Compesina* divides up land and profits on the basis of family size and family contributions to work. Its members so far are sticking together.

"We want to benefit our community and do all we can to exist," says Morales. "Our members are not afraid to work. With what we have to go back to, this looks pretty good."

The coop got its crop started with a \$100,000 loan from an OEO-funded consulting firm, and a \$150,000 loan from the Wells-Fargo bank. When local growers tried to block the loan a local Wells Fargo official reportedly told them: "You'll take your money out of the bank, but they'll burn the bank down. What am I supposed to do?"

Despite the indirect assistance from OEO, the federal government—and particularly the Agriculture Department—has done little to assist Morales' coop and similar ones that are being started by blacks in the South and whites in Appalachia.

TURNED DOWN BY FHA

The Farmers Home Administration turned down *Cooperativa Compesina's* request for a loan.

"The low-income farmer problem is not personally my cup of tea," says Homer Preston, deputy administrator of USDA's Farmer Cooperative Service. "Our conventional coops are not exactly enthusiastic about them. They don't have much to offer except labor and it is less important today. These people were cotton choppers."

"They're tied in with idealism and civil rights, and a lot of romanticism. The purpose of cooperatives is not to keep mass numbers in farming but to help those who remain. You can't go against market trends when everything else points to bigness."

Although the conventional co-ops were started by struggling farmers of yesteryear, they today essentially represent big business and seek farmer members who can invest in processing and marketing.

In the course of assisting "bigness," Preston says the FCS is helping merger negotiation between the country's two largest dairy "super co-ops," which between them, control about 40 per cent of the fluid milk supply.

When he came to Washington seeking management training assistance for 100 low-income southern co-ops, says Father A. J. McKnight, FCS advised him to seek help from a private foundation.

"The USDA programs have favored the big commercial farmers and have deliberately tried to eliminate the small family farm," said McKnight, referring to research sponsored by the Agriculture Department and land grant colleges.

At a time when poor Southerners are starting to earn a living growing labor-intensive specialty crops like okra, tomatoes, sweet potatoes, and cucumbers, McKnight said USDA is developing strains of the same vegetables which can be harvested mechanically.

TOUGHER STRAWBERRY

Similarly, government-backed research at the University of California is developing a tougher variety of strawberry—with a primary emphasis not on flavor or nutrition, but on its ability to be shipped and picked by machine.

"When I asked about the effects of that strawberry picker on migrant workers," says Alfred Navarro, a consultant to *Cooperativa Compesina*, "the Extension Service guy said: 'All I worry about is the economic part of it. Let the sociologists worry about that.'"

"Mechanization is a fact of life," says Navarro, "but the field worker can't eat the machine. Who deals with the social effect of these machines? The Agriculture Department has got to be responsive to more than one sector of the rural economy."

The clash of farm worker and grower has been highlighted in recent years by the rise of Cesar Chavez's United Farm Workers Organizing Committee.

UFOW's major successes to date have been in winning contracts from the new conglomerate farmers, who have entered California fruit and vegetable farming. Primarily because they fear boycotts of their nationally-branded products, the conglomerates say, they have signed contracts while most large independent growers have not.

In the Salinas Valley, for example, four of five contracts won by the union are with national firms: Purex Corp., United Brands, S.S. Pierce Co., and Heublin, Inc.

UNION STILL RESISTED

Meanwhile, the largest independent growers are still bitterly resisting the union, and seek state or national legislation that would restrict its activities. The growers want a law that would prohibit strikes during harvest season and the secondary boycotts by which Chavez has appealed to sympathetic consumers.

The outcome of these battles over agricultural wealth could be an industrialized system of conglomerate farmers and of unionized labor. However, Chavez so far has organized only a small percentage of California migrants, and even these victories are fragile ones, subject to renegotiation in a year or so.

Chavez's ultimate goal is to win economic independence for migrants by creating cooperatives such as *Cooperativa Compesina*.

They could be helped by a new system of crop subsidies, which base government assistance on economic need rather than on acreage.

Present subsidies, theoretically aimed at controlling overproduction, go mainly to the wealthiest farmers who own the most land. But John Schnittker, Under Secretary of Agriculture in the Johnson administration, argues that subsidy payments for wheat and cotton are far larger than those needed to control surpluses. A substantial part of these subsidies, says Schnittker, simply provide income supplements to the wealthiest farmers.

Some reformers argue that the small farmer can still be given a place in America if the government brings about "land reform," including enforcement of the 1902 Reclamation Law.

This law originally was designed to protect the small farmer. It provided that government-irrigated land could not be owned by absentee landlords, and that no individual could own more than 160 acres of government-irrigated land.

The law has never been enforced. In California alone, corporate landholders continue to occupy and benefit from more than one million acres subject to the 160-acre limitation.

Rep. Jerome Waldie (D-Calif.) and others have proposed legislation by which the government would buy this illegally-held land, and then resell it on generous credit terms to small farmers and low-income cooperatives.

Unless present trends are reversed, the ultimate cost of the new conglomerate revolution in agriculture will be paid by the small towns of the Midwest and of California.

CALLED DISASTROUS

Jack Molsbergen, a real estate man in Mendota, Calif., describes as "disastrous" the effects of conglomerate farming on his town in the western San Joaquin Valley.

Conglomerate farmers such as Anderson Clayton and Co., the country's 185th largest corporation with 1970 sales of \$639 million, contribute little to the local economy, says Molsbergen. The conglomerates buy their farm machinery and supplies directly from the factory and their oil directly from the refinery, he says.

When Mendota tried to build a hospital several years ago, says Molsbergen, Anderson Clayton and two other large corporate landowners blocked the project, because it would increase their property taxes.

LIVES ELSEWHERE

"The guy who made the decision for Anderson Clayton lives in Phoenix," explains Molsbergen, "and if you live in Phoenix, you don't need a hospital in Mendota. These corporate guys don't go around with a Simon Legree mustache. They are nice men. It's just the way things are."

Agriculture Department economists do not see any future for the Mendota, Californias, of the country.

"These towns represent the unfulfilled dreams of the people who went there," says USDA economist Warren Bailey. "They are going the same way as the neighborhood grocery. People want to shop where they have a choice. With air-conditioned cars and good roads, they choose to do their shopping in the cities. Iowa really doesn't have room for more than 12 regional centers. The small

town will remain only as a pleasant place to live."

As matters now stand, the small town will die and the small farmer and farm worker will be replaced without any of the attention and national debate that has focussed on other economic disruptions.

LOCKHEED CONTRAST

There is a marked contrast between national concern shown over the economic problems of a Lockheed and the problems of 150,000 small North Carolina tobacco farmers, who soon will be displaced by a new tobacco harvester.

Woodrow L. Ginsburg, research director of the Center for Community Change, contrasts that concern:

"When tens of thousands of scientists and skilled technicians were threatened with loss of jobs in the aerospace industry, a host of industrialists, bankers, and others besieged Congress for large-scale loans and special legislation.

"But when even larger numbers of workers are threatened with loss of jobs in the tobacco industry, scarcely a voice is raised. What corporate executive speaks for such workers, what banker pleads for financial aid for them, what congressman or state official calls upon his colleagues to enact special legislation?"

Ginsburg believes no voice is heard because America lacks "a national rural policy that considers the needs and aspirations of the majority of rural Americans—farm workers, small farmers, small independent business men and the aged."

"The farmhouse lights are going out all over America," says Oren Lee Staley, president of the National Farmers Organization. "And every time a light goes out, this country is losing something. It is losing the precious skills of a family farm system that has given this country unbounded wealth. And it is losing free men."

WASHINGTON, D.C., HOSPITAL CENTER CUTS ITS RATES

HON. GILBERT GUDE

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 6, 1971

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, I certainly need not call anyone's attention to the rising cost of medical care today. Unfortunately it is a fact that we are all aware of, and it has become an issue of national concern. However, I would like to call attention to an article from the AMA News which reports Washington Hospital Center's laudable decision in reducing its room rates for the second time in 2 months.

The article follows:

D.C. HOSPITAL CUTS ROOM RATES AGAIN

The Washington, D.C., Hospital Center dropped its room rates for the second time in two months.

The city's largest hospital lowered the basic room charge by \$5 and trimmed charges for medicines and patient services that will produce an expected \$3-a-day saving for most patients. Rates were cut \$3 daily in July.

Higher-than-expected Medicaid payments and service efficiencies—earlier discharges, temperature taking once daily rather than four times—helped the center reduce the rate to \$59 for a semi-private room.

RESTORE SCHOOL LUNCH FUNDS

HON. ROBERT G. STEPHENS, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 6, 1971

Mr. STEPHENS. Mr. Speaker, I am very concerned about the Department of Agriculture's decision to drastically reduce funds for the school lunch program. However, the Senate has now passed Senate Journal Resolution 157, which assures that every needy child will receive a free or reduced price lunch as Congress intended when the school lunch program was established. Soon, the House will also vote on this important legislation introduced by my friend and fellow Georgian, Senator HERMAN E. TALMADGE.

A fine editorial on this recently appeared in the Athens Banner-Herald, my hometown newspaper. The editorial points out that hungry children should not be made to suffer simply because the Government needs to reduce its expenditures. Surely there are other programs where reductions would be less harmful.

Mr. Speaker, I insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD this editorial calling for immediate action by Congress to restore the school lunch funds:

CONGRESS SHOULD RESCUE SCHOOL LUNCH PROGRAM

All Americans should support emergency legislation introduced recently by Senator Herman Talmadge of Georgia to restore funds cut from the nation's school lunch program for needy children.

Talmadge developed his proposal in response to new regulations established by the Nixon Administration that would expand the program in some areas but cut an estimated \$150 million in funds for free or reduced lunch prices.

The Talmadge bill would order the Secretary of Agriculture, who administers the lunch program, to restore the funds cut with money available to the department through import duties.

Needy children in Georgia and other states will suffer unless the Talmadge proposal or some other plan to restore funds cut is approved.

Under the proposed cutback, the USDA would reimburse school systems at the rate of 35 cents a meal rather than the 42 cents a meal that school officials had anticipated.

Since most local and state budgets are locked in at this time, this cutback would mean that school systems would either have to reduce the number of children getting meals or cutback on the meals.

Some children pay all or part of the cost of their lunches, but these costs cannot be increased at this time to help defray the losses because of the price freeze.

Raising the prices likely would be self-defeating anyway. It might mean that some who pay part of the cost could not afford lunches and that some who can afford lunches might start bringing their own.

The government's decision to cut the program seems unwise. There are other places where cuts can be made without hurting children. But certainly the late announcement of the cutback is unfortunate because it leaves local school systems without a satisfactory recourse.

We urge the Congress to support the Talmadge proposal or some other proposal to restore the food money at the 42-cent level on which local systems based their programs for this year.

The case for reductions, if there is one, can be considered for next year.

Children need at least one good meal a day to perform satisfactorily in school. The free lunch program is the only means some have of getting that meal. It deserves full support.

VETERINARIANS FOR THE SOUTH

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 6, 1971

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, veterinary medicine does not enjoy the public awareness and perhaps the public prestige of some of the other health professions. This, by no means, reflects on the importance of the profession nor has it deferred veterinarians from participating in activities that safeguard the health and welfare of man. Principally among these activities are programs in preventive medicine, protection of our protein food supply, improvement of our environment and research in comparative medicine.

The essentiality of veterinary medicine as a health profession needs no defense, however, the societal responsibilities of the profession are not always evident and consequently must be promoted to increase public awareness.

The publication "Veterinarians for the South. A Report on Veterinary Medical Education," by a special committee of the Southern Regional Education Board—SREB—points out the need for programs to assist in reducing the manpower shortage in veterinary medicine. Release of this report in August 1971 coincided with efforts of the conference committee to extend the health manpower legislation and relates to the problems confronting Congress in resolving the health manpower shortage.

All of the information contained in the report is important. However, because of its length, I insert for expediency in the RECORD at this point only a few selected excerpts pertinent to the needs for veterinarians in the South and to the recommendation for facilities for the new developing veterinarian medical school at Louisiana State University, which has approved but unfunded application for Federal funds for 2 years and which depends on allocation of Federal funds for its opening:

EXCERPTS FROM THE SOUTHERN REGIONAL EDUCATION BOARD SPECIAL COMMITTEE REPORT— "VETERINARIANS FOR THE SOUTH"

"There are considerable problems in veterinary medical education nationally and regionally. Veterinary Medicine has an important and expanding role in efforts to lessen physical and environmental threats to society and an emerging role in marine and space biology, oceanography and other areas. In addition, the profession's traditional role is expanding. These changes have increased the present shortage of veterinarians who are pressed to deliver the kind of veterinary services society asks for. In addition, there are large numbers of qualified students who wish to study veterinary medicine and cannot be accommodated in existing schools.

"There are numerous projections on supply and demand of veterinarians. There are some variations in the estimates, the size

of the shortages now and through 1980, but little doubt that there will be a considerable shortage nationally and in the South by 1980. The shortage can be lessened if we expand the training opportunities in the next few years.

"One of the most successful of the SREB student contract programs has been in veterinary medicine with five regional schools during the 20 years providing students spaces to other states, generally in the numbers to meet the state needs. All the SREB veterinary medical colleges have expanded—some more than others—and have shared their expanded capacity with SREB as best they could. But each SREB contracting state desires more spaces than are now allocated and substantial numbers of qualified young people are being turned away at a time when the need is for more graduates.

"Veterinary medical education is very costly and significant expansion of any SREB veterinary medical school is dependent primarily on federal funds for the expensive facilities required.

"The same problem exists for providing the facilities for new veterinary medical schools. There is in the region, one new developing school—Louisiana State University—which has had an approved but unfunded application for federal funds for two years. It's opening is dependent on allocation of federal funds. Other Southern schools—several of them—are in early stages of discussion.

"Present SREB veterinary medical schools include Auburn University, The University of Georgia, Oklahoma State University, Texas A & M University and Tuskegee Institute. The entering classes for these five SREB veterinary medical schools provide about 165 spaces for residents of the Southern States which have no veterinary medical schools. In each such school a large number of applicants from each state are competing for the limited number of spaces available. The number of applicants increases each year while opportunities for training have remained relatively constant. In 1970, at least four qualified applicants were turned away for each one accepted in American Veterinary Medical colleges. For the several SREB states, the rejection rate for lack of student spaces is higher."

TABLE 1.—THERE FOLLOWS INFORMATION ON ESTIMATED VETERINARIANS IN SREB STATES IN 1968, AND SREB STATES NEEDS ON THE BASIS OF 17.5 DVM'S PER 100,000 BY 1980

	1968, number of DVM's in State	1972, number of DVM's needed	1976, number of DVM's needed	1980 Popu- lation (thou- sands)	Number of DVM's needed
Alabama.....	455	533	611	3,930	688
Arkansas.....	216	270	324	2,160	378
Florida.....	821	1,040	1,259	8,458	1,479
Georgia.....	605	705	805	5,172	905
Kentucky.....	351	428	505	3,329	583
Louisiana.....	299	446	594	4,232	741
Maryland.....	608	669	730	4,525	792
Mississippi.....	214	290	366	2,525	442
North Carolina.....	415	603	791	5,588	978
South Carolina.....	197	355	513	3,842	672
Tennessee.....	366	497	628	4,339	759
Texas.....	1,593	1,803	2,011	12,678	2,219
Virginia.....	544	674	804	5,331	933
West Virginia.....	93	159	225	1,669	292
Total.....	6,777	8,472	10,166	67,778	11,861

MEETING NEEDS IN SOUTHERN VETERINARY MEDICAL EDUCATION

"There are a number of measures which might be taken to expand the veterinary medical training available in the south. Some of these measures would expand the supply of student spaces—building new schools, expanding present schools, moving to the year-round program. Others would have an effect on the quality and effectiveness of training

or on the delivery of veterinary health care—revision of the curriculum—provision of more non-academic professionals in veterinary medical schools and increased faculty.

"New Schools. The problem for this region and for all others is to expand enough to meet the demands for graduates, but to avoid over expansion of expensive facilities. To meet the needs of the region we need one other new veterinary school in addition to the new school at LSU. The region probably does not need a total of three new schools."

"The Louisiana State University is a developing school dedicated to the region wide education service. The ability of LSU to contribute to training regional students now depends on when federal construction money becomes available. LSU plus one of the other schools now in early planning (Florida, North Carolina of a second Texas school) should meet the region's training needs especially if there is desired expansion of SREB schools (Georgia and Oklahoma State University).

"The Committee felt that there were special reasons why the State of Florida should consider a new regional school and continue efforts toward establishing one. The state has been the largest user of SREB student spaces and has a large and expanding need for DVMs. In light of the state's circumstances and the anticipated training needs of the region, the Committee recommends that Florida continue to work toward a new school.

"The Committee recommended that federal funds be provided to LSU for the approved but not funded construction grant. Further the committee recommended that in awarding construction grants to veterinary medical schools, federal authorities give special consideration and priority to those firmly committed to education residents of other states and that consideration be given to opening a second new veterinary medical school in the SREB region in the mid or late 1970's."

The pressures in veterinary medical education today requires further expansion within the same framework of regional co-operation with recommendation that SREB states and veterinary medical schools continue with renewed determination and co-operative participation in the regional training program.

The Committee suggests that the region needs can be better met if institutions consider the adoption of the year round calendar, revise a veterinary and pre-veterinary curriculum to reduce the years required for a degree; increase non-academic and technical support to aid the faculty; allowing faculty members to become more productive.

The report also recommended that the federal government move swiftly to provide increased financial assistance. Without assistance, substantial expansion in the veterinary medical capacity is impossible. This federal support should be selective, aimed at the strong institution which serves regional needs and is ready for expansion. Such institutions could quickly increase their enrollments and the output of regional graduates if funds for expensive facilities and staff were made available to them.

HON. WILLIAM O. COWGER

HON. CHARLES W. WHALEN, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 6, 1971

Mr. WHALEN. Mr. Speaker, I was deeply saddened to learn of the death of my 90th club colleague, William O. Cowger, of Louisville, Ky.

As representatives of large urban areas, Bill and I shared many concerns in the 4 years we served together in the House. I was impressed particularly by the expansiveness of his municipal interests. This was reflected in the scope of the achievements made during his term as mayor of Louisville. Under his administration, the city's human relations commission was formed; the Brown Theater was opened; additional representation in State government was obtained; a new zoo was established; a new senior citizens home was completed; and an award-winning urban renewal program was developed. It is truly an understatement to say that the understanding which he brought to the needs and problems of the Nation's cities is missed in the deliberations of this House.

Mrs. Whalen joins me in extending our sympathy to his family. May Bill Cowger rest in peace.

PAROLE AUTHORITY FOR ENTRY OF SOVIET JEWS TO AMERICA

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 6, 1971

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, as a cosponsor of legislation to assist in the emigration of Soviet Jews, I am very pleased to take note of an agreement worked out between the House Judiciary Committee and the U.S. Department of Justice to provide for the entry of Soviet Jews into the United States under parole status when no visas are available. In the past, Cuban, Czechoslovakian, and Hungarian refugees have been allowed to enter by this method. This procedure is now extended to Soviet Jews—with no numerical limitations placed on the number who may enter.

In a letter to the Honorable EMANUEL CELLER, chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, dated September 30, the Attorney General states that "I can assure you that I would exercise my discretion if the situation demanded and parole Soviet Jews who are able to leave the Soviet Union." This is a significant change in Government policy in which doubts about the Attorney General's authority in this area have been resolved in favor of a humane immigration policy for refugees.

I want to commend the efforts of the Judiciary chairman, EMANUEL CELLER, and of the Immigration Subcommittee chairman, PETER ROBINO, for their untiring work to make the road to freedom a little easier. This has been a long struggle, but the battle has finally been won.

Yet the major problem still remains. While the door has been opened to this country, the Soviet Government still imposes the most severe controls on the emigration of people from its country. Hopefully the action on the part of our Government will now focus world attention on the Soviet Union and on its policy of religious freedom.

While I commend this development in

administration policy relating to immigration of Soviet Jews to the United States, it does not substitute for the need for an American declaration of policy to support and insure the integrity of the State of Israel.

A RESPONSE TO CHARGES OF FOOT-DRAWING IN THE BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS

HON. SAM STEIGER

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 6, 1971

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, the following views are inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in the interests of equity. I do not know how accurate these specifics are. I do know that the BIA bureaucracy has succeeded, to date, in completely frustrating President Nixon's new Indian policies as articulated by Secretary Morton and BIA Commissioner Louis Bruce.

BRUCE HARDWARE & EQUIPMENT CO.,
Peoria, Ariz., September 28, 1971.

HON. SAM STEIGER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR Mr. STEIGER: On September 21 you held a press conference concerning certain Indian matters and inserted three pages of material into the Congressional Record of that date. Since I was mentioned by name five times in the material and since I am a native, third generation Arizonan, I thought it best to correspond directly with you regarding the matters with which you referenced my name. Let me say that having met you on occasion, both in Arizona and in Washington, and knowing your good reputation for integrity, I believe that those who supplied your staff with so-called facts for your release did you a disservice.

I have, of course, no quarrel with the philosophy of Indian self-determination and have worked to implement the concept, both in Arizona, and since coming to Washington a little over a year ago at the request of Commissioner Bruce to join the "new team." My job here has been in Support Services, or administration. It was decided early that Support Services would not be the tail wagging the dog and for that reason we have not been involved in either programs or policies except as administrative support. For that reason I was surprised to be listed so prominently in your statement and I must say in honesty that neither my job description nor my duties or influence here quite merit the attention received. I think the answers are hidden somewhere in the motives of those who provided you with the "information."

I have, as a civil service employee, and unlike some other members of the new team, limited my congressional contacts to those authorized by the Legislative Liaison Section and my contacts with the press to those made through the Public Information Office. However, if you can break precedent to hold your first Capitol Hill press conference, I'm sure you'll forgive me for breaking precedent considering that I was one of the persons given considerable attention at that press conference. I shall, however, comment only upon those matters with which my name was associated. I have quoted each of your statements with a response following.

1. "Since Calvin Brice and Harold Cox have captured contracting—more than three months ago—no Indian self-determination contracts have been approved nor processed."

First, let me say that by memorandum signed by Commissioner Bruce contracting has not been under Mr. Cox for almost a year. I report directly to the Commissioner's office on all contracting matters. Recommendations that I report through Mr. Cox have not been approved.

The people in charge of the various programs of the Bureau determine what type of services they wish to purchase by contract and how much money has been budgeted or is available. These "statements of the work" are then brought to our contracting technicians for negotiation if a sole Indian source exists, or for preparation of a Request for Proposals if there are several possible sources. Over ninety new "Buy Indian" contracts have been executed since May 1, 1971 and, of course, a great number of annual contracts have been renegotiated. Our dollar value is running ahead of last year. Our contracting is not as extensive as I would like it to be and the reasons as I see them are set forth in the attached information memo.

2. "Over a hundred have lain unread and untouched gathering dust in the Bureau of Indian Affairs contract office while the tribes were told they were being worked on for eventual processing."

When I assumed responsibility for Central Office contracting at the end of June, I found 67 so-called proposals stacked on a table in the office. These were then read, placed in files, cataloged and sent to the proper program activity with instructions to make the policy determination as to whether they wished to consider a contract, the availability of funds in their budget, and for preparation of work statements. I scheduled and held classes for Central Office program people on their role in the procurement process. No proposals are in the contracting office except those for which contracts are being prepared. It is my wish that contracts could be prepared faster, but many are extremely complicated and General Accounting auditors have been with us since August 3. In addition, as a result of the Office of Survey and Review audit findings regarding calendar year 1970 contracts, we are now required to submit contracts of \$10,000 or more to the Solicitor's office for legal review. There is a discussion with the Department concerning possible increases in staff but this runs counter to employment cutback policies.

3. "On the Indian preference policy which has been held up in the Bureau by Harold Cox and Calvin Brice, of contracting fame. . . ."

The matter you refer to is the proposed extension of Indian preference to promotions within the BIA. This was discussed by the Bureau's planning committee, of which neither Mr. Cox nor I are members, on the agenda of the last Area Directors' meeting at which the legal and constitutional problems were discussed. Attempts to extend Indian preference via the courts have failed with the United States District Court in New Mexico ruling against one phase of the Bureau's present application. The matter of whether or not the Act was intended to apply to promotions is presently being litigated. The president of the American Federation of Government Employees has stated in writing that his organization will file suit challenging the entire matter if an extension is made. It is out of fear of losing the preference in initial employment that caused a number of Bureau people, Indian and non-Indian, to urge that the Solicitor's office be involved.

Several drafts were prepared, the latest of which I never saw, but understand went to the Department for referral to the Solicitor some time ago. This leaves me perplexed as to just what I am holding up.

4. "Also in the name of good management Indian innovators and supporters of the Commissioner, Ernest Stevens, Alexander

MacNabb, and Leon Cook have been demoted by Deputy Commissioner Crow and non-Indian Cox continued in his position backed by Wilma Victor and the Oklahoma delegation. Non-Indian Calvin Brice of contracting and Indian preference fame, a non-Indian, trained by former Phoenix Area Director Wade Head took responsibility for contracting from Alexander MacNabb, under the direction of William Rogers, non-Indian member of the Super BIA."

The above contains so many mis-statements of fact that those supplying your staff the information must fall suspect of chicanery. I will, however, limit my comments to only those matters involving support services.

First of all, Mr. MacNabb is not an Indian by definition of Indian law. He states, and I have no reason to doubt, that his grandmother was of a Canadian Indian tribe. Any legal definition that would make Mr. MacNabb an American Indian would also make Indians of over 7 million citizens of Mexican-American descent as well as a large number of Puerto Ricans. Mr. Cox, on the other hand, is a descendant of the 1906 Creek Indian roll, a tribe recognized by the Secretary of the Interior and is of one-quarter Indian blood, thus meeting every legal requirement as an American Indian.

The Indian Press Association referred to Mr. Cox as a non-Indian but later, when this was discovered to be in error, a representative came by personally to apologize. I was present at the Executive Staff meeting when Mr. Cox laughingly told the group that he guessed he was no longer an Indian because he had read it in the paper. This event apparently was reported to you as an admission by him that he is not an Indian.

As for Mr. MacNabb's demotion, let me say that he has been, and still is, Director of Operating Services. Last November, Commissioner Bruce by memo asked Mr. Cox and myself to devote a major portion of our time to the budget preparation process and, also by memo, asked Mr. MacNabb to report for a period of six months directly to the Commissioner's office instead of through Mr. Cox. When the budget process was completed Commissioner Bruce announced to a staff meeting of all Central Office employees that he had been told by congressmen that the presentations had been the best in several years. The six months expired and the normal organization of the Bureau has Mr. MacNabb reporting through Mr. Cox.

Your statement that I was trained under Mr. Head must come as much of a surprise to Mr. Head as to me. I was a middle-aged lawyer when I joined the BIA. I am a graduate with B.A. and M.A. degrees from Arizona State University and a law degree from the University of Arizona. I practiced law and was involved with the family business. I have been in government for a relatively short time and always in a technical capacity but because I have the same regard for the integrity of government funds as I have for my own, I guess I qualify as a "green eyed shade boy" or maybe under some people's definition as a "bureaucrat."

Let me say on Mr. Head's behalf that our statistics show that the Phoenix Area has led and continues to lead, all other areas in Indian involvement through "Buy Indian" contracting.

As far as taking responsibility for contracting from Mr. MacNabb, I received written instructions from Commissioner Bruce to lay aside other duties and devote full time to the contracting problem and that I should report directly to the Commissioner's office. I do not know the extent of Mr. Bill Rogers participation in the matter as I am not well acquainted with him and we have had limited contacts. The contracting situation is explained more fully in the statement attached hereto. I did not ask for the task and have

worked exceedingly long hours since receiving it. I can only speculate as to why Commissioner Bruce gave me the assignment, but perhaps it is connected with the fact that I cautioned him quite early upon my arrival in Support Services that our procedures in contracting would not meet the requirements of the Federal Procurement Regulations.

The procedural contracting deficiencies of the BIA were not of Commissioner Bruce's making. Through our Survey and Review audits covering calendar year 1970, the basic problems go back several years. As more emphasis was placed on Indian involvement contracts, the defects in procedure merely became more apparent. We believe that we are on the right track in overcoming these procedural difficulties and that we are going to be able to involve Indians through the contract route to a much greater extent than before. These are my instructions from Commissioner Bruce and Mr. Crow.

Personalities have no part in this process, and those who presented the problem to your staff as a matter of personalities did both the Bureau and the Indian people a disservice.

5. "Calvin Brice functions as the General Counsel for the Super BIA."

This will be news to the Indian Legal Activities staff of the Solicitor's office. Those mentioned as belonging to some alleged Super BIA are very high officials of this Department and have considerable legal resources and expertise at their disposal. I should add that this charge is the only one in your statement which flattered me professionally, but in all honesty I must admit that it is as much news to me as it must be to the prestigious people to whom I am allegedly giving legal advice.

6. "Several months ago, Commissioner of Indian Affairs Louis Bruce and Secretary Rogers C. B. Morton convened a high level interagency task (sic) to review BIA management. The findings of that task force . . . were briefly reviewed with the National Tribal Chairman's Association . . . now complete, this report is being kept from all Indian members of the Commissioner's new executive team . . ."

We received a request relayed from the Office of Management and Budget to comment upon the Preston report. We reported that we had not seen any such report and as a result a brief outline of recommendations was given to us by the Department. This I forwarded to Bureau program Directors for comments on possible implementation. I have no way of knowing if the report is completed or who has seen it in the Department. The answer to the complaint that Indian members of the new team have not seen it is that as far as I know neither have any of the non-Indian members seen it.

Because my reputation has been damaged by your statements and because I do not have access to the Congressional Record for purposes of corrections, I am sending copies of this letter to certain fellow members of the bar, business associates, family and friends in Arizona. If you doubt the facts as set forth in this letter, please check with the Chief of the Bureau's Contract Action Team, Chief of the Enrollment Section, or the Bureau's Statistician. If any of my facts are erroneous, I shall send a written apology to you and to each person to whom I am sending this letter.

If you should wish to make a reply, I would be glad to forward copies of it without editorial comment to all receiving copies hereof.

Sincerely yours,

CALVIN N. BRICE.

BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS CONTRACTING

I. Contracting, within the Bureau of Indian Affairs, has evolved from procurement of needed supplies into a method for the

training and employment of Indians, and finally, during the last five years, as an instrument for greater Indian involvement in the conduct of their own affairs. The vehicle used primarily has been the so-called "Buy Indian Act" (36 Stat. 861, 25 U.S.C. 47).

II. The Buy Indian Act, dating back to 1910, states that "in the purchase of Indian supplies" at the discretion of the Secretary of the Interior "so far as may be practicable Indian labor shall be employed, and purchases of the products of Indian industry may be made in open market . . ." The Interior Solicitor determined that "in open market" gives the Secretary authority to negotiate contracts with Indians under the "as otherwise authorized by law" exception to the competition bid requirement of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949. In other words the Secretary may negotiate a contract with Indians but that negotiated contract must comply with the Federal procurement statutes and regulations. Under the present administration, field officials of the Bureau of Indian Affairs were put on notice that greater Indian involvement under Buy Indian was necessary and members of the "new team" toured Indian country urging greater Indian participation.

III. The Buy Indian Act was used to a very limited extent until the 1960's, with heavy emphasis being placed upon it the last five years. The Bureau of Indian Affairs, lacking the broad granting authority of later created agencies, has had to rely upon Buy Indian as a principal tool for Indian involvement programs. In the rapid expansion of Buy Indian contracting a dual system of procurement developed in the Bureau of Indian Affairs with the contracting officers generally complying with the procurement laws and regulations in competitive purchasing but often giving less than token compliance when supplies or services were being purchased under the Buy Indian programs. This conduct caused the Department auditors to conclude, after an audit of Central Office contracts negotiated during calendar year 1970, that "noncompliance . . . represents a serious situation calling for direct involvement by the Department in effecting corrective action . . . the program people, in their zeal to get new programs underway, have more or less taken over the procurement process. And in so doing have more or less ignored the administrative process and regulatory requirements." The respective Committees of the Congress, sensing the contracting difficulties within the Bureau of Indian Affairs, have caused the General Accounting Office to involve several audit teams in a lengthy audit of central and field office Buy Indian contracting. As a result of the Department audit and in anticipation of the General Accounting Office findings the Bureau of Indian Affairs has issued guidelines to the field requiring much closer compliance with the Federal Purchasing Regulations.

IV. The problem is that raising Indian expectation now collides with Bureau of Indian Affairs efforts to bring "Buy Indian" contracting within general compliance with the procurement laws and regulations. Non-compliance is so extensive that minimal corrective action may not be considered as mere nit picking. To ease the transition an advisory group was created from other agencies within the Interior Department and this group has conducted a seminar for all Bureau of Indian Affairs contracting officers and are making continuing recommendations for improvement of contracting methods. They will visit field offices in an attempt to find and remove bugs in the contracting process. A contract action team has been organized within the Bureau of Indian Affairs and new guidelines published and provided to all offices and tribes. The most urgent need is to educate program people in their role in the contracting procedure so that proposals

are well thought out and organized. This will call for an even greater degree of Indian involvement and participation but will have more positive results.

V. The greatest single problem is time. It takes a great deal more time to negotiate properly. Several hundred Buy Indian contracts expired at the end of the fiscal year and therefore came under the new guidelines. In order to avoid adverse economic impact these already existing contracts have been extended to allow time for proper negotiation of new contracts. This backlog represents the poor contracting procedures of the past several years and will take the remainder of this year to overcome unless staffs are increased. Action on new proposals have been delayed, but not halted, in order to concentrate on the existing backlog. New proposals will have priority by December.

Unfortunately Indian matters are often expressed in terms of personalities and the contracting difficulties have been no exception. Greater efforts must be made to communicate the problem, planned solutions and time frame to Indian leaders and this we intend to undertake immediately.

DESIDERATA

HON. WM. JENNINGS BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 6, 1971

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, during these critical times I commend to the attention of my colleagues and to the citizens of our great country the following inscription which was found in Old St. Paul's Church, Baltimore, Md., dated 1692.

DESIDERATA

Go placidly amid the noise and haste, and in silence. As far as possible, without surrender, be on good terms with all persons. Speak your truth quietly and clearly; and listen to others, even the dull and ignorant; they, too have their story. Avoid loud and aggressive persons. They are vexations to the spirit.

If you compare yourself with others, you may become vain and bitter; for always there will be greater and lesser persons than yourself. Enjoy your achievements as well as your plans. Keep interested in your own career, however humble; it is a real possession in the changing fortunes of time. Exercise caution in your business affairs; for the world is full of trickery. But let this not blind you to what virtue there is; many persons strive for high ideals; and everywhere life is full of heroism.

Be yourself, especially do not feign affection. Neither be cynical about love; for in the face of all aridity and disenchantment it is perennial as the grass.

Take kindly the counsel of years, gracefully surrendering the things of youth. Nurture strength of spirit to shield you in sudden misfortune. But do not distress yourself with imaginings. Many fears are born of fatigue and loneliness.

Beyond a wholesome discipline, be gentle with yourself. You are a child of the universe, no less than the trees and the stars; you have a right to be here. And whether or not it is clear cut to you, no doubt the universe is unfolding as it should. Therefore, be at peace with God, whatever you conceive Him to be, and whatever your labors and aspirations, in the noisy confusion of life, keep peace with your Soul. With all its sham, drudgery, and broken dreams, it is still a beautiful world.

Be careful . . . strive to be happy.

DISCREPANCIES IN GOVERNMENT
CONTRACT AWARDS

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 6, 1971

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, several small businessmen, all members of the painting and decorating field, recently called my attention to a relatively new Government policy which threatens their livelihood and quite possibly that of a large segment of their industry nationwide.

They are increasingly learning that Government jobs on which they once had opportunities to bid, are being negotiated privately with minority contractors.

To be considered for Government contracts, these businessmen must be bonded, experienced, and have adequate insurance coverage and show proof of financial solvency. Yet, they learn that many minority contractors now working on Government contracts are allowed to perform without bond, with little or no previous experience, little or no supervision, inadequate insurance coverage, and without proof of financial resources. Further, they say fees being paid for these services have far exceeded the reasonable sum they might have received had they bid for the jobs.

Mr. Speaker, this news distresses me and indicates that in our zeal to assist minority groups we may be in actual violation of law and injuring one of our vital industries. I am asking the General Services Administration to completely review this policy, and I insert at this point in the RECORD a letter from one of these businessmen describing the problem in more detail, together with pertinent attachments:

A-1 CONTRACTORS, INC.,
Arlington, Va., August 12, 1971.

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: The Federal Government's authority to contract is well established. It is equally well established that the government acts through agents who generally must have statutory authority to bind the government. Congress has enacted statutes which make criminal, acts by public officers violating two basic concepts: (1) that government employees must always be impartial and maintain public confidence in the integrity of the government, and (2) that no government employee is entitled to an advantage over private persons in the conduct of business with the government by virtue of his government position (AFM 110-9), Procurement Law, Pg. 3.1). We are concerned that the rule of impartiality in government contracting is being violated with increasing frequency.

You are our elected representative; you are the expert in legal matters, and in that context, please consider and investigate our complaints—we know they are valid. To our questions, please find answers, for our right to work is threatened and our livelihood is at stake.

As you know, government contracts are awarded on the basis of formal advertising or negotiations. Congressional policy requires that purchases of and contracts for property or services shall be made by formal

advertising unless the property or services fall within one of the seventeen exceptions authorized for negotiations. Has Congressional policy been changed or laid aside? Why is the policy of formal advertising being replaced by private negotiations that eliminate the competitive process? Why is the General Services Administration permitted to contract government jobs with minority groups without formal advertising, when the services to be contracted is not one of the seventeen exceptions authorized for negotiations.

As small businessmen, we do not ask for special favors or special treatment. We do not oppose any minority group nor the competition they offer in the market place. We only ask that the integrity of the formal advertising system be maintained. We only ask for an equal footing in a free market. The democratic process is being replaced by a process of private legislation. Investigation would reveal that numerous contracts have been made with minority groups through private negotiations. This has resulted in a brazen gouge of the U.S. taxpayer.

When government contracts are awarded on the basis of formal advertising, unless all bids are rejected, award of the contract is made to the lowest responsible bidder whose bid, conforming to the invitation for bids, will be most advantageous to the government, price and other factors included. A responsible bidder is one which is a manufacturer, regular dealer, service or construction contractor having adequate financial resources, experience, and record of integrity to comply with the terms of the contract. If the General Services Administration is contracting privately with minority groups because they do not meet the requirements of a responsible bidder, then we contend it is an unlawful procedure.

The procurement of property and services for federal purposes may be by negotiation under circumstances designated by law 10 USC 2304. The legislative basis for permitting negotiations, in lieu of formal advertising is found in Senate Report No. 571, 80th Congress, 5th Session, Pg. 8. Congress has stated that competitive bidding is the cornerstone of federal procurement, and although authority to negotiate does exist, it does not give government agents carte blanche authority to use this tool of procurement indiscriminately as stated in United States versus Warne, 190 Supp. 645 (1960) "Such procurement shall be on a competitive basis (emphasis added) whether by formal advertising or by negotiation, to the maximum extent possible." How frustrating! We are not even notified of many government contracts until after those contracts have been offered to minority groups and accepted. That is not impartial contracting. That is favoritism.

To be considered for government contracts, a contractor must meet certain minimum standards. For instance, he must be bonded, he must be experienced, he must have adequate insurance coverage, and he must show proof of financial solvency. And aren't government standards applicable to all? Many minority contractors working on government contracts are allowed to perform their work without bond. They are allowed to work with little or no prior experience, with little or no supervision, with inadequate insurance coverage and without proof of financial resources. Interestingly, the fees paid by the government for the services of these minority group contractors, have far exceeded the reasonable sum to be expected by a contractor for the work performed.

It is the declared policy of the Congress that the government should aid, counsel, assist, and protect, insofar as is possible, the interest of small business concerns in order to preserve free competitive enterprise (15 USC 631A). As your constituents, and as small businessmen, we need your counsel and would

sincerely appreciate a meeting with you at your earliest convenience.

Very truly yours,

S. P. SMITH,
President.
LILLIAN SHORTER,
Secretary-Treasurer.

ATTACHMENT I.—CIRCUMSTANCES PERMITTING
NEGOTIATION, 10 USC 2304(A)

"Purchasing of and contracts for property or services covered by this chapter shall be made by formal advertising. However, the head of an agency may negotiate such a purchase or contract if . . ."

The seventeen individual exceptions enumerated by this statute are:

1. National emergency.
2. Public exigency.
3. Purchases of \$2,500.00 or less.
4. Personal or professional services.*
5. Services of educational institutions.
6. Purchases outside the U.S.
7. Medicine or medical supplies.
8. Supplies for authorized resale.
9. Perishable or non-perishable subsistence supplies.
10. Absence of competition.
11. Research and development contracts.
12. Classified purchases.
13. Technical equipment requiring standardization.
14. Property requiring substantial initial investment.
15. Negotiation after advertising.
16. Purchases in the interest of National Defense.
17. Otherwise authorized by law.

*NOTE.—Personal services may be procured only when they are required to be performed by an individual contractor in person (not a firm), and only if of a technical nature or are to be performed under government supervision and paid for on a time basis.

ATTACHMENT II

Because Federal Government contracts are being awarded privately, the exact number of contracts offered to and accepted by minority groups is not known to us. A partial known listing, however, is offered here for your review and to underline the gravity of the situation and the frequency of the violation of Congressional directive.

Contracts awarded to minority groups as of March 31, without benefits of formal advertising are as follows:

Hud Building—garage painting	43,285
Justice Building—clean, point, and paint	205,507
FOB 2—Interior and exterior painting	92,813
Newport News Courthouse—interior and exterior painting	24,923
Huntington Courthouse painting	35,600
Parkersburg Federal Building	14,897
Veteran's Administration	40,000
Navy Yard Annex Bldgs. 110 and 199	86,000
Clean and point—GSA building, 19th Street	160,000
S. Agriculture—renovate entrance gates	14,216
FOB 9—miscellaneous mechanical changes	32,660
Treasury Annex—replace electrical panels	9,251

ATTACHMENT III

Contractors from the 10th Congressional District actively competing for government contracts and signatories to this list are:

Robert J. Miller, Paintrite, Inc.
Layman Saltz, Saltz Associates.
James E. Ballard, Ballard & Associates, Inc.
Clifton Mayhew, Clifton D. Mayhew, Inc.
Walter Bainbridge, W. Walter Bainbridge, Inc.
George Groves, George Groves Painting Co., Inc.

Alexander Ploutis, Ploutis Painting Co., Inc.
 Charles E. Bainbridge, Charles Bainbridge, Inc.
 James F. Boyd, Boyd's Construction Co.

URGENT NEED FOR COORDINATION OF RAIL AND WATER TRANSPORTATION

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 6, 1971

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, the need for coordination of rail and water transportation has become better understood since the publication last April of the study of feed grain rates into New England.

The study was made by the Water Transport Association, which since has received strong support for its plan that has obvious benefit to both government and industry.

The advantages of the cooperation were spelled out for the Great Lakes Commission at its meeting in Buffalo this week in a speech by John A. Creedy, president of the Water Transport Association.

Mr. Speaker, as a part of my remarks, I include the text of Mr. Creedy's speech: REMARKS OF JOHN A. CREEDY, PRESIDENT, WATER TRANSPORT ASSOCIATION, BEFORE GREAT LAKES COMMISSION, AT BUFFALO, N.Y., OCTOBER 4, 1971

Transportation of freight accounts for about 10 percent of the gross national product, 10 cents out of every dollar of production expense for agriculture and industry.

Clearly, transport is a crucial factor in the efficient performance of the economy.

A glance at the nation's freight bill will confirm the fact that water transport is the most efficient means of surface transport. Inland river and Great Lakes carriers perform 16 percent of the inter-city ton miles, but receive in revenues only about one percent of the total freight bill.

That's why priority consideration is always given to using water transportation. That's why so much authority was given to the Interstate Commerce Commission to prescribe rail rates to and from ports at levels which permit coordination of the best efficiencies of water and rail transportation.

That's why the Great Lakes Commission has the subject of coordination of rail and water transportation high on every agenda. It is essential to the economic health of the region to make sure that no artificial barriers are placed in the way of making optimum use of the Great Lakes water highways.

IMPORTANCE OF EFFICIENCY

Northeast agriculture has recently collected the most dramatic evidence ever assembled on the crucial economic importance of efficient transportation.

The freight rates on feed grains from the Midwest have risen in recent years until today they are double the rate charged for the same service over the same distances into the Southeast.

As a result of this artificial rate disparity, Northeast agriculture cannot compete in its home markets and agriculture throughout the region is in a state of rapid decline.

In the 1930's, when the South faced the same disparities, the state of Georgia went

to court in a famous suit and forced equality in rate treatment. What's going on in the northeast today is much more interesting.

The Water Transport Association published a study last April of ways of improving efficiency of transport for northeastern agriculture.

The study demonstrated that there were tremendous opportunities for improving productivity in the handling of grain at destination, in the use of volume unit train or trainload services, in the use of Great Lakes steamships and modern bulk handling systems in Buffalo.

If the movements were re-organized to include a coordinated lake-rail service as an effective alternative to all-rail trainload service, a saving on the order of fifty percent in grain transportation costs could be achieved, enough to permit Northeast agriculture to regain its competitive position.

COOPERATION IS REQUIRED

What's required is the cooperation of steamship lines, ports, railroads and the grain and feed industry. The potential exists for a reversal of the decline of Northeast agriculture and greatly expanded traffic for the transportation companies at rates which are lower but because of better utilization of rail equipment more profitable than the current rates.

It would have been easy to get into a law suit and spend years fighting the issue through the courts as did the State of Georgia. What's happening instead is a serious attempt to reach a voluntary solution which will be in the interest of everyone.

The Interstate Commerce Commission, in an unprecedented move, on September 16th held an informal staff conference of the interested parties. These included the water carriers, the railroads, the principal shippers, the egg and broiler producers, livestock and dairy interests, the Northeastern state commissioner of agriculture, the New England Governors' Conference, the Great Lakes ports and leaders of the Congressional delegation from the Northeast.

ICC HEARS COMPLAINTS

The proposal was laid out in detail, the complaints of northeastern agriculture fully heard. The railroads have promised an answer in 60 days. It is so clearly in the enlightened self interest of the railroads to use widely accepted volume trainload services in this important trade that the results should be favorable.

If so, we will have saved ourselves years of litigation and, more important, Great Lakes transportation would, in a significant way, prevent years of further deterioration of northeastern agriculture.

The lesson to be learned here is that efficiency in transportation is not a private matter. Transportation is an all-pervasive influence. It can be a serious drag to the production efficiency of a region as it has been in the Northeast; it can be a healthy stimulant.

It should always command the priority interest of the leadership of the region. The New England delegation in Congress, for example, from the moment the WTA study was published, followed the course of the discussions with one constructive view in mind: how can we help?

The New England Governors' Conference asked the Commission to help the project along. The Commission was highly creative and innovative in arranging the September 16th conference. The record made that day would convince anyone of the need for changes.

NO WORD FROM DOT

In all the outpouring of interest and support, one of our leaders is curiously missing. The Department of Transportation is not a silent service. It has opinions on everything, but, in striking contrast to the initiative

taken by the Commission, it has so far said nothing to comfort Northeastern agriculture.

At the ICC hearing, the Department had an opportunity to lend its weight to an important effort to improve transport efficiency. It was mute. Its charter requires it to be in support of rail-water coordination, but it said no kind words about it.

It favors competition, but the idea of a lake-rail service competing with an all-rail service evoked no interest. The Department has views on coordination, on competition, on efficiency, on even-handed treatment as between regions.

It should favor eliminating artificial disparities in transport services which discriminate against one section of the country. Northeastern agriculture is dying on the vine, clearly being knocked out of its home markets by unnecessary transport inefficiency.

OBVIOUS OPPORTUNITY

There is an obvious opportunity to make a contribution that will not cost the Government a dime. A revived Northeastern agriculture will keep people on the farm, out of the crowded cities and off mass transit facilities, saving the Government money. Where is the DOT?

What significance does the proposal have for the Great Lakes region? I think it is clear that an aroused interest on the part of the leadership of the region in the efficiency of transportation can produce results.

A principle has been distilled which if applied generally will make sure that the best efficiencies of water and rail are available to industry and agriculture. The principle is simple to state. Rail rates and services to and from the ports must be comparable, cost and distance considered, with the all-rail alternative.

If that principle, so often endorsed by the Supreme Court in the past 25 years, is more firmly established, the region can achieve the best efficiencies of both rail and water transport and bring home to industry and agriculture in the region the true advantage of the Great Lakes water highways.

COORDINATED SERVICE

On millions of tons a year of coal transported to electric utilities there is a special opportunity to keep transport rates low through coordinated lake-rail service and so directly benefit everyone who pays a light bill.

Of course if the principle is not established, low cost water transportation can be eliminated. It's as simple and serious as that.

Tremendous momentum has been developed as a result of the proposal for lake-rail service on the grain traffic to the Northeast. The leadership of the Great Lakes region should build on that momentum, examine the potential for improved efficiencies in transportation and see that they are made effective at Chicago, Toledo, Detroit, Milwaukee and all the other ports.

Economic growth of the Great Lakes region is slowing down compared to growth in other regions. Before transport service gets to the stage reached in the northeast, there should be an awareness of the crucial importance of transport efficiency and the favorable potential of combining the best efficiencies of water and rail.

NEEDS OF THE ECONOMY

The Secretary of Transportation, and former Governor of Massachusetts, John A. Volpe, recognizes the urgency of the problem of efficient transportation. He said in Cleveland last May that "to meet the needs of this economy we shall in the next 18 years, almost double the capacity of our transportation network."

He went on, "I can tell you right now we are not going to meet this goal simply by building more of everything—more highways, more railroads, airports or more sea-

ways. We are going to achieve this increased capacity, by more efficient utilization of our present systems.

"We are, consequently, going to need the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Seaway System and we are going to need all the seaway capacity we can get."

Clearly, one way to improve efficient utilization of our present systems is to encourage the coordination of rail and water service.

It is time for a breakthrough on this important issue. With proper recognition of the public stake in a successful outcome, optimum efficiencies can be achieved.

IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION SERVICE CHANGES ITS PROCEDURES

HON. EDWARD I. KOCH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 6, 1971

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, in June of this year, I was informed by an attorney in New York of a procedure used by the Immigration and Naturalization Service to which aliens were subjected which can only be described as outrageous. What occurred in the case of one immigrant has occurred in a number of other cases and rather than restate the outrageous behavior, I urge our colleagues to read the correspondence which is appended.

I am pleased to say that as a result of my bringing this matter to the attention of the Immigration and Naturalization Service, I have been informed that the procedures governing the custody of applicants for admission to the United States have been changed so as to eliminate the abuses which I brought to the attention of the Immigration and Naturalization Service. I want to commend Commissioner Raymond F. Farrell for his prompt and excellent disposition of this matter.

The correspondence follows:

WILKIE FARR & GALLAGHER,
New York, N.Y., June 3, 1971.

HON. EDWARD I. KOCH,
Member of Congress,
New York, N.Y.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN KOCH: I am writing to give you full details of a procedure being regularly followed by the United States Immigration and Naturalization Service.

On Monday morning, May 31, I received a call from a friend, Mr. Russell Thompson of New York City, who advised me that he had gone on Sunday morning, May 30, to Kennedy Airport to meet a friend, Mrs. X of Lima, Peru, who was arriving that morning on Braniff Flight 900.

It seemed that, when Mrs. X arrived, she was seized by Immigration officials, held for several hours and finally taken away with no opportunity for Mr. Thompson to speak to her. Since the Immigration officials refused to speak to him, Mr. Thompson learned from Braniff that Immigration had determined on her behalf a \$1,000 bond to insure that she did not work while in this country and that she did eventually depart. Mrs. X had come as a tourist, with a two-way ticket intending to stay for only a month or two. Nothing had been said to her about a bond at the time she obtained her visa at the U.S. Embassy in Peru.

Mr. Thompson then learned that Mrs. X had been taken under guard to the Idlewild Riviera Hotel, where she was to be held until Tuesday, June 1st, since there was no proce-

dures at the airport to obtain the necessary bond and since the Immigration officials at the airport would not in any case be authorized to accept a bond without some sort of clearance from the main office at 20 West Broadway, which office was closed for the holiday weekend.

Mr. Thompson located a Spanish speaking person who managed to call Mrs. X at the Riviera, during which conversation she learned that \$200 had been forcibly taken by the guards from Mrs. X and each of the other 10 or 12 persons being held under the same circumstances. Since apparently none of these individuals spoke any English, no one knew why the \$200 had been taken.

After a minute or so of this phone conversation with Mrs. X, it was realized that a guard was on the line listening in. The guard at this point forcibly ended the conversation and later attempts to communicate with Mrs. X were unsuccessful.

On being informed of this situation on Monday morning I agreed, as a favor to Mr. Thompson, to look into the situation to see what if anything could be done.

Since there is no listing for Immigration at JFK, I called the hotel and was connected with one of the guards, a Mr. McKinley who is employed by the Beatty Protective Agency. Apparently this agency is retained by the airline to guard people in this position. Mr. McKinley advised me that I had better not "mess around" since I was dealing with the U.S. Government. When I kept "messing around," he gave me the number of Immigration at JFK. I called there and spoke to a Mr. Moroni (phonetic spelling) who was reasonably courteous and advised me that nothing could be done since the "supervisor" had determined that this bond was necessary. He told me that if the bond was not forthcoming on Tuesday, Mrs. X would be sent back to Peru, and he gave me the name of a Mrs. Ohliger at 20 West Broadway to contact on Tuesday for details on how to secure this bond. I was informed by the "supervisor" that the reason for the requirement of a bond was that Mrs. X had a husband living somewhere in the U.S., had two children in Peru and had bought her airline ticket from Braniff on credit. (Later Les Trager also called Mr. Moroni and found, after a series of questions, that the "supervisor" who had made this determination was none other than Mr. Moroni.)

Having been unsuccessful in my attempts to either communicate with Mrs. X or get some explanation as to why I couldn't, I picked up Mr. Thompson and drove out to the Riviera Hotel, accompanied by my wife who speaks fluent Spanish.

At the hotel, we found out the room number, knocked at the door and were told by a voice inside that there was nobody there, that it was the "ladies room." I then knocked at the guards' door and was told that these people were indeed being held in the room where I had first knocked, which was the ladies room only in the sense that this was where they were holding the ladies. I was also told gruffly that I damn well could not talk to anyone in there, and the guard was unimpressed that I was this lady's attorney; that I could see anyone I damn pleased about it but I better be careful since I was "messing around" with the U.S. Government.

I then went downstairs to call the "supervisor" at Immigration. By this time (about 3 o'clock) there was a new supervisor, a Mr. Aursman, who was somewhat more helpful. After some discussion he agreed to release Mrs. X in Mr. Thompson's recognizance and defer the determination as to her admission until later in the week at 20 West Broadway when, I suppose, a bond will have to be posted.

When I asked Mr. Aursman about the \$200 he, as Mr. Moroni had done, denied any knowledge as to what this could be and suggested that I either talk to the guard service or Braniff.

After a while Mrs. X was produced by Mr.

McKinley and released at which point McKinley asked me to meet him back at the hotel where I could pick up Mrs. X's luggage and settle "accounts." When I asked what this was all about, it turned out that Mrs. X was to be charged for the privilege of being guarded by the Beatty Protective Agency at the rate of \$3.85 per hour. When I asked whether this was the purpose of the \$200, Mr. McKinley stated that this was so (although, earlier, he had denied that anything had been taken from Mrs. X).

Back at the hotel, I was taken by Mr. McKinley up to another hotel room where about 8 or 10 Latin-American men were being held (apparently under similar circumstances) and I was refunded the sum of \$111.50.

When the unfortunate people who were being held in that room realized that I was an American and had apparently had gotten someone out of this fix, they clustered around me and asked me what was happening. Each was anxious to tell me his story. My Spanish is rather poor but I gathered that these men were under the impression that they were to be held until whatever amount of money they had with them equalled the product of \$3.85 times the number of hours they had been held, at which point they would be sent back to South America. I do not know whether this was so but I do know they were not allowed to see anyone or obtain any information from anyone who spoke their language and their ability to make and receive calls was, at best, severely restricted. I was also told that at least \$200 was taken from everyone. (Mrs. X had in fact been given a scribbled receipt for the \$200—the receipt did not indicate what it was for.)

When I asked Mr. McKinley why the people were held incommunicado, he stated that they were permitted to make two phone calls (this seems questionable in light of what I saw and heard) but they were not permitted to see anyone (including attorneys) for fear of an attempt to escape.

As we were leaving the hotel, one of the women being held came to the window and threw a note out which was in Portuguese. The note indicated a telephone number which I called and spoke to a friend of this woman. I told this friend what I had learned and advised her to get down to immigration on Tuesday and see about the bond. (I later learned that this was done and the woman was released on Tuesday.)

During the return trip to Manhattan, Mrs. X told us about her experiences. She stated, among other things, that, while she was not physically mistreated in the sense of being beaten or starved or deprived of essential facilities, her treatment, as well as that of the others, was very gruff and discourteous and some of the men were pushed when they did not move fast enough. One woman was threatened with handcuffs at one point when she tried to look out the window.

Mrs. X stated that one of the women being held was coming here for her health and intended to stay for only 15 days which she told the first official she saw at the Immigration desk. He replied that she was entitled to stay for six months and he would mark her papers accordingly. When she protested, among other things, that she did not have money for such a lengthy stay, he brushed her protests aside and marked the papers to indicate a six month stay. When the woman proceeded down the hall a few yards she was confronted by another official who looked at her papers, demanded to know how much money she had and stated that since this was obviously not enough money for a six month stay, she would have to post a bond which couldn't be done that day and she was marched off to the Riviera.

I am writing you this lengthy letter in the hope that you will be able to somehow persuade the Immigration Service that, if they must have this bonding requirement, it should be done in such a way that aliens are advised at the time they obtain their visas whether such a bond will be necessary

and provided with a procedure to arrange for it. In the alternative, a procedure for bonding at the spot at the airport might be provided comparable to that which is available to those charged with crimes.

In any case, there is absolutely no reason why visitors to this country cannot be treated with courtesy, and due regard to their right to contact and be visited by friends, relatives or attorneys. Since this is virtually a bilingual city and the vast majority of those subjected to this treatment appear to be Latin-Americans, there is no reason why there cannot be Spanish speaking personnel available or, at least, a printed card which would advise these individuals, in Spanish as to what is happening and what are these choices. To make these people pay for their guards is an indignity to which even murderers are not subjected.

I am, of course, outraged and disgusted that the U.S. Government is subjecting perfectly innocent visitors to this horrendous treatment. I have no idea how long this has been going on but I did learn that it is a daily occurrence. Undoubtedly, the burden is compounded every weekend and especially on holiday weekends.

I do not intend to let this matter rest and I sincerely hope that you will be able to render assistance. I would be most happy to meet with you to discuss this matter and I, as well as my wife (who is a Cuban refugee and has had her own past history of discourtesy at the hands of the Immigration Service), would be happy to assist you by providing further details, accompanying you to the scene, acting as interpreter or in whatever other way you think fit in order to help civilize this disgraceful, inhuman and probably illegal practice.

Very truly yours,

EDWARD N. WILSON.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., July 1, 1971.

HON. RAYMOND F. FARRELL,
Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. FARRELL: I am sending you a copy of a letter I have received from a constituent detailing a case of horrendous mistreatment of visitors to this country by the Immigration Service and agents acting under its direction.

I should appreciate your investigating this case—which would appear to be but an example of a reoccurring practice of a Kafkaesque detention of aliens arriving in this country. Frankly, I was stunned when I read the letter that such a callous disregard of feeling and human rights could be perpetrated by agents of our government.

Surely, a decision as to whether a bond is required for an alien can be made in all cases before he boards his plane for this country. I would appreciate having your comments on this aspect of the case.

Another disturbing aspect of this matter is that money should be forcibly taken from a person. You will note that \$200 was taken from Mrs. X by the guards without any explanation. Later she learned that this was to pay the \$3.85 per hour guard service performed by the Beatty Protective Agency. Surely, this per person rate is rather high, and I would appreciate knowing more about your policies that permit the Agency to extract such a payment from an alien. In fact, I don't understand why, if the Immigration Service requires this protective service, it doesn't pay for it.

As you read Mr. Wilson's chronology of events, the story seems to be too ludicrous to be true. But, I have every reason to believe that he has given us an accurate accounting of what happened.

I would encourage you to look into this matter personally and take what remedial action is required, for if the facts outlined by Mr. Wilson are correct, this is an un-

fortunate blemish on the history of the U.S. Immigration Service.

Sincerely,

EDWARD I. KOCH.

U.S. DEPARTMENT
OF JUSTICE, IMMIGRATION
AND NATURALIZATION SERVICE,
Washington, D.C., August 5, 1971.

HON. EDWARD I. KOCH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. KOCH: Further reference is made to your letters of July 1 and July 2, 1971 forwarding copies of a letter you received from Mr. Edward N. Wilson describing the experiences of a Mrs. X upon her arrival at the John F. Kennedy Airport, New York on a Braniff plane.

As you were advised in my letter of July 9, 1971, the matter was referred to Mr. Solomon Marks, our District Director at New York, with the request that he take corrective action, and advise. I am enclosing a report furnished me by Mr. Marks, in which he sets forth in detail the circumstances involved, and describes the procedure which has been instituted to prevent a recurrence of an incident similar to that which occurred in the case of Mrs. X.

I wish to again thank you for bringing this matter to my attention in order that appropriate remedial action could be taken.

Sincerely,

RAYMOND F. FARRELL,
Commissioner.

Mrs. X, a native and citizen of Peru, arrived at John F. Kennedy International Airport, New York on Sunday, May 30, 1971, aboard Braniff Airlines flight #900 from Lima, Peru. She was questioned concerning her eligibility for admission into the United States as a non-immigrant visitor for pleasure by an Immigration officer, pursuant to official inspection procedures.

It was ascertained that Mrs. X had purchased her round trip airline ticket on credit; that she had left her two minor children in Peru; that her husband was in the United States but his whereabouts were unknown to her. It therefore appeared, to the inspecting officer, that Mrs. X was not at that time entitled to enter the United States as a bona fide visitor for pleasure. Her inspection was deferred to permit her to post a bond in the amount of \$1,000.00, ensuring that she would maintain her status as a visitor in the United States and would depart when required.

In view of the fact that Mrs. X's arrival occurred on a holiday weekend, she was returned to the custody of Braniff Airlines, in accordance with statutory authority. Braniff Airlines was charged with the responsibility of presenting Mrs. X, for completion of inspection, on Tuesday, June 1, 1971 at the New York office of the Immigration and Naturalization Service, 20 West Broadway, New York City.

On June 3, 1971, Mrs. X was admitted into the United States as a visitor for pleasure, until August 30, 1971, subsequent to the posting of a \$1,000.00 maintenance of status and departure bond in her behalf by Mr. Russell A. Thompson.

Inquiry has been made concerning the mistreatment of Mrs. X, that Mr. Edward N. Wilson set forth in his letter to the Honorable Edward I. Koch, Congressman, 17th District New York. It was ascertained that Braniff Airlines had authorized the Beatty Protective Service to assume custody of Mrs. X and present her for completion of inspection on June 1, 1971 at the New York office of the Immigration and Naturalization Service. Beatty Protective Service was further authorized by Braniff Airlines to collect from Mrs. X the cost of her lodging, transportation and escort service, for which expense the protective service would formerly have billed the airline. The foregoing procedure has been recently instituted by Braniff Airlines, rela-

tive to all its passengers in similar situations, in an attempt to effect economy in its operations.

On July 13, 1971, Mr. Edward N. Wilson informed an Immigration Officer that Mrs. X had departed from the United States on June 8, 1971 and was therefore not available for interview. The revised procedures concerning alien applicants for admission, effective July 6, 1971 and which are referred to hereinbelow, were explained to Mr. Wilson. He advised that he was satisfied with the remedial measures taken. Mr. Wilson's letter to Congressman Koch reflects that he was able to secure the release of Mrs. X in Mr. Thompson's recognizance, on Monday, May 31, 1971, upon his intercession with a Supervisory Immigration Officer. It is further reflected therein that Mr. Wilson obtained, from the Beatty Protective Service, a refund in the sum of \$111.50 of the \$200.00 that has been exacted from Mrs. X.

A number of incidents, similar in nature to that of Mrs. X, had come to the attention of the New York Office of the Immigration and Naturalization Service during the months of May and June, 1971. It concerned alien passengers on Avianca and KLM Airlines, whose applications for admission into the United States, could not be readily resolved. Said airlines had contracted with the Beatty Protective Service to assume custody of the aliens in the same fashion as heretofore described in the case of Mrs. X.

It was determined that the airlines mentioned in this report, together with some other airlines, had changed their policy during the month of April 1971 relative to the aliens returned to their custody by the Immigration Officers. Whereas heretofore the airlines would absorb all expenses involved in such custody, they now sought to avoid such costs by having the Beatty Protective Service collect the charges purportedly due, directly from the aliens.

In a move to prevent recurrence of these incidents and to counteract any further abuses, new procedures governing the custody of applicants for admission were put into effect on July 6, 1971 in the New York District. Whenever feasible, an alien is to be granted parole for appearance and further inspection at the New York office of the Immigration and Naturalization Service, if an immediate determination cannot be made as to eligibility to enter, upon the alien's arrival in the United States. Where custody of the alien is unavoidable it will be accomplished only at a facility subject to the direction of the Immigration and Naturalization Service. All aliens being escorted to such a facility by Immigration Officers or any other guard, are personally instructed by a Supervisory Immigration Officer that they are prohibited from paying any monies for guard service, accommodation expense, or any other expense.

The above-mentioned procedures were instituted in furtherance of established policy of the Immigration and Naturalization Service to afford every possible consideration to persons coming within its jurisdiction, consistent with its mandated obligation in administering and enforcing the Immigration and Nationality Laws. No incident, similar to that of Mrs. X, has occurred since its implementation.

MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN—HOW LONG?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 6, 1971

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, a child asks: "Where is daddy?" A mother asks:

"How is my son?" A wife asks: "Is my husband alive or dead?"

Communist North Vietnam is sadistically practicing spiritual and mental genocide on over 1,600 American prisoners of war and their families.

How long?

RELIGION AND THE SCHOOLS

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 6, 1971

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I want to call to the attention of my colleagues an excellent letter written to the Evening Star by Mr. Floyd Robertson, assistant to the general director of the National Association of Evangelicals, in response to an editorial on religion in the schools which appeared in the September 24 issue.

I am a cosponsor of a constitutional amendment to restore prayers in our schools and I am in accord with the contents of Mr. Robertson's letter.

The editorial and letter follow:

[From the Washington Star, Sept. 24, 1971]

RELIGION AND THE SCHOOLS

New life has suddenly been breathed into a proposed constitutional amendment to allow prayer in the public schools, and we can only view this development with misgivings. Congress has too many ponderous matters on its hands and the country has too many volatile divisions to undertake an emotional debate over religion in the schools.

Nonetheless, that now seems ordained, at least in the House. The senators should leave well enough alone and thereby embalm the proposition if it reaches their domain.

That's what the House has wisely done until recently. For eight years Representative Emanuel Celler of New York has kept a parcel of school-prayer proposals bottled up in his Judiciary Committee. But the other day he was overruled by a majority of House members, whose signatures on a discharge petition took the matter away from his committee. A House vote is probable in November on a First Amendment alteration permitting "nondenominational prayer" in schools.

The amendment is aimed at nullifying Supreme Court decrees of 1962-63 that prohibited organized prayers in public schools, and its proponents think they can muster the required two-thirds majority in the House. In the Senate, the resistance would be stiffer, for that body never was cordial to a similar proposal advanced with evangelistic passion by the late Everett Dirksen.

But House members shouldn't burden the Senate with that decision. They should summon the courage to reject the measure, as an affirmation of the founding principle that religion and the state must be separate. Any amending of the Constitution is a serious matter, to be approached with great caution. But to set in motion history's first revision of the Bill of Rights would be an act of the profoundest gravity, fraught with peril. It could be the precedent for making the charter a patchwork in which basic rights would be diluted.

Not only would the amendment intrude into the area of religious-state separation, it also promises to create more confusion than currently exists on the subject. For, as 38 religious leaders and organizations pointed out in opposing the measure, it is impossible for the major faiths to agree on what con-

stitutes "nondenominational prayers." Hence that task would fall to school boards, and government would be into religion, establishing forms of worship. That's no way to protect religious beliefs, which is the business of government, or to spread religion around, which is not the business of government.

Religion in all its diversity is a vital element of strength in American life, and its erosion is a cause for deep concern. But it is folly to expect the schools to transmit it to the young, when many homes and churches are falling in that task, and to propose writing that desperate wish into the Constitution. Religious enrichment must flow from the family and the church; it cannot be legislated into being.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF EVANGELICALS,
Washington, D.C., September 28, 1971.

THE EDITOR,
The Evening Star,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Even when we do not agree with your conclusions we usually find your editorials accurate and fair in your manner of handling the facts. However, the one on the so-called Prayer Amendment (9/24/71) was a shocking departure from this high standard we have learned to expect from reading your paper.

You indicated the Senate was never cordial to the identical Dirksen proposal yet your own newspaper reported the fact that less than a year ago as a rider to another bill it passed the Senate by an overwhelming majority of 50 to 20. It is now pending in the Senate with no less than 37 cosponsors.

Contrary to your contention, this would not be "history's first revision of the Bill of Rights." The Fourteenth Amendment as interpreted by the U.S. Supreme Court changed the entire Bill of Rights and the First Amendment in particular by about 1800. Mr. Justice Potter Stewart stated in his eloquent dissent from the 1962 and 1963 decisions in question:

"As a matter of history, the First Amendment was adopted solely as a limitation upon the newly created National Government . . . it is not without irony that a constitutional provision evidently designed to leave the States free to go their own way should now have become a restriction upon their autonomy."

Except for the fact that the First Amendment had been changed by the Fourteenth the Court itself clearly indicated in the first paragraph of its own decision that it would not have had jurisdiction over the "practices at issue" regarding Prayer and Bible Reading in the public schools.

The 38 religious leaders you mentioned may have been speaking for whatever church hierarchies they purported to represent but other writers have more aptly described them as generals without armies. They certainly do not represent their constituent members as evidenced by the fact that virtually every poll taken on the subject for the past nine years clearly reflects at least a 3 to 1 majority in favor of corrective action by Congress.

You say, "Any amending of the Constitution is a serious matter to be approached with great caution." We agree. Surely the current proposal meets both of these criteria which is far more than could have been said of the Fourteenth Amendment.

No other issue on the current scene has had a longer or more sustained public interest than the Prayer Amendment.

What really appalls us is your reference with approbation to the fact that "For eight years Representative Emanuel Celler of New York has kept a parcel of school-prayer proposals bottled up in his Judiciary Committee." Does this really say what is inescapably obvious?

We are reminded of B. F. Skinner's most recent book "Beyond Freedom and Dignity". In it he advocates a system whereby a select

few would be able to abolish freedom and the dignity of the individual because, as he contends, the average person doesn't really know what he needs nor does he have the ability to properly exercise freedom. Are you suggesting the same thing and that the wisdom of Mr. Celler and a select few on his Committee is so far superior to the combined wisdom of some 75% of the other Americans that he should be allowed to bottle up an important piece of legislation for eight long years and circumvent the will of the public?

Is this why you did not share with your readers the substance of this legislation which you describe in such horrendous terms? It is very short (only 36 words) which reads as follows:

"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."

If enacted the proposed Amendment will restore the freedom of persons to pray in public places when and if appropriate. It will leave absolutely undisturbed the freedoms secured by the First Amendment and the entire Bill of Rights.

Sincerely,

FLOYD ROBERTSON,
Assistant to the General Director.

CHICAGO ELEVATOR STRIKE STOPS GRAIN SHIPMENTS

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 6, 1971

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, the Nation's attention has been focused for several days on the strikes in our ocean ports. There is no doubt these are cause for serious concern for the entire Nation, but a Midwest tieup of grain shipments from the port of Chicago is equally distressing especially for our Midwestern grain farmers.

This strike, now in its sixth week, coupled with the strikes on our ocean ports, will soon cause harvested grain to be piling up on the streets of Corn Belt towns.

In an effort to get the grain shipments underway again, I sent a wire to President Nixon last week urging him to use the Taft-Hartley law to bring both the Chicago grain elevator workers back on the job along with the coastal dockworkers. These strikes are causing corn and soybean prices to decline, and could easily result in the permanent loss of overseas markets. It will without a doubt result in needless destruction of grain which could be used for livestock and human food.

Attached as part of these remarks are copies of my telegram to President Nixon, a letter I received from Secretary of Labor Hodgson, and my reply to Secretary Hodgson of yesterday:

SEPTEMBER 30, 1971.

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

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Chicago Grain Elevator strike in 5th week having extreme effect upon farmers. 75% of grain storage capacity shut down. 70 million bushels corn

and soybeans affected. Price of corn to farmers already depressed due to record crop. Strike causing futures market to decline further. Estimate total loss to farmers alone during October-December may reach \$74 million. Foreign markets lost may be permanent. Closing of St. Lawrence Seaway less than 90 days away. Movement of grain critical for both farmers and our commitments to overseas markets. Foreign buyers will find new supply of corn.

Lost sales will add to adverse effect on our balance of payments already carrying a deficit. Urge you to invoke Taft-Hartley law and impose 90-day cooling-off period. Thanks for your consideration.

PAUL FINDLEY, M.C.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR,
Washington, D.C., October 4, 1971.

HON. PAUL FINDLEY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FINDLEY: This is in reply to your telegram of September 30, 1971, concerning the five-week strike involving nine Chicago grain elevator operators and some 200 of their employees represented by the International Longshoremen's Association. You urge that the emergency procedures of the Taft-Hartley Act be invoked to end the stoppage.

We share your concern for the adverse economic effects of this labor-management dispute. However, use of the national emergency provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act is limited to work stoppages which affect an entire industry or a substantial part of an industry, and which, if permitted to continue, will imperil the national health or safety.

The Government has provided intensive mediatory assistance by the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service. A Federal mediator has been assisting directly in the negotiations. We will continue an active interest in resolving this dispute and fully recognize the acute hardships it is causing.

Sincerely,

J. HODGSON,
Secretary of Labor.

OCTOBER 4, 1971.

HON. JAMES D. HODGSON,
Secretary of Labor,
U.S. Department of Labor,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Thanks for your prompt response to my wire of September 30, 1971, regarding the Chicago Grain Elevator strike. I appreciate, as do the nation's farmers, your recognition of the "acute hardships it is causing."

I feel these hardships, when considered alongside the other strikes affecting farmers, create a situation which imperils the national health and safety.

Closing down of Eastern and Gulf ports by the dockworkers' strike last Friday greatly aggravated the situation as far as farmers are concerned.

The strike in Chicago of the Grain Elevator Workers effectively embargoes the shipment of grain by Midwest farmers. The result threatens the well-being of this significant segment of our economy.

Robert Butcher, a Sangamon County, Illinois, farmer and commodities broker told me today the prices farmers are receiving are already depressed because of the dock and grain elevator strike. He said grain barges which normally ship grain on the Illinois and Mississippi Rivers are not available.

He said, "We'll soon have to dump the grain in the streets of our towns. There just isn't enough storage space available for this crop. Farmers are very upset as they see their grain prices fall apart while they see little action in the federal government to get the workers back on the job to handle and ship the crop. Farmers know they have produced an extra large crop. Its size alone depresses

the price. To permit grain prices to slide even further because of strikes gives farmers a good reason to be mad. Major Illinois grain purchasers have stopped buying grain for delivery anytime during October."

I recognize that the decision to invoke the Taft-Hartley 80-day cooling off period involves many considerations. I am sure that you agonize over this very question. Should you decide to recommend affirmative action to the President, as I hope you will, I urge that in addition to the striking dockworkers you also recommend covering the strike of the Chicago Grain Elevator workers in any Taft-Hartley injunction.

Sincerely yours,

PAUL FINDLEY, M.C.

CITIZEN INTEREST IN AFFAIRS OF STATE

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 6, 1971

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, recently I had the privilege and pleasure of mailing a questionnaire to the residents of the Fourth Congressional District of Illinois. I am happy to report the response was unusually heavy, demonstrating substantial citizen interest in the affairs of state. But as important as the quantity of the replies received was the substance and thought which went into the views expressed by my constituents.

We hear much from vocal elements within our country that the President ought to set a "date certain" regarding the time when the last American will be withdrawn from Vietnam. In my opinion the President has wisely rejected that counsel, while sticking to the commitment that American troop withdrawals will continue in relationship to the improved effectiveness of the South Vietnamese defense forces. Should the North Vietnamese and the Vietcong participate in legitimate discussions for a cease-fire and peace, our troop withdrawals would then be more substantial. It also appears that the good people of my district reject the counsel of those who would "cut-and-run." An amazing 85 percent expressed their support for "the President's troop withdrawal program in Vietnam."

The people of the Fourth Congressional District of Illinois voiced their opposition to a federally controlled program of national health insurance financed by increased social security taxes and other Federal taxes. More than two-thirds of those responding informed me that they are opposed to a government program providing medical care to Americans. Whatever the problems, there seems to be strong support for a medical service system based on individual doctor-patient relationships and nongovernment medicine.

In addition, the questionnaire showed that 55 percent of those voting were in favor of expanding diplomatic and trade relations with Communist China; 75 percent in favor of increasing military pay in order that an all-volunteer service might be tried; and almost two-thirds felt that the Federal Government has

the responsibility of developing laws to prohibit strikes by public employees.

An itemization of the questionnaire and the results follows:

	[In percent]	
	Yes	No
(1) Do you support the President's troop withdrawal program in Vietnam?	85	15
(2) Would you favor a federally controlled program of national health insurance financed by increased social security taxes and other Federal taxes?	32	68
(3) Do you favor the continuation of manned space exploration?	52	48
(4) Should the Federal Government develop laws to prohibit strikes by public employees?	63	37
(5) Are you in favor of the United States expanding diplomatic and trade relations with Red China?	55	45
(6) Do you approve revenue sharing of Federal funds by direct payment to the States and local governments without Federal control?	42	58
(7) Do you support increasing military pay and adjusting manpower practices in order to attract an all-volunteer military?	75	25
(8) Do you concur with my view that a 3d airport should not be built in Lake Michigan?	88	12

OPPOSITION TO WYLIE AMENDMENT—HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 191

HON. JAMES C. CORMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 6, 1971

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, Wilber G. Katz, professor of law at the University of Wisconsin and former dean of the University of Chicago Law School testified before the House Judiciary Committee in 1964 stressing the need for Government agencies to remain impartial not only between religions but also religious and nonreligious philosophies if our religious freedom is to be maintained.

Because our religious freedom is again being threatened by the proposed school prayer amendment, I would like to insert Mr. Katz' testimony in the RECORD as reminder of the importance of impartiality.

The testimony follows:

STATEMENT OF WILBER G. KATZ, PROFESSOR OF LAW, UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN

I am opposed to the amendments which are before your committee because I believe that the adoption of any of them would make our Constitution less appropriate to the religious diversity of American society. Our society includes believers in many different religions and also many who find no basis for belief in God and whose ultimate devotion is to their fellow men or to ethical principle.

Our general constitutional policy has been one of freedom and equality for all of these groups. To assure this equal freedom, a requirement of impartiality is imposed upon our State and Federal Governments. Government agencies must be impartial not only between religions but also between religious and nonreligious philosophies.

The requirement of impartiality means that Government must be neutral with respect to religion. This is not because the religious and ethical beliefs of its citizens are a matter of no concern to Government. It is because one of the deepest concerns of democratic government is that its citizens have

freedom in the area of their ultimate devotion. It is for this reason that Government agencies should stay out of the business of promoting religious practices or beliefs.

When Government schools include regular religious devotions in their programs, the school authorities are not impartial. They discriminate not only against those who have no religious belief but also against those whose beliefs are incompatible with the particular devotions in question.

There is a special danger inherent in public school prayers which are "nonsectarian" and which have wide support among Protestants, Catholics, and Jews. The danger is that those who cannot conscientiously participate may be regarded as less than 100 percent American, and that those who oppose such prayers may be branded as "cynics, atheists, and unbelievers."

The objection to regular prayers or devotional reading in public schools is not met by merely excusing those who do not wish to participate. Making excuses available does not make the program truly voluntary. The supreme court of my State (Wisconsin) recognized this in 1890 when it held that devotional Bible reading is forbidden by the State constitution. The court said that a pupil who has to withdraw from group devotions "loses caste with his fellows, and is liable to be regarded with aversion and subjected to reproach and insult."

In recent years this view has been expressed by many experienced educators and child psychologists. A committee of the National Council of Churches concluded that "so-called voluntary exemption does not overcome the compulsion exerted by majority behavior."

No constitutional amendment is necessary to permit continuance of provisions for worship in the armed services. Our traditional practices in this area have not been designed to promote religion. They have reflected rather a policy of neutrality. Without some provision for worship, the regulations of the armed services would result in restraining religious freedom.

No constitutional amendment is necessary to permit continuance of prayers offered in the Houses of Congress and on occasions such as the inauguration of a President. There is no doubt that a President is free to express publicly his need for God's help as he takes his oath of office.

Nor does the constitution forbid all religious expression in the public schools. For example, if a teacher had expressed her shock at President Kennedy's assassination by a prayer for the Nation and for the bereaved family, her action would not have been open to criticism.

What is open to criticism is a regular public school program designed to inculcate religious beliefs or habits. I respectfully urge the committee to preserve the constitutional barrier to such programs.

SIXTY YEARS OF LOYALTY AND FRIENDSHIP

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 6, 1971

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, for the past 60 years, America has had a loyal and faithful friend in the Republic of China. We have been fortunate to have had this friend stand beside us through these turbulent years.

On October 10, the Republic of China commemorates its 60th anniversary, and this observance comes at a time of un-

certainty. Meanwhile, China's seat in the United Nations is threatened, and America appears to be almost ready to turn her back on this long-time and trusted friend.

Mr. Speaker, this loyalty must not be permitted to be cast aside. It is for this reason, I have joined in signing a petition to the President of the United States strongly and unalterably opposing the expulsion of the Republic of China from the United Nations.

The friendship of Taiwan's 16 million people is well known. We must rally to their side at this critical time.

WANTED: A FLEXIBLE U.N.

HON. JERRY L. PETTIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 6, 1971

Mr. PETTIS. Mr. Speaker, I would like my colleagues to read the following article written by our former distinguished colleague, George Bush, Ambassador to the United Nations.

The Ambassador outlines some of the specific issues on the U.N. agenda this session—China, the Middle East, Pakistani refugees—in terms of what he believes the proper role of the United Nations to be. His concept of the function of the United Nations can be shared by a vast majority of the American people—a flexible and responsive body able to meet the rapidly changing conditions of world society in its quest for a lasting peace.

None of us envy the task that confronts Ambassador Bush in these coming days. Yet we all know that he will succeed in representing the people and policies of this country in an able, knowledgeable, and dynamic manner.

The article follows:

WANTED: A FLEXIBLE U.N.—ISSUES DEMAND QUEST FOR A WORLD TRULY AT PEACE

(By Ambassador George Bush)

United Nations.—Plato put it this way—"The only thing permanent is change."

And Justice Holmes wrote—"Behind every scheme to make the world over lies the question, what kind of world do you want?"

In my view, these two quotes encompass the very natures of the immensely important and challenging issues confronting member nations at the 26th General Assembly starting Tuesday.

We hear much today about change. In the fall of '71, more than ever, issues will be brought before the General Assembly that demand flexibility, that demand a United Nations that is responsive to constructive change, that demand a United Nations that is willing to look ahead in its quest for a world truly at peace. And that's exactly my answer to the question in Justice Holmes' quote—what kind of world do you want—or, for now, what kind of United Nations do you want? Flexible, responsive, realistic—that's the kind of United Nations I want—that I think all Americans want and deserve.

Here are some of the issues that will challenge the United States this fall:

China: The U.S. has enunciated a new policy on China at the U.N. It is a realistic policy and a simple policy. If it's successful, it will represent a significant step in helping shape the U.N. into a much more represen-

tative body. What we hope to accomplish at the General Assembly is to have the U.N. accommodate two realities—the People's Republic of China (Peking) and the Republic of China (Nationalist China), without prejudicing either's claims. This does not represent a "two China" policy as has been erroneously reported.

Our policy offers representation to the People's Republic of China, but also seeks to prevent the expulsion from the U.N. of the Republic of China, our friend and ally of long standing. It points up the importance of their continued representation in the U.N. Importantly, our policy, unlike the Albanian resolution, avoids the dangerous precedent of expulsion of a member.

The Republic of China is bigger than 92 other countries represented in the United Nations. Indeed, a dues paying and important member, playing a useful role in a variety of ways. The Republic of China represents a large number of people and we want to see them stay there. We want to see the General Assembly on record as favoring their retention and we will be battling every moment to achieve this goal.

On the other side of this issue, the President is determined in his effort to communicate effectively with another reality, a very large reality—the People's Republic of China, U.N. representation for that reality will be an important move in this direction.

The fact is that President Nixon has made a bold reappraisal of our China policy. This move has the support of the American people. Through this U.N. policy we are not promising a millennium. We simply face up to a fact: the People's Republic of China is there. Within the context of our commitment to freedom and to peace, what are we going to do about it?

The answer is the U.N. offers representation to the People's Republic of China and at the same time refuses to kick out the Republic of China.

Middle East: While the China question will certainly be a focal point for world attention, the Middle East will be the subject both of behind-the-scenes discussions and perhaps public debate in the Security Council or the General Assembly.

The U.S. remains convinced that Security Council Resolution 242 remains the best foundation on which to build a just and lasting peace in the Middle East. For the past several months attention has been focused on efforts to achieve an interim agreement on reopening the Suez Canal. The U.S., at the request of Israel and the UAR, has been actively seeking to promote such an agreement. While problems remain, we believe the door to an interim agreement on the canal is still open and we are cautiously hopeful progress on this front will be made. In the event an interim agreement on the canal is made, we consider that this will materially contribute to efforts to bring about an overall settlement.

When it comes to the Middle East, the U.S. believes quiet diplomacy offers the best prospect for success rather than heated debates in the Security Council and General Assembly.

While we are continuing our quiet diplomatic efforts, our basic position remains unchanged. That is, we support Security Council Resolution 242, including the efforts of Ambassador Jarring, and we adhere to the policy set forth in the secretary of state's speech of Dec. 9, 1969, and the President's foreign policy report to Congress, Feb. 25, 1971.

India-Pakistan: During the General Assembly, there will be discussion of the report of the U.N. High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR). This year major attention will be focused on the activities of the UNHCR in assisting refugees from East Pakistan. Here exists a situation in which the U.N. and the secretary can help dramatically

in organizing and planning relief activities both in India and in East Pakistan. Our government will continue to support the Secretary general and the entire U.N. system in these efforts.

CRIME IN TOKYO

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 6, 1971

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, following is the text of the New York Times article on crime in Tokyo which I referred to in my remarks on the floor of the House today:

CRIME IN TOKYO A MINOR PROBLEM
(By Richard Halloran)

TOKYO, Oct. 2.—The Japanese National Police obtained a warrant this week for the arrest of a rightist leader who mailed to Premier Eisaku Sato a pistol, 175 cartridges, and a note demanding that he shoot himself for falling to crack down on leftist radicals.

But the charge against Masamoto Yoshinga was not that of threatening the Premier. Rather, the warrant was for illegal possession of firearms in violation of Japan's gun control laws.

About the same time, narcotics control officers arrested six Americans, including an Air Force captain, and a Japanese woman for trafficking in hashish around Tachikawa Air Force Base outside of Tokyo.

The police began watching the alleged drug ring, officials said, about two months ago and stepped in this week to nab Capt. Richard J. Scotti, a medical officer at the base, and his associates.

The two events were reflections of the effective enforcement of this nation's strict gun control and narcotics control laws, both of which Tokyo Metropolitan Police officials believe to be among the major reasons for the relatively low crime rate in this city.

THREE DIE BY HANDGUNS IN YEAR

One day not long ago a Metropolitan Police official ran his finger across a page of crime statistics.

"Ah, yes. Here it is. We had three people murdered here with handguns last year. One was killed by a gangster, another by an ordinary citizen, and the third by a juvenile gangster."

He looked up and chuckled at the incredulous look on his visitor's face. Of the 11,398,801 people in Tokyo, the world's largest city, only three were killed with pistols in an entire year.

During the same year in New York City, 538 persons were murdered with handguns.

Other figures on crime in Tokyo were equally startling to an American. The total number of murders here last year was 213, compared with 1,117 in New York, whose population in 1970 was 7,895,563, 30 per cent less than Tokyo's.

The largest number of slayings, 69, in Tokyo were committed by adults with kitchen knives, razors, and similar weapons that, in many cases, were at hand when a violent argument broke out. Eighteen were committed by gangsters and six by juveniles with similar weapons.

ROBBERIES TOTAL 474

There were 474 robberies here last year, compared with 74,102 in New York City. Tokyo records show 7,268 assaults, New York's, 18,410. There were 500 victims of rape here, 2,141 in New York. The number of narcotics cases here was 292. In New York it was 52,479.

The rate of crime in Tokyo, however, grew faster than the population. Crime was up 5 per cent in 1970 over 1969, while the number of people living in the city increased only 1 per cent. The biggest single category of crime was fraud, of which there were 9,397 cases, a 20 per cent rise over the year before.

Police officials here are confident that their statistics are accurate. There is no reason to doubt them since the Japanese keep perhaps the most complete statistics in the world.

If one searched long enough, he could probably find out how many left-handed barbers here were born between 1 and 5 p.m. on Sundays in any given year.

The only exception, the police officials said, might be in the figures on rape. As in the United States, an unknown number of rape victims may not report to the police out of embarrassment.

PORTS ARE WATCHED CAREFULLY

It is illegal for any resident of Japan to own a handgun. Only the armed forces, the police, ballistics researchers, and sporting marksmen may have pistols—and the use of those is carefully regulated. The police officials said they thought the absence of handguns was particularly important in keeping the murder and robbery rate down.

Moreover, seaports and airports are closely watched to insure that handguns are not smuggled in.

Unlike the United States, there is no question of a citizen's right to bear arms here. In earlier days, only the samurai warriors who up about 5 per cent of the population were permitted to carry swords. That tradition has passed over into modern times without protest.

A second reason for the low crime rate seemed to be strict controls over narcotics, which are illegal except for medical use. In addition to the police, the Ministry of Welfare has special narcotics force.

Particular attention is given the prevention of narcotics smuggling. The narcotics control forces maintain extensive networks of informants, especially in Yokohama, the great port down the bay from Tokyo, and in Kobe, the major port in central Japan on the Inland Sea.

PIRATES WIN NATIONAL LEAGUE PENNANT

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 6, 1971

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I proudly take the floor to tell my colleagues that the Pittsburgh Pirates today won the National League pennant by beating the San Francisco Giants, 9 to 5.

The Pirates combined good pitching with lusty hitting, as they have done all year, to beat the Giants today.

Now it is on to Baltimore and the world's series, starting Saturday. I know the Pirates will play the brand of ball befitting the champions of the National League.

I am sure that Pirate fans everywhere are as proud of that team as I.

The Bucs have thrilled and delighted Pittsburghers the entire year and they deserved their shot at the world crown. Good luck Pirates.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL EXTENDS A HAND TO SOVIET JEWS

HON. EDWARD I. KOCH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 6, 1971

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, Jews around the world have won one battle in the struggle to ease the plight of Soviet Jews. For many months, I and many others have been attempting to have the United States make it absolutely clear that we are willing to accept any Soviet Jews allowed to emigrate. Now, in a major shift of policy, the Nixon administration has unequivocally stated that it will act to admit Soviet Jews into the United States if and when they are allowed to leave the Soviet Union.

In a letter dated September 30, sent to Congressman EMANUEL CELLER, chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, Attorney General John Mitchell said:

The mounting evidence that Soviet Jews have unsuccessfully sought permission to emigrate from the Soviet Union has compelled a Departmental reexamination of the Attorney General's parole authority with respect to refugees. . . . Accordingly, I can assure you that I would exercise my discretion if the situation demanded and parole Soviet Jews who are able to leave the Soviet Union.

Great credit for our success in getting this commitment from the Attorney General must go to Chairman EMANUEL CELLER of the House Judiciary Committee, House Minority Leader GERALD FORD and Immigration Subcommittee Chairman PETER W. RODINO, Jr. The thousands of Jews and non-Jews in this country concerned about the plight of Soviet Jews surely share my gratitude toward these men.

The willingness of our Government to state now that we are ready to accept Soviet Jews recognizes that the special harassment to which Soviet Jews are subjected requires special attention at this time. Our attitude is a challenge to the Soviet to permit emigration and an example of moral persuasion to other countries. Prior to the Attorney General's letter, the problem for all concerned was not only to persuade the Soviet Union to allow the emigration of Jews, but also to secure from this country a guarantee that Jews could enter if they wished. Now that the latter has been done, we must press even harder than before to force the Soviet Government through world public opinion to allow the Jews to leave—to reunite with their families, wherever they might be, or to go to Israel, the Jewish homeland.

The Attorney General may grant entry under parole status when no visas are available, as would be the case for Jews allowed out of the Soviet Union. In the past, Cuban, Czech, and Hungarian refugees have been allowed to enter in this fashion.

However, the administration—for a long time—has balked at making a commitment to use this executive parole authority and that is why in March of this year I introduced a bill, H.R. 5606, that would provide 30,000 nonquota refugee

visas for Soviet Jews. Given the administration's earlier reluctance, I introduced this bill so that the Congress could invoke its primary authority in this area and do by law what the executive branch refused to do administratively—to welcome Soviet Jews. Although my bill has 123 cosponsors in the House, I will not now press for passage of the bill, for the Attorney General's letter is an unequivocal statement that has the same effect that passage of the bill would have with one favorable addition—that no limitation is placed on the number of Jews who will be allowed to come into this country.

This change of policy is extremely gratifying to me, for it is one I have sought with much labor. Shortly after the introduction of my bill, I went to the Soviet Union—at the request of constituents—to see for myself how Jews were treated. I spoke to many Jews including the wives of Lassal Kaminsky and Lev Yagman who were then awaiting trial in the Leningrad jail and later sentenced to 5 years' imprisonment. I spoke to Soviet officials about their policy as well. During my trip, I saw firsthand the persecution of Soviet Jews; I saw their fear, but most memorably their extraordinary courage and their hope for a better way of life.

After my return, I implored the executive branch to indicate this country's willingness to accept Soviet Jews. I am grateful to Attorney General John Mitchell for his action. It is particularly fitting that his announcement came on the eve of the Succoth holiday, a joyous festival for the Jewish people around the world.

Two other Members of the House who did an enormous amount of work in pressing this legislation whom I want especially to thank are SIDNEY YATES and ABNER MIKVA, both of Chicago.

While our country's action cannot, by itself, ease the plight of Soviet Jewry—it is a strong moral incentive toward that end, and, most important, it is a step that shows the hopes of Soviet Jews will not be in vain.

WOMEN IN MEDICINE

HON. MARGARET M. HECKLER

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 6, 1971

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the role of a woman in American life, as our discussion of the equal rights for men and women amendment demonstrates, has come to occupy an increasingly significant amount of attention throughout the Nation, and, in view of the great interest in the role of women in modern society, I am pleased to incorporate in my remarks a perceptive and timely series of articles which appeared in the Boston University Medical Center magazine *Centerscope* for July-August of 1971 concerning the role of women in medicine. These thoughtful and provocative columns are of particular value, beyond the insight they afford into the ca-

pabilities of women for a meaningful role in modern life, for the important implicit considerations they suggest as to the promise of women doctors and paraprofessional specialists in meeting the growing crisis in health manpower personnel.

The articles follow:

WOMEN IN THE BUSM—A BRIEF HISTORY

(By Dorothy Campbell Keefer)

Boston University School of Medicine is the successor medical institution of the New England Female Medical College and graduated its first class in 1874. Of the five graduates in this class, two were women.

For the past 97 years, the School has admitted women on the same basis as men and every class has graduated women even when the graduating classes were small and contained fewer than 20 students.

The admission to our medical schools and the education of women for the practice of medicine in the United States and the world have always reflected the attitude and culture of the society of the times.

In Philadelphia, in 1762, an attempt was made to found a school for midwives, but no woman applied for admission.

It was not until November 1, 1848, that the first institution in the United States for teaching medical subjects to women was created. This institution was named the *Boston Female Medical College*. The title was changed to the *New England Female Medical College* in November, 1851. The year that the Boston Female Medical College opened its doors a national convention for women's rights was held in Philadelphia where one of the several principles advocated was the right of women to enter the professions of law, medicine and the ministry.

Elizabeth Blackwell, the first woman medical school graduate in the United States applied to four medical colleges in Philadelphia and 12 other colleges before she was admitted to the Geneva Medical College in November, 1847. This fact in itself is significant but it also reflected public attitude and public opinion about the admission of women to colleges for the preparation of medicine.

Perhaps of equal significance is the fact that *Miss Blackwell was finally admitted by a vote of the student body, 150 strong, and not by a vote of the faculty or the trustees.*

Following admission, she performed admirably and received her degree at the top of her class.

Although little notice was taken of Miss Blackwell's admission to medical school, her graduation in January, 1849, was given extensive publicity in the newspapers and by the advocates of women's rights.

It still was not until 1950—more than a century later—that all medical schools admitted women on an equal basis with men.

In contrast to Dr. Blackwell's "press," little notice was taken of the graduation of Mrs. Rebecca Lee of Boston from the New England Female Medical College on March 1, 1864—although she was a Black and the first woman of her race to receive a medical degree in the United States. This was another "first" for the School.

Still another "first" is attributed to a former faculty member of the New England Female Medical College, Dr. Marie Elizabeth Zakrzewska, Professor of Obstetrics and Diseases of Women and Children from 1859 to 1862. She founded (with Dr. Elizabeth Blackwell and her sister Dr. Emily Blackwell) the first hospital for women and children in the United States in 1857, and in 1862 founded the New England Hospital for Women and Children, the second oldest hospital of its kind in this country.

Thus, it may be seen that the history of Boston University School of Medicine is an integral part of the history of women in medicine in the United States.

WOMEN IN THE FEMALE MEDICAL COLLEGE

(By Elizabeth Moyer, Ph.D.)

It fell apart when the 58-year-old Dr. Samuel Gregory died on March 23, 1872!

The Trustees of the New England Female Medical College met on April 2 to decide what they could do. There was a mortgage of \$27,000 on the still very new college building which had welcomed its first classes in November of 1870. And the Trustees had lost their money raiser, Dr. Samuel Gregory who, in 1848, had founded the College, as the New England Female Medical Education Society and had been secretary of its governing body from 1848 until his death.

The Trustees decided to solve their financial problem by negotiating at once to affiliate the College with the Massachusetts Homeopathic Hospital which (thanks to the Ladies) had just completed a very successful fair on Boston Common which netted \$76,000.

At the same time Boston University was making arrangements to establish a medical school with the Massachusetts Homeopathic Hospital. In 1873, there appeared the 25th (and last) catalogue of the New England Female Medical College and the first catalogue of the Boston University School of Medicine.

In 1874, the two schools were united by an Enabling Act of Massachusetts legislature, which marked the end of the New England Female Medical College and its yearly reports of the Trustees as part of the school catalogue.

The vivid, careful descriptions in the reports by Samuel Gregory form a history of the New England Female Medical College from the time the lectures were held in a private house on Franklin street until the opening of the new college building on Concord street in November, 1870. They furnish a basis for determining how much responsibility was exercised by women in the developing institution.

The founding fathers (Incorporators of 1850 were Timothy Gilbert, William Bowditch and Samuel Gregory) clearly state in Article I of the Constitution that the object of the Society was: "to provide for and promote the education of Midwives, Nurses and Female Physicians and to diffuse among women generally a knowledge of physiology and the principles and means of preserving and restoring health."

Men or women could join the Society by paying a dollar, or become a life member for twenty dollars. Their dues produced a working capital. The members, numbering 3,000 in 1851, had the right to visit the school, look at the anatomical apparatus or consult its registry of nurses.

Governing the Society, which was to become the college in 1856, were men: a President, Treasurer, Secretary, and seven directors. The constitution provided for seven directresses; the directors were to appoint them and supervise their activities. At first, there were no directresses because they were not needed until a hospital was added, when their responsibilities were to assist in conducting the internal affairs of the hospital, select the patients, collect the funds, cooperate with the directors, and send reports of meetings to the directors.

From 1859 to 1862, the college maintained a hospital on Springfield street. It had paid the City of Boston \$5,000 toward this purchase, but could not complete the payments. (The Civil War was at its height). "The occupancy of the building enabled the Trustees to try the experiment of a hospital branch, which they discontinued at the end of three years" is the way Gregory described the unsuccessful expansion.

With the loss of the hospital, the directresses (now called lady managers) were not needed and thus, not reappointed.

The faculty of the Female Medical College numbered two in 1848, and from then until

1872 consisted of six or seven persons. As early as 1852, the Demonstrator of Anatomy was a female M.D. In 1859, women held the posts of Professor of Obstetrics and the Diseases of Women and Children, Professor in Physiology and Hygiene, and Demonstrator of Anatomy. In 1862, there were three women and one man, and in 1864, there were four women and two men on the faculty. During these same years, a woman was Dean of the Faculty. (Women seemed to be taking over; the men were busy with the Civil War.) In 1870, the faculty numbered two women and four men. The Professor of Medicine, Materia medica, Therapeutics and Chemistry and of Principles and Practice of Surgery were men. The Professors of Physiology and Hygiene, Anatomy and of Obstetrics were more often women. A man was Professor of Obstetrics in 1863 and in 1869. For some reason, the Demonstrator in Anatomy was always a woman until 1873, when a man was appointed to that post and a woman served as assistant Demonstrator. In that same year, the last for the New England Female Medical College and the first for Boston University School of Medicine, the faculty had grown to 26 in number: 23 men and three women. The Anatomy, Professor of Diseases of Women and Professor of Diseases of Children.

Dr. Gregory worked hard to have professorships endowed, so that tuition would be less important. In the Eighth Annual Report he reported that Mrs. Waterhouse had given \$1,000 toward endowing the first Professorship, to be in Anatomy. "Dr. Waterhouse was accustomed to speak of the necessity and importance of having women in the medical profession, not as practitioners in some special branch merely, but as physicians". (When she asked what would be a suitable endowment for a professorship, the sum of \$10,000 was decided satisfactory by the Trustees, and in 1864, Mrs. Waterhouse left \$9,000 to the College to be added to the thousand dollars she had given in 1857.)

In 1865 Doctress Frances Cooke was the first Waterhouse Professor of Anatomy.

All the students were women. Some took courses to satisfy their curiosity, some were nurses improving their knowledge, and some studied to become medical doctors. At least 90 M.D.'s were produced during the years of the N. E. Female Medical College.

In the entering class of the Boston University School of Medicine in 1873-74, of the 43 students twenty were women.

THE WOMAN AS MEDICAL STUDENT
(By Felicia Liu, BUSM 1973 and Alice Rothchild, BUSM, 1974)

This will be a discussion of our personal experience preparing for and entering medical school.

In examining reports by other investigators of "women in medicine" we have found that our experiences are by no means unique! Therefore, we shall cite evidence from other authors. (A reference bibliography appears at the end of this article.)

In retrospect we realize that in the process of growing up we felt numerous pressures that did much to discourage us from entering a male dominated profession such as medicine—or at best made the decision a very ambivalent one. We see that society's expectations for an intelligent woman are very contradictory; she is praised and supported for good academic performance in school, for superior drive and motivation, and at the same time discouraged from pursuing a career like medicine which requires just these qualities.

We find, looking back, that adults encouraged us until we entered college and it became apparent we really meant to become doctors. The discouragement then became very subtle and consequently more insidious and harder to cope with. Premedical advisors reminded us that to succeed we would

have to be "superwomen." Peers expressed anything from fear at having us as competitors to ridicule at our naive aspirations. Interviewers always asked us our marital plans. Now at medical school we find that we have to face the daily irritation of having to deal with male medical students who do not take our presence or our futures seriously.

While we were growing up, and today as medical students, we realize that the traditional expectations for women are often barriers. The public media and its observation of adult occupations soon taught us that women were expected to enter those fields that reinforced the characteristics defined by the role of mother, i.e., one-third of all professional women are nurses, one-third are teachers (1).

We also began to sense that our peers, primarily boys, were very threatened by an intelligent, highly motivated girl. It was discouraging to watch our female friends, as early as sixth grade, weighing the odds and choosing popularity over high grades, thus internalizing society's definitions of womanhood and femininity. A study has shown that in a review of intellectual differences between female and male children, none were found until high school. (If anything the girls did better.) However, once in high school, the girls began to do worse on a few intellectual tasks such as arithmetic reasoning. Given the fact that previous tests had established that the girls were of similar ability to the boys, these differences in performance can only be seen as the fulfillment of society's expectations (2). As Margaret Mead has noted, "in our culture boys are unsexed by failure, girls by success" (1).

An examination of parental attitudes has indicated that while 15 per cent of girls' fathers were opposed to their desire to study medicine, 47 per cent of the mothers were against their decision (3).

So in addition to the barriers of social and cultural expectations, there is a serious lack of appropriate role models and support from other women. The importance of models for career choice is indicated by the fact that 15 per cent of women medical students are daughters of professionals, while only 5 per cent of the men have mothers who are professionals (3). It was also found that women tend to choose medicine for primarily abstract reasons, (i.e., humanitarian, inspiration from reading, etc.), or personal experience with illness, rather than because of a desire to be like someone (3).

Having made the decision to enter medicine, we found that as women we were faced with additional difficulties over and above the already fierce competition for places. Our medical school interviewers, with their frequent probing into motives, marital plans, and the usual reminder that women have to make great social sacrifices as medical students, were very discouraging. We soon sensed that we were not being interviewed as individuals. How many male applicants were asked similar questions? Interviewers assume that a woman with marital plans is a greater risk. However, a recent study has shown that marital status bears no relationship to the completion of medical studies. We began to feel that the interviewer was often merely testing his preconceived notions about women doctors rather than listening to our replies:

"The ability of the woman candidate to convince the admissions officer sitting across from her in the interview that she is feminine but strong, dedicated but healthy in her needs, and intelligent but not boorish or domineering, depends probably in the end on some very basic and nonverbal transactions: did the officer like her, did he feel that he could get along with her in a work situation, or at least that she would not aggravate him?" (3).

The percentage of female to male applicants to medical school has increased over the years (from 1920—3.5 percent to 1964—9.5 per cent (4)). However, in examining the present four classes at our own medical school, we see no such trend. 1971 has 11 percent women; 1972—9 per cent; 1973—13 per cent; 1974—10 per cent (5).

A disproportionate number of women are in the six year medical school program—1971-25%; 1972-21%; 1973-28%; 1974-25%. (5). The difference in the percentage of women in the four and six year programs is undoubtedly a reflection of the number of women who are discouraged by the socialization process that occurs while they are in college. A recent study showed that one-third of the high school National Merit Scholars interested in medicine were women. However, by the time the National Merit Scholars applied to medical school, less than 8 per cent of the applicants were women (6). Another important fact is that from 1940 to 1965 the number of women applying to medical school nearly tripled while the number of men rose by only 50 per cent. The number of women accepted also rose, but not in proportion to the rise in applications (1).

In a recent discussion with an officer of an internship selection committee we were told that women applicants were primarily compared against each other rather than against the entire applicant pool because having more than a few women interns was not considered desirable or good for the prestige of the department. (We suspect that similar discriminatory admissions policies exist also at the medical school level.)

At BUSM we have been distressed by the kinds of interactions that occur between women medical students and their male classmates and male doctor-instructors, especially because these same men will be treating female patients and will probably also be relating to a wife and daughters. The interactions that we find destructive are frequently unimportant in themselves, but they reflect a larger socialization process that has serious consequences for human relations. For example: the dissection partner who has difficulty letting you (as a "girl") do any of the dissecting; the cardiologist who continuously refers to the women in his physical diagnosis class as future pediatricians (even after they have informed him differently); the gynecologist who has the gall to inform the women in the class that they shouldn't be in medical school (they should be home having babies); the doctor who announces to the class, "Today we will pick on the girls; after all, ladies first."

There are so many daily oppressive moments: the male medical student who prefers a female medical student as a subject in physical diagnosis and yet is unable to treat her with the appropriate professional attitude; the doctor who comes in and begins his lecture, "My, we have some lovely young ladies here . . ." or even worse, the doctor who will only address the class as "men . . ." the student wives whose photographs are captioned "an extremely decorative assembly . . . experts in the area of pastry making . . ." (7), rather than as intelligent young women.

But most depressing are the everyday jokes and comments by our classmates, comments that only serve to show how greatly they misunderstand and misperceive women, comments that are so often reinforced by the doctors who teach us. A recent survey of doctors asked if they felt there was any discrimination towards women in medicine. The following remarks were elicited: "I dislike female doctors of either sex. [sic] . . . Women MD's irk me, though some are good doctors . . . A silly question. Women were created to be wives . . . I'm glad my daughter isn't neurotic enough to want to be a doctor (6). We can only wonder

what kinds of role models these doctors provide.

We have found that there are many things that are particularly oppressive to women as they work towards becoming doctors. Students now, we find it disheartening to look into the future and see that the same men who do not want to accept women—because they do not engage in practice as much as men while they are raising children—also support very rigid residency programs that are almost impossible for many young mothers; that the interviewers who doubt a woman's motives for a medical education also create a system where virtually no woman is allowed to become a department head or dean, or to enjoy the same salary as her male counterparts; that the women doctors who do choose to spend the majority of their child-rearing years in practice are then frowned upon for being bad mothers.

In short, the inflexibilities of the present medical system and the cultural expectations of America are such that a woman will always find it more difficult than a man to do that for which they are equally qualified.

We feel very strongly that this situation will change only if alternative solutions are developed. Such solutions must involve very basic redefinitions of the appropriate behavior and expectations for women and men. There must be changes in the ways in which men and women learn to relate to each other, and equally important, a serious restructuring of the medical system. We often feel closer ties to the women who make up 80 per cent of the health care work force than to the doctors who dominate it; for it is with these women that we share the common experience of struggling with and defining ourselves within the health system.

REFERENCES AND BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. *The Fuller Utilization of the Woman Physician*, President's Study Group on Careers for Women, U.S. Department of Labor, Washington, D.C.
2. Weinstein, N., "Kinde, Kuche, Kirche as Scientific Law," New England Free Press.
3. Lopate, C., *Women in Medicine*, Johns Hopkins Press, Baltimore, Maryland, 1968.
4. "Datagram," *Journal of Medical Education*, 41: 184-185.
5. "School of Medicine—Boston University Bulletin," 1971-1972.
6. Phelps, C. E., "Women in American Medicine," *Journal of Medical Education*, 43: 916-924.
7. "Front and Center," October, 1970.
8. Dykman, R. A., Stalnaker, J. M., "Survey of Women Physicians Graduating from Medical School 1925-1940," *Journal of Medical Education*, 32:3-4.
9. Kaplan, H. I., "Women Physicians: The More Effective Recruitment and Utilization of Their Talents and the Resistance to It—The Final Conclusions of a Seven Year Study," *The Woman Physician*, September, 1970, 25: 561-570.
10. Powers, L., Parmelle, R., Wiesenfelder, H., "Practice Patterns of Women and Men Physicians," *Journal of Medical Education*, 44:481-485.
11. Stritter, F. T., Hutton, J. G., Dube, W. F., "Study of U.S. Medical School Applicants, 1968-1969," *Journal of Medical Education*, 45:195-200.

WOMEN INTERNS AND RESIDENTS

(By Leah M. Lowenstein, M.D., D.Phil.)

Women physicians now account for 8% of all doctors in the United States; they will soon constitute 10 to 15%. Medical schools are now accepting greater numbers of women in their classes than ever before, and in some Boston medical schools 20% are women.

Although women are now able to enjoy good medical school training, definite problems exist in the post-graduate training of women doctors, during internship and residency.

Some of these problems are posed by the hospitals. Many excellent internship services do not select women interns. This reluctance arises from several reasons. One is that women on an intern staff, like foreigners, are considered a detraction to prestige and a sign of failure to attract men. Many hospitals feel that women do not have the stamina to survive an internship or that they are not serious about medicine. Finally, many chiefs of departments are afraid that women interns may not finish internship because of pregnancy. (The interview of a BUSM IV student for an internship at a Boston University teaching hospital last year included detailed questions about her methods of contraception, rather than her plans for a career and her goals as a physician; this hospital has not had a woman intern for years.)

Some of these concerns are valid; others are ephemeral. The "diminished prestige" suffered by a service that admits women will be lessened over the years as more and more women graduate from excellent medical schools; but this statement is difficult to reconcile with an internship service that is concerned about its "public relations image."

Fears about a woman lacking the stamina for an internship at a hustling teaching hospital are not justified. The internship is the most stressful year of all (for a man or woman physician) with its long hours, inflexible schedule, continual demand for critical decisions, and restriction on outside activities. There have been no studies on the comparative ability of men and women to survive these rigors. But classic studies of the stamina of women under situations of stress (during World War II London bombings and concentration camps and I suppose our internships have a little of both situations) have indicated that they survive such stress better than men. However, both men and women find themselves exhausted and exhilarated by internships; and if both are devoted they are quickly involved in the intensity of the internship.

The women interns at Boston City Hospital I've spoken to enjoyed their year. They found it intense, tiring, immensely worthwhile—"the best year of my life," said one. None mentioned any disadvantage encountered as women.

Possible pregnancy is listed by hospitals as a major deterrent for accepting women. The number of women who do become pregnant during their internship is probably small since this year is such a critical one in their training. The number is also small compared to the number of men who leave their internship suddenly for emotional reasons. If we add the number of men who have to leave in the middle of their residency training because of their being drafted, women become much more "permanent trainees" than men.

During the residency period however, problems arise for a woman who wants to start a family and pursue her training. Some women avoid this problem by postponing children until after training. Of physicians graduating in 1968, 80% of all men and 63% of all women were married by the end of their residency training. It is during this period that opportunities to acquire post-graduate training in addition to raising a family is of importance. This means that the residency program needs to be made more flexible for mothers.

Unfortunately, many post-graduate training programs have rigid full-time requirements. Training programs awarded by the National Institutes of Health are only awarded on a full-time basis. Specialty boards in general do not recognize training on a part-time basis and part-time career positions are often not given adequate status. The most popular fields for women are psychiatry, pediatrics, internal medicine, anesthesiology, and pathology. Because of the popularity of the first two fields with women,

the American Board of Psychiatry and Neurology and occasionally the Board of Pediatrics gives credit for less than full-time residencies.

Internal medicine and anesthesiology are the other two most popular fields, and the possibility of these boards accepting less than full-time residencies in these fields is extremely important.

On a final practical note, in a recent survey by the American Medical Women's Association, the major problem of women doctors, both in and out of training, had nothing to do with their acceptance into this or that internship or residency program—but with obtaining household help! This was summarized by one woman doctor who said that all the other problems in her career were miniscule by comparison. The problem has been recently intensified by immigration service regulations for overseas help. The high expense of housekeepers is not tax deductible. A solution to this problem would provide the country with an instantaneous increase in the number of practicing doctors virtually equal to the building of ten new medical schools.

91% of the women physicians in the United States are practicing medicine; half of these full-time, the rest part-time. The highest prevalence of part-time activity is among physicians who still have small children but who have difficulty in finding good child-care centers or domestic assistance so that they feel secure enough to return to work.

The BUSM, with its high percentage of women in medical school classes, could make a very real contribution to solving the problems of women in medicine and thereby increase the number of physicians practicing in this country. Model child-care centers could be established here. Training programs could be set up for professional homemakers to take over household management. The internship programs could lead the way by showing no prejudice against the appointing of women as interns. Residencies could be constructed with flexible schedules (e.g. ten months on, two months summer vacation off).

The BUSM could be the leader among medical schools in ensuring that its women graduates obtain good internships and flexible residencies, and the opportunity to become full-time active physicians.

NEW HOPE FOR SOVIET JEWRY

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 6, 1971

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I welcome the recent shift in policy by the Nixon administration, which now says it will admit into this country those Jews who are permitted to leave the Soviet Union. This is a great victory for those of us who have been working to extend to these beleaguered people the hope and haven America has symbolized for oppressed persons for nearly two centuries.

This major policy shift is long overdue. I can only hope that it signals other concrete steps which the administration will take to help end the decades of persecution, ill treatment and denial of human rights under which Soviet Jewry has suffered.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Europe of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, I wish to announce that I will very soon resume hearings begun last

spring on the denial of human rights to Jews in the Soviet Union.

Our hearings in May revealed the suffering of a people forbidden to teach or fully practice their religion, a people kept virtual prisoners in the Soviet Union, unable to emigrate to the land of their choice—all in contravention of the United Nations Charter, the U.N. Declaration of Human Rights and, indeed, Soviet law itself.

The focus of these new hearings will be the Anderson-O'Neill resolution, sponsored by more than 100 Congressmen from both parties, urging the State Department to raise the issue in the U.N. General Assembly of the Soviet violation of the Declaration of Human Rights. It also requests the President to demand of the Soviet Government that it permit Jews and all other citizens to emigrate freely.

In recent days there have been indications out of the Soviet Union that the glare of adverse world publicity over that government's treatment of its Jewish citizens may be having some effect. This, hopefully, will result in removal of some barriers to Jewish emigration from Russia.

I applaud the courage of those prominent Soviet citizens who could no longer ignore the constant injustices they witnessed and have publicly expressed their abhorrence of the official policy.

Perhaps it is too much to hope that hearings and protests will overnight work a change in years of calculated harassment and persecution, but I do know that we must continue to avail ourselves of whatever methods of influence we have at our disposal until this blot on the freedom of all the world's peoples is erased.

JOHN BELL WILLIAMS AND CHARLES B. RYAN HONORED FOR SERVICE TO THE HANDICAPPED

HON. CHARLES H. GRIFFIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 6, 1971

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, I want to bring to the attention of our colleagues the achievement of two outstanding Mississippians in their efforts to help handicapped persons help themselves.

On Monday, September 28, 1971, industrialist Charles B. Ryan and Gov. John Bell Williams were presented Distinguished Service Awards for their work in this direction.

Mr. Ryan, one of Mississippi's premier industrialists, is now president of MPI Industries and has for years worked to assure that handicapped persons had ample opportunity for employment with companies in which he was associated. He has also been serving as the chairman of the Governor's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped under two Governors.

John Bell Williams, as you know, is presently Governor of Mississippi and is a former Member of this body. He has worked tirelessly and diligently to secure proper training and rehabilitation pro-

grams for the handicapped, through the years, as well as various other efforts designed to give handicapped persons an equal shot at employment and a rich, fulfilling life.

At this point, I include an article in the Jackson, Miss., Clarion-Ledger of September 28, 1971, giving a full account of their activities in behalf of the handicapped:

GOVERNOR WILLIAMS AND C. B. RYAN GIVEN SERVICE AWARDS

(By Charles Hills, Jr.)

Gov. John Bell Williams and industrialist Charles B. Ryan were presented Distinguished Service Awards here Monday for their efforts in helping Mississippi's handicapped persons find productive jobs.

The presentations were made by Harold Russell, a nationally-known handless individual, who heads two private companies and serves as chairman of the President's Committee for Employment of the Handicapped.

The program at Northgate Restaurant was the key feature of Mississippi Hire the Handicapped Week.

Also participating in the program was Dr. Frank Cotton, head of the Department of Industrial Engineering at Mississippi State University, who outlined what is being done in Mississippi to employ the mentally and physically restored in compatible jobs.

Russell, who lost both hands in a war-time training accident in the Army, said the state of Mississippi has made "fantastic" progress with its rehabilitation program. He said he was greatly impressed.

Since it is still difficult for handicapped persons to get jobs, Russell said the best "hope" lies in "educating" the employer—showing the employer that the handicapped can do the job, and getting the right quality of training to handicapped people.

"Most times," he said, "a handicapped person will try harder. Most of them have the determination to do a good job. They have enthusiasm and faith."

Ryan, who is president of MPI Industries Division of DeSoto, Inc., Jackson, and chairman of the Governor's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped, was given a special service award for his outstanding work under two governors.

Russell said that Ryan's "tireless, selfless devotion to this cause has resulted in unparalleled benefits to handicapped persons, and through his dedicated efforts Mississippi is making great strides in hiring of the handicapped.

Williams, Russell said, has pushed development of training programs for the handicapped, and many Mississippi industries have begun handicapped hiring programs at his urging.

Approximately 250 persons attended the award luncheon and workshop. Included were a large number of industrial leaders who were present to learn how their companies can aid and participate in the handicapped person hiring program.

Sponsoring the program were: the Governor's Committee on the Employment of the Handicapped; the Association of Building Contractors; the Electric Power Association of Mississippi; Mid-Continent Oil and Gas Association; Mississippi Dairy Products Association; Mississippi Farm Bureau; Mississippi Hospital Association; Mississippi Retail Furniture Association; Mississippi Retail Merchants Association; Mississippi Road Builders Association; Mississippi State Medical Association; Mississippi Trucking Association; and the Mississippi Manufactures Association.

Williams, Russell noted, is a personal example of one who has overcome physical handicaps to attain the high positions of congressman and governor. He was injured in

a plane wreck in 1943 while flying a bomber to the war front in North Africa. Three years later, at the age of 27, Williams became the youngest congressman in Mississippi's history and served continuously until becoming governor in 1968.

Ryan is a native of Rochester, New York, who has been with the MPI Division of DeSoto Inc., and its predecessor companies since 1938, and has served as president of the Jackson plant since 1961. He has been most active in Jackson and Mississippi civic projects.

MAJOR URBAN CITIES SUFFER FINANCIAL CRISIS

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 6, 1971

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday, September 30, the mayor of Newark, the Honorable Kenneth A. Gibson, spoke before a meeting of the New Jersey congressional delegation. He eloquently described the plight of our major central cities as a spokesman on behalf of all cities that suffer a financial and urban crisis. His message of concern for the fate of welfare reform and revenue sharing received a very sympathetic ear and I would like to share with my colleagues Mayor Gibson's recent correspondence with the administration and his statement in behalf of the Legislative Action Committee of the U.S. Conference of Mayors:

NEWARK, N.J.,
August 17, 1971.

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

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The recent announcement of your new economic policy, which clearly points up the power and authority of the Chief Executive, has rightfully generated much immediate public response. The prospects of a generation of peace and prosperity must be the number one priority of all Americans.

I applaud the new direction you have taken in attempting to slow down inflation and increase employment. Decisive action against these two enormous problems could no longer be delayed.

I do question, however, some of the steps you have taken towards our common goal of economic stability. For, in a certain sense, the cities of America seem destined to bear the heaviest burdens of your new economic policy.

The high prices and unemployment which now afflict all Americans have existed chronically and with greater severity in our cities for the past decade. Any postponement of immediate and massive Federal action can only serve to insure these conditions in our urban centers for years to come.

Mr. President, the unemployment rate in Newark is now approximately 16%; while another 30% of our people are under employed. Our property tax is among the highest in the nation with the result that buildings are being abandoned at the rate of one a day. The poor who remain in Newark, approximately half the population of the city, are paying more and more for inferior goods.

In short, Newark is a ravaged economy.

It appears to me that none of the measures you have just taken will effectively cure this condition. In fact, some of your actions will definitely aggravate the already desperate problems of Newark and other troubled American cities.

Postponing revenue-sharing and welfare reform legislation further puts off the long delayed fundamental assistance that our cities must have in order to survive. Every delay makes survival an even more tenuous question.

In light of your desire "to reorder our budget priorities," I would hope that the 4.7 billion dollar cut in Federal spending will not come at the expense of the people who need assistance most. I hope the needs of the poor will not be postponed as those of the cities have been by your new economic policy. Our most precious national resource is the people, and any major decrease in Federal programs aimed at total human development will cause far greater damage to this country than the past decade of unemployment. The cut backs should only be made in those areas which are of secondary importance to the survival of this nation such as space exploration and wasteful military projects.

In short, Mr. President, I would hope that this price freeze and the other aspects of your new program could be aimed more at the battle to end the enduring problems of this economy and not so much at "freezing" the misery of the poor so that big business and the middle-class can regain their lost prosperity.

Unfortunately it seems that your policy will do no more than simply maintain the disparity of wealth which pervades the Newark of America. The citizen of Newark willingly stand ready to share the responsibility of stabilizing the economy but we must not become victims in the process.

Sincerely,

KENNETH A. GIBSON,
Mayor.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT
AND BUDGET,

Washington, D.C., September 24, 1971.

HON. KENNETH A. GIBSON,
Mayor of Newark, N.J.,
Newark, N.J.

DEAR MAYOR GIBSON: Thank you for your letter of August 17, to the President commenting on his New Economic Policy. I know the President is grateful for your support of his decisive move to restore the nation's economy to a course of non-inflationary growth and full employment.

In his speech before the joint session of Congress on September 9, the President emphasized the need for a strong and healthy economy and urged the Congress to pass his welfare reform and revenue sharing proposals in this session to "strengthen the health of [its] government institutions".

The announced delay in welfare reform and revenue sharing was a delay in implementation, not in enactment. The Congress' own delay in considering welfare reform and revenue sharing made later effective dates inevitable. The magnitude of the administrative challenge posed by welfare reform is without precedent—surpassing even that encountered in Medicare. The effective dates in H.R. 1 were recommended last January and are no longer administratively feasible.

As your letter suggests, the President's dramatic proposals were essential to moving the economy to full employment without inflation. The twin problems of inflation and unemployment, while hurting everyone, hit the poor especially hard.

To attack these problems, it was necessary to avoid an excessive deficit in the Federal budget. Thus, the President proposed reductions in Federal spending of \$5 billion. Included are \$1.6 billion due to the adjusted effective dates for the implementation of revenue sharing proposals and \$0.6 billion for delaying welfare reform implementation for one year. These programs could not have gone into effect on their previously scheduled effective dates even without the New Eco-

nomie Policy, since Congressional action was delayed.

In summary, let me emphasize that a successful New Economic Policy is essential to easing the plight of the poor and of fiscally-troubled cities. Enactment of the welfare reform and revenue sharing measures in this session of Congress is more important than ever—as the President said in his address of September 9. These measures will strengthen our Federal system and replace the present welfare system with a fairer one designed to enhance the dignity of its beneficiaries. Strong support from the nation's mayors at this time could do much to assure passage of both of these important initiatives. I hope that we may look forward to your support.

Sincerely,

GEORGE P. SHULTZ,
Director.

WELFARE REFORM

(Statement of Hon. Kenneth A. Gibson, Mayor, city of Newark, N. J., on behalf of the Legislative Action Committee of the U.S. Conference of Mayors, Boston, Mass., Sept. 23, 1971)

After months of delay by the U.S. Senate in acting on welfare reform, we were dismayed at the President's request for a one-year delay of welfare reform legislation. In light of the President's desire "to reorder budget priorities," I hope that the projected \$4.7 billion cut in federal spending will not come at the expense of the people who need assistance most. The long-delayed promise of national welfare reform is more urgently needed today than ever before.

While several years of debate have produced no major changes in the Federal welfare program, States have begun to act in negative and restrictive ways. Recent legislation in New Jersey and other States is aimed at reducing eligibility levels and benefits for already hard-pressed welfare recipients. These State actions increase the welfare burden which must be carried at the local level.

The deficiencies in the welfare system are clear:

(1) Benefit levels are too low to support individuals and families. Inadequate welfare payments almost guarantee a continuation of the present welfare syndrome.

(2) Welfare benefits, requirements, and financing in the 50 States vary widely. We treat a national problem as if it were 50 separate local problems.

(3) There are inadequate incentives for the family unit to remain together.

(4) There are inadequate incentives for able-bodied persons to seek employment.

These deficiencies will not be corrected without a federally administered and financed national welfare system—a system which must be designed to provide adequate maintenance support levels for all Americans in need. If our welfare system continues to be shaped by individual State actions in response to local tax and fiscal pressures, the result will be disaster for millions of poor Americans and for the cities in which they live.

The responsibility to reform the present inadequate welfare system rests at this moment with the Congress and particularly the Senate, where welfare reform legislation now is bogged-down in Committee. We urge the Administration and the Congress to recognize that our most precious national resource is our people. Postponement of national reform of our welfare system, at the same time that we allocate hundreds of millions of dollars for subsidies of alling corporations and idle farm-lands, would be a cruel and deceitful hoax for the Newarks of America.

Urban Americans stand ready to share the responsibility of stabilizing the economy, but we must not become victims in the process. We must not "freeze" the misery of the poor,

in the process of returning big business and the middle-class to their lost prosperity.

OIL AND WILDLIFE: A BIOLOGIST'S VIEW

HON. LES ASPIN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 6, 1971

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to place in the RECORD today a paper by Robert B. Weeden of the University of Alaska. Mr. Weeden is the former head of the State of Alaska Fish and Game Agency.

Those of my colleagues interested in the proposed trans-Alaska pipeline will, I believe, find Mr. Weeden's paper both informative and interesting.

His paper follows:

OIL AND WILDLIFE: A BIOLOGIST'S VIEW
(By Robert B. Weeden)

In this brief review of oil-wildlife relationships in Alaska, I will discuss three different questions:

Has contemporary Alaskan petroleum development caused serious wildlife problems?

Are important future problems likely, that will be directly attributable to the oil and gas industry?

As oil and gas development catalyzes economic and population growth in Alaska, what consequences to wildlife will result?

Most of the scanty literature on environmental effects of arctic and subarctic oil activities deals with the exploration phase of petroleum development. The North has seen little of production and transportation phases. The varying views of industry, science, and government on the effects of petroleum operations in Alaska and northern Canada can be found in two recent book-length publications: Change in Alaska (Rogers, ed., 1970), a selection of papers from the August 1969 Alaska Science Conference, and the Proceedings of the Conference on Productivity and Conservation in Northern Circumpolar Lands held in Edmonton, Alberta, in October 1969 (Fuller and Kevan, eds., 1970). Weeden and Klein (1971) reviewed the evidence of conflict between oil and wildlife in Alaska; only a few of the items discussed there will be repeated in the present paper. The Environmental Impact Statement of the proposed trans-Alaska pipeline (United States Department of the Interior, 1971) is a valuable reference to problems of northern pipeline construction. Other reports are cited later in this paper.

EVALUATION OF PAST OIL-WILDLIFE CONFLICTS

Alaska's experience with oil and gas development activities has come from two widely separated and ecologically different areas. One hundred miles north of the limit of trees, south and east of Point Barrow, prolonged exploration by the federal government and private industry in and around Naval Petroleum Reserve Number 4 culminated in March 1968 with discovery and subsequent development of the Prudhoe Bay field. About 750 miles south, the Swanson River field was found in 1957 within the Kenai National Moose Range. An adjacent series of oil and gas pools was tapped a few years later under the silty, shallow waters of upper Cook Inlet. Production from the Kenai-Cook Inlet area totaled 317,643,000 barrels of crude oil and 614,284,000 cubic feet of natural gas through the end of 1970. About 1.5 million barrels of crude oil have been produced at Prudhoe Bay for local fuel

needs. Reserves at Prudhoe Bay are estimated variously at 10 to 20 billion barrels.

Oil operations to date have caused only one major wildlife disaster that we know of. A large number of lesser problems have occurred whose cumulative impact is hard to estimate.

The exceptional incident was the massive mortality of sea birds east of Kodiak Island in February and March 1970. A minimum of 10,000 waterfowl, alcids, and other marine birds were killed by oil, and biologists were sure that many more died—perhaps up to 100,000 (United States Department of the Interior, 1970). No major commercial fishery activities were present in the area at the time. The pollution probably resulted from the deliberate discharge of slop oil or oily ballast from tankers.

Ruptured underwater oil pipelines and carelessness and accidents on offshore drilling platforms, tankers, and shore facilities have caused many small- to moderate-sized oil spills in Cook Inlet over the past 12 years. Kinney et al. (1969) estimated that approximately 0.3 per cent of all oil handled in Cook Inlet is spilled. Their studies showed that oil slicks disappeared from surface waters in two days, that bacteria feeding on Cook Inlet crude oil could consume nearly all of a sample in a few months, and that tides and winds flushed oil from the Inlet rapidly (90 per cent in ten months). Acute problems from spills have been moderate to date (with the exception noted above). Chronic effects, if any, are completely unknown.

Evans (1969) gives a more thorough documentation of biological problems stemming from Cook Inlet oil operations.

Onshore, on the Kenai Peninsula and in upper Cook Inlet marshes, the impact of oil development has been more complex. Spilled oil has been a very minor problem in comparison with the ecologic and especially the recreational and esthetic effects of oil-related activities.

The Kenai National Moose Range, created by executive order in 1941, has been a somewhat reluctant host to the oil industry for over 13 years. Petroleum operations have been under relatively intensive regulation and surveillance on the Range. This work has paid dividends, as a comparison of seismic and drilling practices in and adjacent to the Moose Range clearly demonstrates. The policing effort also has taken its toll of the limited staff and budget of the Range, diverting energies from research, habitat manipulation, and recreation programs.

The Kenai account shows a mixture of credits and debits. The presence of the oilfield on the Kenai National Moose Range seems to have caused no noticeable sustained changes in wildlife numbers. The 3000 miles of seismic trails cut through the part of the Range open to oil exploration are esthetically displeasing to many people, but have become access roads for fishermen, hunters, and snowmobile enthusiasts. Where open to public travel, roads built to drilling pads and other facilities have become arterials for recreationists. These gravel roads were built to high standards of landscaping and construction. Fire hazards have increased.

Fires, always costly in an economic sense, may be "good" or "bad" ecologically, depending on individual viewpoints and the characteristics of specific burns. Infrequently, carelessness by seismic or other field crews driving heavy equipment has caused severe siltation of streams and excessive vegetation damage. Lastly, the paraphernalia and activities of petroleum development (helicopters, bulldozers, drill rigs, pipelines, gas flaring, seismic shots, etc.) are intrusive factors that diminish the enjoyment of the Range for people sensitive to those sorts of disturbances.

Alaska's North Slope (the land area north of the crest of the Brooks Range) has ex-

perienced extensive seismic exploration for three decades. Part of this huge area has been subjected to exploratory drilling. A still smaller area in and around Prudhoe Bay is under more intensive oil operations, including intensive seismic exploration, development drilling, and construction of permanent roads, airfields, camps, and storage areas.

Almost nothing is known about the effects of this activity on wildlife populations. The main difficulty lies in not knowing what was there before oil operations began. The general oilfield area at present seems to have a similar fauna to adjacent lightly-explored areas. However, it is reasonable to expect delayed effects which may show up only after several years of increasingly intensive and widening oilfield activities. Severe losses to wildlife certainly could occur (for example, see Bartonek, 1969, for comments on the vulnerability of arctic waterfowl to oil spills in coastal lagoons).

Large carnivores are much less common on the North Slope than before intensive petroleum activities occurred, and their numbers are declining. The decline seems to have encompassed wolves, wolverines, and grizzly bears. The diminution in numbers has not been well documented, but wildlife biologists who have visited the region in the last two years agree that these carnivores are in serious trouble. The oil industry itself is not solely responsible; government contractors, military station personnel, field parties of scientists, a handful of unethical guides, and legal hunters all have taken their toll. Harassment from helicopters and cross-country vehicles, legal and illegal shooting, and destruction of "nuisance" animals around poorly planned campsites have caused a cumulative attrition among carnivore populations. Elimination of these species from the Alaskan Arctic is a possibility, although not an immediate threat.

FUTURE DIRECT THREATS TO WILDLIFE

Even without new petroleum developments in Alaska there are risks of worse damage from existing operations than have occurred so far. For example, an oil spill of moderate size (on the order of 1000-2000 barrels, the amount lost in a tanker mishap in Cook Inlet early in 1968), pushed by a south wind and an incoming tide, could wreak havoc in the marshes of upper Cook Inlet at peak waterfowl migration times.

Quantifying the risks of such catastrophes is extremely difficult because certain risk-inducing factors will increase with time (intensified development activity at Prudhoe Bay, for example) whereas others should decrease (such as technologic and operational weaknesses).

Schofield and Hamilton (1970) pointed out the potential severe damage to lichen populations in and around high-latitude oilfields from chronic sulfur dioxide pollution. Using an estimate of 0.7 per cent sulfur for North Slope crude oil (this being a world average, as no specific analysis was available for Prudhoe crude), they calculated that potentially damaging concentrations of SO₂ could accumulate during a four-day period of stable air at Prudhoe Bay from normal fuel burning and flaring. Recently (Anon., 1969) an analysis of crude oil from this field showed a 1.12 per cent sulfur content. This is considerably above the average for US crude (0.75 per cent) but lower than Venezuelan crude and that from some other foreign fields. Lichens are critical in the diet of caribou in the region. Widespread damage or destruction to the pollution-sensitive fruticose lichens would cause the loss of some existing range and might result in caribou population losses.

Recognizing that petroleum reserves (other than oil shales) in the conterminous United States are at least half consumed (Hubbert,

1969) and knowing that close to 20 per cent of Alaska's land area and very large segments of adjacent offshore areas are underlain by geologically promising sedimentary basins, Alaskan biologists are deeply concerned about environmental effects of expanding oil and gas exploration and development in the near future. Just to list a few of the sources of an ecologist's anxiety, I will mention (1) the extraordinarily enticing oil prospects in the Chukchi Sea adjacent to Alaska's northwest coast, where oil spills could cause heavy mortality in migrating whale, seal, walrus, and polar bear populations; (2) the present industry interest offshore from Prudhoe Bay in the ice-and-water environment of the Beaufort Sea; and (3) the long-standing explorations along the Bristol Bay coast of the Alaska Peninsula, where discovery of a commercial oil reserve could lead to serious economic losses to the area's world famous salmon fishery.

It is hard to know how to approach these problems most effectively. There seems to be very little middle ground between crying wolf and playing ostrich. Before-the-crisis research has never had much attraction to budget review committees in government, and industry has moved so quickly from semi-secret exploration to billion-dollar developmental investments that science always seems to be putting on its trousers when the fire starts. A good example is the lack of meaningful information about Prince William Sound, terminus of the proposed trans-Alaska pipeline. It would take at least two years and \$500,000 to provide thorough baseline data on the physico-chemical environment, biota, and pollution problems of that body of water. At this point there is time but no money; later, there may be neither.

In recent years nearly all private oil companies in Alaska have been very responsive to wildlife and general environmental problems their operations might be influencing. Policies at the top have been exemplary. Companies have gone to considerable expense to alleviate problems stemming from poor waste disposal, improper use of tracked vehicles, illegal shooting, and so on. Performance in the field is—as engineers are fond of saying—"orders of magnitude" better than during the disgraceful seismic operations by the federal government 10 to 20 years ago. Nevertheless, human error and a degree of environmental ignorance will accompany oil and gas activities into new parts of Alaska. Occasional catastrophes and the cumulative attrition of local harassment and habitat loss will diminish—temporarily or otherwise—some wildlife populations, especially the large carnivores, waterfowl, and other vulnerable groups.

OIL: A STIMULUS FOR ECONOMY GROWTH

Present or foreseeable effects of petroleum development on animals, vegetation, soil, or water, though important, pale when compared with the eventual secondary effects of economic and population growth stimulated by petroleum extraction. The ecological problems accompanying oil operations can be tackled with science and technology, our society's strong points. The other problems are rooted in economic myth, frontier attitudes, and life styles, none of which respond well to logic.

The drive for economic security has long dominated the Alaska political scene (Morehouse and Harrison, 1970). This in itself is not a uniquely Alaskan phenomenon, but in no other state in the last half century has popular sentiment tied economic progress so closely with geographic expansionism and natural resource extraction. In the conventional wisdom of the North, roads, new settlements, mining and homesteading are synonymous with progress. This frontier notion thrives despite the near impossibility of commercial agriculture in all but a tiny

fraction of the state, despite the fact that metallic mineral production has not equalled value of sand and gravel for years, despite the fact that government payrolls and construction contracts have been the lifeblood of the Alaskan economy for three decades, and despite the increasing urbanization of the Alaskan populace.

Vast areas of the State still are virtually uninhabited. Fur and gold spread people to the hinterland of Alaska, but neither survived as a significant employer of people or source of revenue beyond World War II. In the span of the generation you and I represent, the important economic happenings have been urban ones: the growth of military bases, the birth of a pulp mill industry in southeast Alaska, modernized transportation, the building of educational facilities, and the growth of government as prime employer.

Now oil has "arrived" and a latter-day Klondike is in the making. The petroleum industry will go where there is promise of oil. For them there are no far corners of the earth, only greater or lesser cost distances from Houston or London. The North Slope experience sets the pattern. Early in 1968 there were only a few wildcat wells being drilled north of the Brooks Range; the wells drilled during exploration of Naval Petroleum Reserve No. 4 were plugged and abandoned. In spring Atlantic-Richfield and British Petroleum found oil. The next year witnessed the largest peacetime airlift in history, as tons of freight were flown to Prudhoe Bay. Two years later we seem on the verge of building the continent's biggest pipeline across Alaska and extending the present continental road network 365 miles to the Arctic Ocean. As I mentioned earlier, this sequence could be repeated in the remotest parts of Alaska, given three or four discoveries in other sedimentary basins. (Alaska's Governor Egan recently announced projections showing that the State will be operating with a serious deficit by 1980, even with North Slope oil produced at 2-3 million barrels per day. His conclusion: another rich oil strike is needed.)

Thus, oil development can play leapfrog with geography, wiping out with extraordinary speed the protection that distance and inaccessibility give to wildlife populations. If new and more costly forms of protection are not provided by management and enforcement programs, ensuing harvests and disturbances can threaten vulnerable fish and game species. (It can be argued that access is a benefit, which it can be. The key is control—and we have a very spotty history of control in Alaska.)

The oil industry itself is capital-intensive and highly mechanized; probably more dollars are produced by fewer people than in any other private endeavor except counterfeiting. During an initial phase of intensive exploration and developmental drilling, oilfields require more manpower than after production starts. The men are usually housed in work camps in remote fields like Prudhoe Bay where they work for periods of a few weeks, interspersed with rest trips to distant regional headquarters cities such as Anchorage. If semi-permanent oilfield settlements do develop they are likely to be small freight-handling and service centers with few or no family facilities. The greatest direct population effect of petroleum development, therefore, is in existing communities selected as administrative and service headquarters. With development and discovery of the Cook Inlet and Swanson River fields, for example, Kenai, Soldotna, and other communities nearby grew from a combined population of 6100 in 1960 to over 13,500 by 1969 (Rogers, 1970).

The most important economic effect of oil and gas production is to channel very large sums of money directly into the treasuries of landowners. In Alaska the present major oil-field proprietor is the State by virtue of

offshore grants and upland selection grants provided at statehood. State oil revenues stem from bonus bids on competitively leased lands, lease rentals, royalties on production, and severance taxes. Bonus revenues occur only during bidding for leases. They can be extremely important—witness the \$912 million bid on September 10, 1969, when Prudhoe Bay leases were offered—but in the long run are outweighed by production taxes. Royalty and severance taxes now total about 16 per cent of wellhead prices of oil and gas in the Cook Inlet fields. The effective rate will be closed to 20 per cent in Prudhoe Bay due to increasing scale of taxation on highly productive wells. This may amount to an annual income from North Slope crude of about \$200-300 million at a production rate of 1 to 2 million barrels per day, or roughly 50 per cent of the State's income at projected 1976 levels.

The full effect of this revenue in a state with a frontiersman's goals is difficult for a non-resident to appreciate. There will be a tremendous pressure for state investments in roads to "open up" lands alleged to contain vast deposits of metallic ores and other politically less glamorous natural resources. Whether the resources actually exist is not important, as Alaskans generally accept the idea of speculative transportation investments. The Alaska Department of Highways has publicly announced a plan for new roads to be built by 1990, which includes highways to the Arctic Ocean, Seward Peninsula, Bristol Bay, the Southwest Interior, and other areas, amounting to a doubling of the present non-urban road mileage of the State. Other public works investments will be important, too, in encouraging the growth of a large local construction industry that will make its demands for annual encores. The shape of things to come was visible in the ways the State proposed to spend the first of its bonus bid windfall from the Prudhoe sale of 1969. For example, the 1969 budget included only \$1.6 million for capital improvements. In 1970 the Legislature authorized \$50.6 million, most of the increase being for an expanded marine ferry system.

Any wildlife biologist could predict the impact of this apparently inevitable spread of settlement, transportation, and economic activity into the bush, if the game is played according to traditional rules. Funds for research and resource protection will lag far behind needs. Fishing pressures on slow-growing subarctic and arctic freshwater fish populations will exceed sustained yield levels. Grizzlies, wolverines, wolves, and some raptorial birds will disappear from land near highways and other activity centers. Presently liberal hunting seasons and bag limits on most big game species will be reduced progressively.

It would be overly pessimistic, perhaps, to predict the disappearance or even the widespread reduction of populations of wild animals. This has not occurred around present communities and road systems, despite the pressures of 300,000 people. I am confident of the fundamentally conservative attitude of Alaskans toward wildlife resources, and of the ability of Alaskan fish and game biologists to point the way to successful sustained-yield management.

But if most problems of *quantity* can be averted or alleviated, the problems of *quality* remain: poorly defined, neglected, and almost completely overshadowed by the urgencies of daily management crises. To me, maintenance of that complex interaction of scenic beauty, faunal diversity, uninhabited countryside, solitude, and sense of personal adventure that we call the Alaskan experience, is the foremost challenge to wildlife biologists in the North today. And when I wake in the night darkness, listening to the sibilant drone of another load of drilling mud on its way to the North Slope, I have a de-separate feeling we are not going to meet it.

In conclusion, the petroleum industry, like the little girl of nursery-rhyme fame with the curl in the middle of her forehead, is of mixed character. On one hand, the large companies working in the North are willing and able to absorb extra costs to provide needed protection when ecological problems are perceived. Secondly, the industry is highly automated and will in itself bring relatively few people to the North. Furthermore, the petroleum industry pays well for the right to extract and ship oil and gas, making funds available for intensified natural resource protection and management.

The potential for environmental mischief also is great. Oil and gas could occur in Alaska in more than a dozen large sedimentary basins beneath tundra, boreal forest, deltas, tidelands, open ocean, or marine ice. In many places the industry would be operating at the fringe of ecologic and technical knowledge, where familiar problems are magnified and new risks loom unexpectedly. Despite all efforts to prevent them, damaging oil spills are still a statistical certainty in large and prolonged petroleum activities. Finally, the petroleum industry is a massive political force that historically has held the upper hand whenever its interests were challenged.

In looking beyond the first-order effects of oil and gas exploitation I expressed forebodings that the economic spark of oil discovery has set off a chain of roadbuilding, settlement, mining, urbanization, and human population increase that would have a more profound environmental impact. This assumes the continued ascendancy of the frontier mythology in Alaskan government. There are developmental strategies that could delay or in some areas prevent the overrunning of Alaska by commerce. (As an example applying to the petroleum industry, Alaska could set an upper limit to daily North Slope oil and gas production, calculated to be within the capacity of one transportation route chosen as a least-cost route from an environmental standpoint. In addition to this policy's many land management and environmental benefits, it could also help prevent the State from stepping onto the wrong budgetary escalator.) It is also possible that new environmental preceptions could make themselves felt politically—as seems to be happening occasionally today—and could lead to significant shifts in economic and social policies. Along with many other groups of concerned natural and social scientists, wildlife biologists must help provide a sound factual basis for these heightened environmental interests and to make all Alaskans aware of the implications of their daily economic and political decisions.

LITERATURE CITED

- Anon. 1969. Analysis of North Slope crude oil. *Oil and Gas Journal*, 67(40):91.
- Evans, C. D. 1969. Environmental effects of petroleum development in the Cook Inlet area. Proc. Twentieth Alaska Science Conf. (E. C. Viereck, ed.), Alaska Division Amer. Ass'n. for the Advancement of Science, pp. 213-221.
- Fuller, W. A., and P. Kevan (eds.). 1970. Proceedings of the Conference on Productivity and Conservation in Northern Circumpolar Lands. International Union for the Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources, New Series no. 16. Morges, Switzerland. 344 pp.
- Hubbert, M. K. 1969. Energy resources, pp. 157-242 in *Resources and Man*. National Academy of Sciences, National Research Council. W. H. Freeman Co., San Francisco. 259 pp.
- Kinney, P. J., D. K. Button, and D. M. Schell. 1969. Kinetics of dissipation and biodegradation of crude oil in Alaska's Cook Inlet. (Contr. No. 61, Institute of Marine Science, University of Alaska, College.) Joint Conf. on Prevention and Control of Oil Spills, New York. pp. 333-340.

Morehouse, T., and G. Harrison. 1970. State government and economic development in Alaska. Part I. State Government, 43(4): 194-202.

Rogers, G. W. 1970. Alaska's economy in the 1960's. Alaska Review of Business and Economic Conditions, VII(6): 28 pp. Institute of Social, Economic, and Government Research, Univ. of Alaska, College.

Rogers, G. W. (ed.). 1970. Change in Alaska: People, petroleum, and politics. Univ. of Alaska Press, College. 213 pp.

Schofield, E., and W. Hamilton. 1970. Probable damage to tundra biota through sulfur dioxide destruction of lichens. Biological Conservation, 2(4): 278-280.

United States Department of the Interior. 1970. Summary report, Kodiak oil pollution incident, February-March 1970. 28 pp. mimeo.

—. 1971. Environmental impact statement, trans-Alaska pipeline. Draft, January 13, 1971. 196 pp. plus attachments (60 pp.). mimeo.

Weeden, R. B., and D. R. Klein. 1971. Wildlife and oil: a survey of critical issues in Alaska. Polar Record (in press).

TO IMPROVE NARCOTIC ADDICTION REHABILITATION ACT

HON. WILMER MIZELL

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 6, 1971

Mr. MIZELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with a sense of strong purpose and a sense of urgency, for legislation is being introduced today to effectively curb drug abuse and illegal distribution of drugs in America.

President Nixon has identified drug abuse as public enemy No. 1 in the United States, and I am extremely pleased that the Congress has begun to mount a comprehensive attack on the enemy, and that I have the opportunity to cosponsor the legislation that will serve as the attack strategy.

With the distinguished gentleman from Florida, (Mr. FREY) and several other colleagues, I am today offering a measure providing for a national involuntary civil commitment program, a narcotic addiction manpower training program, extensive and continuing research into the drug problem in America, and a partial realignment of the Federal judicial system to better serve the purpose of this legislation.

The bill is designed to amend and improve the Narcotic Addict Rehabilitation Act of 1966, one of the earliest congressional responses to this growing national menace of drug abuse.

The cornerstone of this new proposal is the establishment of a national involuntary civil commitment program, the voluntary commitment program, provided under the Narcotic Addict Rehabilitation Act.

The voluntary program has only been responsible for the treatment of 6,000 persons since 1966, and with an addicted population estimated at between 250,000 and 500,000, a program of this small scope simply will not get the job done.

With extensive safeguards, the program being proposed today could be responsible for providing treatment—not punishment, but treatment—to a far

larger percentage of drug addicts in this country.

This more comprehensive plan would, as mentioned, put substantially more addicts in a therapeutic climate; protect the addict against himself; prevent the contamination of others and protect society against criminal acts; and reduce the demand for narcotics by placing any known addict under medical supervision and control.

Japan has already adopted a massive involuntary civil commitment program and the drug abuse problem in that country has been largely eliminated.

Similar programs are already underway in New York, California, Missouri, and Illinois, and indications are that with adequate facilities and sufficient personnel, involuntary commitment achieves excellent results and the incidence of abuse in due process is very, very low.

The legislation we are introducing provides for a manpower training program especially designed to supply treatment facilities with the trained personnel they need for operating an involuntary commitment program.

In addition, the bill calls for continuing and extensive research into the whole problem of drug abuse. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare would be authorized to conduct research into the causes and effects of narcotics and drug abuse; research in finding a non-addictive narcotic substitute to dangerous drugs like heroin; and research into the chemistry of narcotics to develop some form of drug abuse immunization.

These are comprehensive and desperately needed proposals aimed at combating this deadly enemy of American young people and of our society as a whole. I urge the most rapid consideration of this bill in the appropriate committee. It has been painstakingly researched, and its merits, I believe, will be readily seen and approved. In this matter, we can afford no delay.

COMBATING THE GYPSY MOTH—A COMPREHENSIVE APPROACH

HON. JOHN G. DOW

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 6, 1971

Mr. DOW. Mr. Speaker, on September 8 members of the Tocks Island Regional Advisory Council, interested officials, and gypsy moth specialists met in Stroudsburg, Pa., to focus on the regional gypsy moth crisis in the New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania areas. I would like to commend them on their plans for a plan, a comprehensive and coordinated strategy, to combat the moth epidemic. I feel this approach has substantial merit and I would like to call it to the attention of my colleagues. The report of their meeting is as follows:

TRI-STATE GYPSY MOTH CONTROL MEETING

Attached are details of a meeting held on September 8th in the TIRAC office, Stroudsburg, Pennsylvania to review the gypsy moth situation. Present were several representa-

tives of area Congressmen, federal and state officials who oversee control programs, and federal agency personnel involved with the Delaware Water Gap National Recreation Area.

The meeting was most valuable in that it allowed the various disciplines to come together, exchange information, and air viewpoints. Several accomplishments also came out of the meeting in the form of realistic directions for the region to take. In summary, they are:

An integrated, uniform policy for regional control of the gypsy moth was formulated, and agreed to.

A Memorandum of Understanding should be executed among federal, state, and local authorities so that this uniform policy will be adhered to on an interstate basis.

An area within the tri-state, seven county region should be selected for use as a national field laboratory to observe and evaluate alternative control methods.

A Forest Pest Advisory Group should be established for the region to carry out the uniform control policy and oversee the functioning of the national laboratory area.

1. INTRODUCTIONS

List of attendees is attached. Each state was represented by the agency currently directing control efforts. Federal interests were represented by Forest Service and Park Service personnel. Realities of public concerns were supplied by aides of two area Congressmen.

2. EXPLANATION OF PURPOSE FOR MEETING

Mr. Klock explained that elected officials are in a quandry on how to deal with the gypsy moth. Opposing viewpoints are being publicly espoused, and no clear cut direction is being given for the region. The controversy over the Park area control approach exemplifies the emotion being exhibited. The meeting was called to explore the situation, and determine if direction can be established to better prepare the region for next year's infestation.

3. DISCUSSION: CURRENT SITUATION

National Park Service—According to Mr. Hutchison, the originally infested Park area of 200 acres in 1969 around Millbrook has spread through the Kittatinny ridge area to Worthington Tract line, and comprises 7500 acres. Egg masses are showing up throughout the flood plain area and on the Pennsylvania side near Bushkill. Climax situation is felt to be attained on the ridge top. Considerable hemlock has been defoliated where interspersed with hardwoods, especially in VanCampens Creek gorge. Estimates are that 80% of the DWGNRA is susceptible to infestation. Present control methods are entirely biologic, with heavy reliance on egg parasites.

New Jersey—Mr. Metterhouse reported that even though 180,000 acres were defoliated in varying degrees throughout the state, 1/5 of all acreage so infested showed a decline in activity. He predicted that next year an equilibrium would be reached, and many areas would experience population collapse. He credited natural controls as gaining enough foothold to have a stabilizing effect.

New York—Mr. Terrell stated that where spray was applied, good control has been achieved. However, because of the continued spread, the state may be nearing the point where budgetary limitations will restrict future spray programs to high use areas. The cost of the spray program this year approximated \$3.00 per acre.

Pennsylvania—Messrs. Nichols and Bitzer relayed that 42,000 acres were defoliated in this region, and the prospects for next year are frightening. Some areas defoliated this year are not showing a strong comeback, and there is some mortality already. One ridge in western Monroe which has experienced 3 years repeated attacks is approaching 100%

tree mortality. The ridge cover is dominantly chestnut oak.

Presented was a mapping program being conducted by state Dept. of Environmental Resources to identify areas of high value which are threatened by moth infestations. The officials anticipate using this material to press for a more concerted and integrated bio-chemical effort next year.

4. DISCUSSION: REGIONAL EFFORTS AND INTER-STATE APPROACH

A general discussion followed on the implications of the current situation and the policies being followed, with these salient points being made:

a. New Jersey is taking the approach of identifying how best to live with the pest. Eradication is not possible, nor is preventing the spread of infestation. Operational and financial feasibility dictate that only high value forest areas be sprayed, with major dependency being placed on biologics to flood over and dampen major outbreaks. Spraying of limited acreage will not affect overall forest ecology, but massive spraying is vehemently opposed.

b. The Forest Service realizes that the present program is entomologically unsound; however the biological approach is still not a science but a concept. In time an integrated chemical and biological approach will be possible but not now. Efforts will continue to be directed toward year by year chemical suppression in certain critical areas to hold off intolerable losses until a better solution becomes available.

c. Evidence shows that quarantine measures do not work.

d. National Park Service local officials advocate limited spraying to attain minimum protection of high value scenic and historic areas. However, higher level NPS officials have displayed resistance to any spraying efforts, and only under special circumstances will individual tree spraying be authorized (no aerial spraying).

e. The expenditure of \$50 million of taxpayers funds for purchase and development of a recreational, scenic, historic area (DWGNRA) which subsequently becomes denuded will not be tolerated by the public. If the additional \$25 million needed for land acquisition is to be granted, then measures must be taken by the responsible federal agency to ensure preservation of the scenic and historic setting. The public expects this and will not accept anything less.

f. The Forest Service advocates that a tri-state and federal policy be adopted for providing uniform treatment of high value areas in the TIRAC region, such as centers of recreational activity, conifer stands, and other unique areas, but not ridge tops nor wild woodlands except where special values exist. A system would be developed to identify and establish priorities for high value areas.

g. All of the governmental agencies involved should become party to a Memorandum of Understanding, which would set forth the above as uniform guidelines to be employed on an interstate basis to combat the gypsy moth.

h. An area within the seven county, tri-state region should be established as a national laboratory for field observation and evaluation of various control techniques now being researched. This would allow:

Close coordination and comparison of research projects.

Long range consequences to be measured. Use of an area (Delaware Water Gap National Recreation Area) which has not been ecologically disturbed by previous spray programs.

High degree of public exposure to the comparative results and consequences.

i. A Forest Pest Advisory Group for the TIRAC region should be established, to be made up of agencies represented plus the Agricultural Research Service and EPA. The Advisory Group would address itself to monitoring the gypsy moth situation, establish-

ing a uniform tri-state and federal policy, developing a priority system for control in high value areas, and overseeing the establishment and functioning of an area for use as a national field laboratory.

5. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned on the note that much more was accomplished by the participants, and the next meeting would be called for late November or early December to review activity surveillance reports by the Forest Service.

ATTENDEES

William Slippey, Bureau of Forestry.
William W. Metterhaus, N.J. Dept. of Agriculture.
Barney Kalb, National Park Service.
Elmer G. Terrell, Insect & Disease, N.Y.
Peter DeGelleke, Del. Water Gap Nat'l Rec. Area.
Conrad H. Idukas, Asst. to Cong. Fred B. Rooney.
John H. Bitzer, Dist. Forester, Pa. Bur. of Forestry.
William T. Deitz, Ad. Asst. to Rep. Frank Thompson, Jr.
Harry Serfass, Co. Agric. Agent, Warren Co., N.J.
James O. Nichols, Pa. Dept. Environmental Resources.
L. F. Thomsen, Corps of Engineers—Env. Section.
D. O. Vandenburg, U.S. Forest Svc. Forest Pest Mgt.
John F. Chansier, U.S. Forest Svc., Portsmouth, N.H.
Andrew E. Hutchison, Del. Water Gap Nat'l Rec. Area.
Thomas E. Klock, TIRAC Director.

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 620

HON. JACK H. McDONALD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 6, 1971

Mr. McDONALD of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, this body has before it Discharge Petition, No. 9, which when signed by a majority of Members will bring to the House floor for action House Joint Resolution 620, a Constitutional amendment regarding assignment of school-children based on race, color and or creed.

The people of this Nation, through their elected representatives, have time and time again expressed their wishes regarding this issue. In the Civil Rights Act of 1964, Congress signaled its intent to enforce the landmark Supreme Court decision of 1954 which stated that the concept of "separate but equal" was unconstitutional and that all public school systems must be dismantled. In the Civil Rights Act, Congress declared that no funds contained in the act could be used to force any student to attend a particular school against the choice of his or her parents in order to overcome racial imbalance.

In April of this year, however, the Supreme Court, citing the equal protection clause of the 14th amendment, upheld the use of busing as an interim method for eliminating from the public schools all vestiges of segregation.

The Court was aiming at State laws which fostered segregation, or, as more recent Federal court decisions have shown, at gerrymandering on the part of local school districts in order to maintain segregated facilities.

Mr. Speaker, I feel strongly that the Courts have misinterpreted the equal protection clause. The will of the people, as articulated through their elected representatives, has been thwarted by first of all the Court decisions and secondly, by the lack of action by the House Judiciary Committee on the several bills offered to them which have dealt with this issue.

This discharge petition gives those people the opportunity to reaffirm their opposition to busing to achieve racial balance, by amending the Constitution to specifically prohibit public school students from being assigned to or required to attend a particular school based on race, color or creed.

The wisdom of the framers of the Constitution was never more evident than now. Here is a constitutionally guaranteed opportunity for the citizens of this Nation to let their voices be heard.

Congress can debate this issue, and it can pass bills against this concept. But until a constitutional amendment is passed and made available to the individual States for ratification there will be no relief from what I consider poor judgment on the part of the courts.

The dissent and subsequent violence that followed the Court decisions were irrational and wrong, but equally significant is the fact that it was predictable. In the past decade there has been much progress made toward improving not only race relations but equal opportunities as well. We must continue our work in this delicate area, and press for improvements of all educational employment, social and political opportunities. But while this work is continuing, order must prevail.

Violence and demonstrations against the Court decisions must stop now or result in a legacy of hatred, intolerance and misunderstanding which will only divide this great Nation. Those hurt most by this irresponsible behavior will be our children.

The decision to bus followed a legal interpretation of the Constitution of the United States. If we are to modify that decision, we must do so here in this building, and in the capitols of our sovereign States—not in the streets, not in the school halls.

I love this country. And I respect our Constitution and the judicial system. We of this generation have been provided one of the greatest tools yet devised by man with which to maintain a free and representative Government. We must take advantage of this great tool, and let the people's voice be heard here in Congress.

CRACKING DOWN ON THE "LEGAL" PROFITTEERS IN HEROIN TRAFFICKING

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 6, 1971

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, two owners of a Washington, D.C., pharmacy were recently convicted of possessing, as im-

plements of a crime, 36,500 gelatin capsules, 384 ounces of quinine hydrochloride, 36 pounds of dextrose, and 125 pounds of lactose. These are the "legal" implements of heroin trafficking and, until now, those possessing them were immune from prosecution in the District of Columbia.

Last year, the Select Committee on Crime, on which I am privileged to serve, conducted a major inquiry into the heroin paraphernalia trade. At that time, Congressman CLAUDE PEPPER, the distinguished chairman of the select committee, stated:

Our investigation has shown that there is no legitimate need for these millions of empty gelatin capsules, the millions of glassine envelopes, and the thousands of ounces of quinine and other cutting agents reaching certain retail druggists. It is outrageous that men who call themselves legitimate businessmen make huge profits from the manufacture and sale of these items.

These two successful prosecutions are a promising sign that we are becoming aware that these otherwise innocuous and legal materials are an integral part of the cutting, packaging, and marketing of heroin. It is necessary, however, to promptly give our district attorneys and law enforcement agencies the authority to crack down on the legal profiteers in heroin paraphernalia.

I am proud to be a cosponsor of H.R. 8569, introduced by Chairman PEPPER. This bill would make it unlawful in the District of Columbia to intentionally promote or facilitate the illegal traffic in drugs by possessing, selling, or distributing certain enumerated heroin paraphernalia. This bill, if enacted, can be a major tool in our efforts to stop the hypocrisy of "legitimate" businessmen who are getting rich on the blood of our children. In addition, this bill can serve as a model for other communities and States across the country.

The Washington Post of October 5 carried an account of the arrest and prosecution of these two accomplices to heroin trafficking.

The article follows:

TWO MERCANTS CONVICTED IN DRUGS CASE

Two drugstore owners have been convicted of possession of implements of a crime in a trial testing a new theory of criminal responsibility in illicit drug traffic.

Superior Court Judge Tim C. Murphy found Richard P. and Jerry Rosenberg, owners of the Petworth Pharmacy, guilty of possessing 36,500 gelatin capsules and other items that are commonly used in cutting heroin for street sales. Each has been sentenced to one year's probation.

The store is located at 4201 Georgia Ave. NW.

Possession of the capsules and other material—in this case 384 ounces of quinine hydrochloride, 36 pounds of lactose—previously never has been held to be a crime.

But in the Petworth Pharmacy case the government presented evidence that the businessmen know or should have known those items were being used to further illegal drug trade.

In his decision, arrived at Sept. 24 but not made public until yesterday, the judge said, "The thrust of the government's case here is not that . . . gelatin capsules, quinine hydrochloride, lactose and dextrose are in themselves sinister, but that their possession by a retail pharmacy in vast quantities does give rise to sinister implications."

The two store owners, neither of whom is a pharmacist, first were tried in July 1970, but their case ended in a mistrial after a juror was accused of showing up drunk and a bailiff overheard the repeated jury room deliberations.

Subsequently the defendants agreed to let Judge Murphy decide the case by reviewing the transcript of their trial.

According to the U.S. attorney's office, the case was "one of a kind." Charles R. Work, chief deputy U.S. attorney at Superior Court, said that heroin traffickers in the city have switched from using gelatin capsules to tinfoil wrappers in recent months.

CONGRESSMAN EMANUEL CELLER ANNOUNCES ATTORNEY GENERAL WILL USE PAROLE AUTHORITY FOR SOVIET JEWS

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 6, 1971

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I insert in the RECORD a copy of my remarks at a press conference held this noon, October 6, wherein I announced the pledge of the Attorney General to use his parole authority to permit the entry of Soviet Jews.

The world in general and the Soviet Union in particular must know that Soviet Jewry will not be forgotten. This unalterable fact has been emphasized by the letter I received from the Attorney General of the United States on September 30. It reads:

HON. EMANUEL CELLER,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary,
House of Representatives, Washington,
D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CELLER: I am aware of your concern with the plight of the Soviet Jews and can assure you that I share your views.

As you know, the Department has had reservations as to the extent of the Attorney General's parole authority under section 212(d) (5) of the Immigration and Nationality Act. The mounting evidence that Soviet Jews have unsuccessfully sought permission to emigrate from the Soviet Union has compelled a Departmental reexamination of the Attorney General's parole authority with respect to refugees.

In recent weeks, members of my staff have been in contact with the staffs of the appropriate subcommittees of the House and Senate Judiciary Committees. These contacts, together with communications with individual Committee members, have diminished our earlier doubts as to the extent of the Attorney General's statutory authority to parole refugees into this country.

Accordingly, I can assure you that I would exercise my discretion if the situation demanded and parole Soviet Jews who are able to leave the Soviet Union.

Sincerely,

JOHN N. MITCHELL,
Attorney General.

A similar letter was sent to Peter W. Rodino, Jr., chairman of Subcommittee No. 1 of the House Judiciary Committee, which has jurisdiction over immigration matters.

By pledging himself to use parole authority to permit Soviet Jews to enter the United States, the Attorney General of the United States has informed the U.S.S.R. that he has taken official notice

of the desperate plight of the Jews in Russia and has made it clear that our country has not turned away from its traditional humanitarianism.

Preliminary talks between the staff of the Judiciary Committee and the staff of the Department of Justice have already taken place in a joint effort to make certain that the most effective procedures in the use of parole will be appropriately available when needed.

We have opened a door, but the door of the Soviet Union remains shut. The fact that now and then, with the tantalizing inhumanity of sadistic prison guards, the Soviets permit the exit of a few Jews, cannot turn us away from the central core of the tragedy—the Jews of the U.S.S.R. cannot leave as Jews nor live within the Soviet Union. Only unceasing civilized pressure can open the door for Soviet Jewry and keep it open. The Soviet Union is not immune to world opinion.

The Koch bill, cosponsored by some 120-odd Members, served notice that the needs of Soviet Jewry had not been set aside. As Member after Member dropped a companion bill into the hopper, the realization grew that a means would be found to give hope to Soviet Jewry. In the intervening period others of us worked exploring other avenues, including the use of parole.

The door of the United States is open. Let the Soviet Union reply in kind.

I also take this occasion to state my appreciation to the Department of State, which helped achieve this breakthrough. In a discussion of the Koch bill, which would provide for the issuance of 30,000 special immigrant visas to Jewish citizens of the U.S.S.R., via a letter to me dated August 16, 1971, David M. Abshire, assistant secretary for congressional relations, stated:

However, as you are of course aware, the parole authority of the Attorney General has been used in a number of emergency refugee situations to bring refugees into this country when existing machinery and visa and conditional entry numbers were insufficient to meet the demand. This means was used, for example, to assist large numbers of Hungarian refugees after the 1956 uprising in Hungary and is presently being used for large numbers of Cuban refugees. You may be certain that in a similar situation the Department would strongly support the use of parole by the Attorney General for a substantial number of Soviet Jews.

The basic humanitarianism of the United States has been underscored.

YAKOV A. MALIK'S ANTISEMITISM MUST NOT GO UNCHALLENGED

HON. EDWARD I. KOCH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 6, 1971

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, September 25, Yakov Malik, the Soviet Union's delegate to the United Nations made a slanderous and anti-Semitic speech in a Security Council meeting. On September 27, my colleague from New York (Mr. ROSENTHAL) and I responded and our statement appeared in

the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of that day. I should like now to insert in the RECORD for the benefit of my constituents and interest of our colleagues a digest of our remarks:

We, as Members of Congress and as Jews, believe it is imperative that we respond to the slanderous and anti-semitic remarks uttered by Yakov A. Malik, the Soviet delegate to the United Nations, on September 25. Speaking in a Security Council meeting on the subject of Jerusalem, Mr. Malik is reported as having said:

"Zionism and Fascism are both racist ideologies... the chosen people, people elected by God—in the 20th century, this is a criminal and absurd theory."

Surely it will shock the consciences of decent people everywhere to have "Zionism", expressing the love that Jews have had for their ancestral homeland from time immemorial equated with Fascism. Here we are, proud Members of the United States Congress devoted to the United States and also proud to be referred to as "Zionist."

The Soviet Union does in fact define Zionism as a crime. Even in the Soviet Union it is not acceptable to openly encourage anti-semitism, and so, an acceptable codeword, "Zionism" has been found, making it respectable for Soviet citizens to revile Jews in the Soviet Union—only they are reviled not as Jews but as Zionists.

The attempt by Mr. Malik to stir the bestial prejudices that rise so quickly when sparked is abundantly clear. His intent to slur the Jews and the phrase, "chosen people", was a blatant attempt to set Jews and non-Jews against one another. So many religions have cardinal principles which set them apart from other religions and this is accepted by all as it should be. Would Mr. Malik make similar references and use his crude obscene language to the Japanese delegation or to any of the Christian delegates sitting at that table. We know he would not dare.

Now let us tell you what the concept of the "chosen people" is. The Jews believe that God imposed upon the Jews, and the Jews willingly accepted no matter what the cost, the obligation to speak out against injustice and to be ever faithful to God and to the concept of monotheism.

Rather than give up these cardinal principles, Jews through the centuries have died horrible deaths in almost every country—Russia being one of the foremost to have that infamous honor.

Our distress today is even greater than it would otherwise be because not one delegate other than Israel's rose to challenge or denounce Mr. Malik's anti-Semitic remarks and our own delegate, George Bush, sat silently by.

For us and we hope for many others, Jews and non-Jews alike, the memory of the holocaust will always be with us and new Jew-baiters will be denounced when they raise their ugly heads, wherever they may be, including in the United Nations.

We think that the response by Benjamin Disraeli in 1837 to another anti-Semite is appropriate for Mr. Malik:

"Yes, I am a Jew, and when the ancestors of the right honorable gentleman were brutal savages in an unknown island, mine were priests in the Temple of Solomon."

A REACTION TO GOING METRIC

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 6, 1971

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, the Congress will shortly consider several bills which

would make the metric system the standard system of measurement for this country. "A Metric America, a Decision Whose Time Has Come," a report submitted to the Congress by the National Bureau of Standards, discusses the feasibility of conversion to the metric system at this time. I commend this report to my colleagues.

The report concludes that the United States should convert to the metric system under a planned program as soon as is feasible.

The report discusses the difficulties that may be encountered by different industries and institutions in both the public and private sector by conversion. I recently came across an article in the quarterly magazine section of the October 4, 1971 issue of "Realtor's Headlines," analyzing the changeover in terms of the real estate business. The article makes the point that while the conversion itself will not be easy, once accomplished it will make it easier to describe parcels of land.

The article, which speaks for itself, follows:

GOING METRIC—A DECISION WHOSE TIME HAS COME

What do varas, rods, wagon wheels, chains, and arrow shots have in common?

They all were used at one time, or are still used, to measure land area. For instance, the "vara" is a measure found in the Spanish land grants of the farwest and is equal to about 33.33 inches. And in New Orleans, a term called the "French foot" of pre-Napoleonic times is found.

A rod is equal to 16.5 feet, and it takes 160 square rods to equal an acre, or 16 square chains, a chain being equal to four rods. While these are rather precise, the wagon wheel, and the arrow shot, are not. The wagon wheel, as a measure of distance, can be found in some old deeds and was that distance defined as so many revolutions of a wagon wheel. The size of the wheel supposedly, depended on the two persons involved in the transaction agreeing. Still, this would seem to be more constant than the arrow shot as a mark of distance, for this would depend on the strength of the bowman's arm.

Which all goes to say that the standards of measurement have been many and varied.

Throughout recorded history, and even before then, man has used various methods of determining time, distance, and volume. For the most part, his standards has been something readily discernible, the width of his hand, the distance from his outstretched fingertips to the tip of his nose, the rate of his pulse beat, or the volume of the queen's wine cup.

Some of these ancient forms of measurement are still in existence today. We measure the height of a horse by hands, and we measure the depth of water by fathoms, being that distance between the outstretched fingertips.

Efforts to agree on a single, world-wide standard have met with varying degrees of success until recently.

DEVELOPED IN FRANCE

Prior to World War II, most of the non-English speaking world had adopted the metric system. The system was developed in France during the Revolution by Charles Maurice Tallyrand. Its keystone was, and is, the "meter," a unit of length defined as a fraction of the earth's circumference measured on a meridian passing through Paris. Today, more sophisticated means of measurement define the meter as equal to 1,650,763.73 wavelengths of the orange-red light of excited krypton of mass number 86.

Since World War II, the rest of the world, except for the United States, Burma, and several small countries, has committed itself to conversion to the metric system. Canada, while committing herself to the conversion, has established no timetable, possibly because of her closeness to the United States, which is as yet uncommitted.

The primary system of measurement in the United States today is called the "customary system," and uses those familiar terms of inch, foot, mile, yard, pint, quart, gallon, bushel, ounce, pound, degree Fahrenheit, and the like. This is not to say we are exclusively customary, since many of our measurements are already in the metric system like the ampere, the second, and the candela.

SIMPLE AND LOGICAL

The metric system is termed a simple and logical system to use. It is streamlined, and each measurement relates to others in a consistent pattern.

On the other hand, the customary, while seeming to have no logical pattern, is closely related to everyday human experience, and even the human anatomy. The foot is roughly equal to the length of a grown man's foot, the yard is close to being the distance between a grown man's outstretched hand and the tip of his nose, and the mile is about equal to 2,000 paces.

While both systems are accepted and used in the United States, the customary system still dominates, but it is losing ground to the metric system, particularly in the areas of highly technical industries, in education, in pollution standards, and, most importantly, in international trade and relations.

What does all this search for a standard measurement mean for real estate?

Not much, really, since the change would be gradual, most likely according to a 10 year plan. It won't, for instance, mean the wholesale rewriting of all deeds and land titles. These would be changed only as the various properties were resurveyed and the titles changed hands.

The initial positive result in converting to the metric system would be noticed on the international level. Here, all persons involved in real property transactions would be talking a common language, and there would be a minimum of arithmetic. In the metric system, all measurements are directly related to the meter, thus a hectare is 10,000 square meters, and the square kilometer is one million square meters.

In the customary system, rods and chains have little direct relationship with inches, feet, and yards, and still less relationship with varas. The conversion of square meters, hectares, and square kilometers, to one of the other two forms of square measure is a simple matter of multiplying or dividing by 10, or a multiple of 10. In the customary system, the arithmetical conversions are much more complicated.

METRIC IS GAINING

As has been noted already, the metric system is gaining ground in its use in the United States, and the advantages of a common language are readily evident when one realizes how much our world has shrunk in terms of communication and travel time.

At the time the National Bureau of Standards was conducting the study on the advantages and disadvantages of increased use of the metric system as the basis for measurement in this country, they contacted more than 700 major national groups, inviting them to submit their views and cost-benefit estimates of a metric changeover for their particular sectors of interest.

In contacting NAREB and its affiliated institutes, societies, and councils, the National Institute of Farm and Land Brokers, accepting the recommendation of its Agriculture, Urban Land, and Legislative Committees, endorsed the adoption of the metric system since "the metric system operates on units

or multiples of 10, it is thought that once the conversion is made, it would make land description and land measurement more exact." (National Bureau of Standards publication, SP 345-12, U.S. Metric Study, Interim Report, Testimony of Nationally Representative Groups, page 128.)

A popular phrase nowadays concerns the power of an idea whose time has come. Perhaps the decision to convert to the metric system is a decision whose time has come.

REVITALIZING THE ECONOMY

HON. ROBERT PRICE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 6, 1971

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 10947 the Revenue Act of 1971. This bill, which essentially embodies the President's legislative program for the new economic policies enunciated last August 15, must be enacted promptly if these new policies are to be successful.

The economic difficulties the Nation has been experiencing that gave rise to the need for this bill began long before President Nixon took office in January of 1968. As far back as the early sixties the Federal Government began spending money like water in an effort to finance the war in Vietnam while simultaneously generating a period of economic boom. In those days the phrase "guns and butter" was on everybody's lips. While on the surface these expansionary loose money policies were successful, they set in motion the forces of inflation and economic imbalance, forces that had reached alarming proportions by the time President Nixon took office.

In an effort to turn back the rising tide of inflation, the President engaged a series of traditional and time-tested steps. He attempted to reduce excessive Federal spending. He attempted to reduce outsized Federal payrolls. He lowered the rate at which Federal dollars were entering the already overheated economy.

Despite the fact that these initiatives were linked with restrictive monetary policies including higher interest rates and other limitations on the movement and flow of money, the economy continued to boil. Although there were some bright spots in the economy, and some progress was made in stemming inflation the costs of inflation to the American people were still way too high. Federal Reserve Board Chairman Arthur Burns put the matter in square perspective when he observed that the traditional economic principles just did not seem to work the way they used to.

To President Nixon the fact that the traditional economic practices and principles were no longer producing the needed results was no reason to give in to the ravages of inflation or accept them as being an inevitable part of our economic growth. Instead he gathered together his most trusted advisers and economic experts and devised a series of new economic policies which he unveiled last August 15.

Part of the initial set of policies that

emerged out of the President's deliberations is the freeze the Nation is presently waiting out. Other principal components of these policies are contained in the legislation before the House this afternoon.

In principal terms, the Revenue Act of 1971 may be considered in the following general sections: tax reductions for individuals; job development investment credit and readjustment of the accelerated depreciation regulations; repeal of the excise tax on automobiles and small trucks; and tax adjustments for U.S. export firms. Taken together, these sections are designed to restore national economic health by stimulating private industry, generating economic productivity, encouraging consumer spending, and creating additional jobs.

From my point of view, I think the legislative provisions in the committee bill make eminently good sense and, in fact, I have earlier in this Congress personally introduced legislation which parallels certain parts of the Revenue Act of 1971. For example, I have proposed restoring the investment tax credit but at the level of 7½ percent rather than 7 percent. And while my proposal was restricted to smaller commercial operations, I am confident the committee-drafted investment tax credit will stimulate a higher level of economic growth. I say this because when the investment tax credit was in effect in the early sixties it helped to stimulate a significant amount of real economic growth.

In the area of job development tax credits, I have introduced legislation to stimulate rural areas of the Nation suffering from unemployment, underemployment, and sluggish economic conditions. I have proposed that tax and other incentives be provided to companies that locate their operations in rural areas and establish and operate in-house training programs for area residents of all ages who want to learn new job skills or upgrade their present ones. Given the present nationwide level of unemployment, I think consideration should be given to incorporating a strictly jobs-oriented tax credit along with the investment tax credit contained in the Revenue Act of 1971.

As regards automobile and truck excise taxes, I have introduced legislation paralleling the committee actions which removes the excise taxes on farm trucks, farm truck parts, and accessories. I know from personal experience and from my continuing involvement in the farming community that this tax relief, although modest in terms, will be most welcomed by the farmers and ranchers of this Nation.

Finally, I have introduced a series of bills designed to ease the Federal tax burdens on individuals. One measure would enable an individual to deduct 20 percent of his total State and local taxes from his Federal tax bill. Another measure would allow parents to write off part of their children's higher education or vocational training expenses. A third would allow homeowners to take a depreciation deduction for their residences in much the same manner as owners of rental property are now able to do.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I would emphasize that on the basis of the tax relief legislation I have introduced in the past, coupled with my knowledge of the prevailing economic conditions throughout the Nation, I think the Revenue Sharing Act of 1971 will provide much of the tools and much of the means needed to get the economy on track and moving briskly again.

Congress must move swiftly on this bill; I urge my colleagues to give it their overwhelming approval.

U.S.A. AND THE SOVIET MYTH

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 6, 1971

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the recent expulsion of 105 Russian diplomats and officials from Great Britain revealed again to the world the conspiratorial and insidious nature of Soviet Russian diplomacy and its network operations. This was, of course, a mass expulsion, but in terms of the long record of Soviet Russian subversive activities in accommodating countries, it is just an additional case. To understand the compulsive character of this traditional Russian political bent requires an appreciation of the institutional makeup of the Soviet Union itself.

A current work that provides keen insights into this makeup is "U.S.A. and the Soviet Myth." It is authored by Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, professor of economics at Georgetown University an authority on the Soviet Union. The book has received numerous favorable reviews. Two such reviews appeared recently in London's East-West Digest and the New Guard, publication of the Young Americans for Freedom. A reading of these reviews will show why it is necessary for all interested Americans to examine the contents of this disturbing work.

[From the East West Digest, July 1971]

U.S.A. AND THE SOVIET MYTH

(By Lev E. Dobriansky)

Even today, years after the passing of the great African and Asian empires of the Western powers the very word "colonialism" can move many to a mood of angry indignation. Curiously enough, however, all their finely honed moral concern is conspicuous by its absence when the subject of present Soviet colonial subjugation of Ukrainians, Byelorussians, Georgians, and others arises. Indeed, it is rarely understood (or admitted, at any rate) here that the USSR is not a nation at all but is rather a colonial empire and nothing more. It is the great merit of Professor Dobriansky's brilliantly devastating analysis that it underscores the essentially imperio-colonialist character of the USSR.

While the more politically perceptive American will appreciate the true nature of the relationship of satellite countries of Central Europe to Moscow, he is perhaps less likely to comprehend that within the primary empire which is the USSR itself there is an even more oppressive imperial structure. He is even less likely to comprehend that it is partly an aggressive Russian expansionism, behind a facade of Communist ideology, that really threatens the Free World including the

United States today. Professor Dobriansky clearly exposes the true nature of this expansionist menace with its roots deep in the dark soil of Tsarist times. He does not, as no doubt some misguided critics will charge, minimize or deny the role of Communist ideology here. To the contrary, he points up how it is very effectively exploited for expansionist purposes by the Machiavellian power clique in the Kremlin.

One other line of criticism (again mistaken) may perhaps be anticipated: that the author is possessed of a Russophobia bias originating in his Ukrainian antecedents and present organizational connections. An honest and careful reading of *USA and the Soviet Myth* sustains no such charge. Though he clearly shows that the majority of the so-called "Russian" people in the USSR are in reality non-Russians (Byelorussians, Georgians, Turkestani, Ukrainians, etc.) and very logically demonstrates that any effective Free World policy must therefore contemplate ultimate liberation not merely for satellite peoples like Czechs, Germans, Hungarians, and Poles, but also political self-determination within the USSR itself. He throughout distinguishes the pernicious structure of the expansionist Communist state from the Russian people. Indeed, one might well wish that everyone who had written about say Germany in the 1930's and 1940's had been so scrupulous about distinctions.

In conclusion, this is a truly indispensable book for anyone who would understand world affairs and particularly US-USSR relations today. The price of failure to understand here will be much too high. As the author himself expresses it: "In this struggle for keeps, lest we delude ourselves, the only alternative to victory over Soviet Russian imperio-colonialism . . . is disastrous defeat for ourselves."

[From the New Guard, September 1971]

A VIEW ON THE NATURE OF BOLSHEVISM

(By Royal M. Wharton)

At the time that Senator Muskie was touring the Soviet Union in a quest for mutual understanding, Professor Lev Dobriansky's *USA And the Soviet Myth* (Devin-Adair, 1971) was being published. The Senator would have been better advised to stay home and read Dr. Dobriansky's latest book rather than continue his well publicized tour.

Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, YAF national advisor and head of Captive Nations Committee, with this book continues his efforts to enlighten the American people as to the real nature of the Soviet Union, its ultimate goals and its fatal weaknesses.

The history of Russia he writes, is largely the history of the Russian empire. Even from the time of Muscovy, its rulers held the notion of state greatness, and followed a messianic mission of world redemption through world domination. Throughout its history Russian rule was typified by totalitarian despotism and tyranny, and even included

the practice of leader worship. It was also characterized by an expanded bureaucracy and it followed a foreign policy of concessions when expedient. Russian Communism has proved to be just the third ideological rationale for Russian imperialism, building upon the legacy established by the "Third Rome" ideology and "Pan-Slavism." Communism, writes Dr. Dobriansky, has only magnified and refined the collectivist economic instruments for a more extensive state political control. He notes that even Karl Marx had referred to Russian foreign policy as changeless—a policy aimed towards world domination.

The USSR is today as in Tsarist times a multi-national state which incorporates in itself at least twelve separate national entities. Lenin, prior to his successful coup had recognized this multi-national character and agitated for the independence of these nations. However, once in power, he quickly reestablished the Russian empire by reconquering these nations, some of which had already been recognized by several western powers as well as by his own government.

It is these states that compose the Soviet Union's greatest strength and also its greatest weakness. The peoples of the captive nations now comprise 60% of the Soviet Union's total population. By language, history, culture and religion, these nations are as different from each other as, in Dr. Dobriansky's words, "the French are from the Germans or the Spanish, or the Chinese from the Japanese." Dr. Dobriansky stresses that the key to the destruction of the Soviet empire is the universal force of nationalism which, although presently held in check, is still felt in these captive nations as elsewhere.

He notes that it is through the economic exploitation of these captive areas that the USSR has been able to build an economy second only to the U.S. The Ukraine, the largest non-Russian nation both in Eastern Europe and in the Soviet Union, is a world leader in iron-ore and wheat. With a population of over 40 million people and a militantly anti-Russian history, Dr. Dobriansky looks to this captive nation as the primer for the nationalistic break-up of the Soviet empire. With its strategic location within the USSR, its importance would skyrocket with any direct conflict between the US and the Soviet Union.

THE SOVIET WORLD STRATEGY

Dr. Dobriansky views the policy of the Soviet Union as a global "troika strategy." Its three essential components are the continuance of a deceptive "peaceful coexistence" policy towards the West, allowing time for material, especially *The Vulnerable Russians* (Pageant, N.Y., 1967). It presents a strong case for a new policy directed towards the Soviet Union. *USA And The Soviet Myth* is a refreshing change from the literature of the detente and should be on the reading list of all those who seek a more realistic view of Soviet-American relations.

PENAL REFORM

HON. MARGARET M. HECKLER

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 6, 1971

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, in recent days, all Americans have come to have a deepened awareness of the urgency of penal reform, and the tragic loss of lives at Attica and the growing unrest throughout other penal institutions within the country, attest to the validity of this need. It was with a realization of the need for a thorough reevaluation of our penal codes and system, as well as an intensive study of the success with which the rehabilitative procedures within our Federal and State institutions have met, that I have introduced legislation to establish a Commission on Penal Reform.

For if we truly believe that the genuine worth of a man is as much in what he may become as in what he is, we must act to analyze what possible imperfections within our reformatories and correctional institutions have contributed toward the high rate of recidivism, which is, unfortunately, too predominant a characteristic of correctional institutions.

Perhaps one worthwhile solution, of which there undoubtedly are many, would be to emphasize the excellent work that is being done by the Teacher Corps, which was authorized by the Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended in 1970, to undertake programs and projects of a remedial educational and literacy nature as a means of enriching the skills and meeting the intellectual needs of offenders. This present year, the Teacher Corps is conducting five such programs, in different localities throughout the United States, two of which are located in New England, for juvenile offenders. Teacher Corps personnel work with youngsters, with correctional difficulties, in the public school systems, encouraging their progress and success in civil life, and some teachers assist in the county jails in providing services.

The extension of this program to adult offenders in State and other correctional institutions would be an impressive step forward in our joint commitment to improving the rehabilitative features of penal life, from which will flow its concomitant, a more peaceful and stable prison setting, with the attendant benefit to inmates, prison administrators and staff, and the general community as well.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Thursday, October 7, 1971

The House met at 12 o'clock noon. Rabbi Alvan D. Rubin, Temple Israel, St. Louis, Mo., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God and Father, we make supplication to Thee this day to bless the labor of our hands, "May the words of our mouths and the meditations of our hearts be acceptable before Thee."

Place Thy hand upon these servants

who minister to this Nation. Clothe them mightily with wisdom of mind and love of heart. Grant unto them patience, love, strength, and faith in their service to our people so that all of our citizens may realize a unity where there is discord, hope where there is despair, plenty where there is poverty, love where there is bitterness, light where it is dark, righteousness where there is injustice. The hand that gives is the hand that receives.

We pray that our hands may strengthen this Nation and we pray that our hands may receive of Thy blessings. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.