

The Honorable Mehmet Varisli, Senator for Konya in the Grand National Assembly.

[Applause, Senators rising.]

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I look forward to joining other Members of the Senate in greeting our distinguished colleagues from the Republic of Turkey, our longtime and cherished friends. We are very honored that they came here today to see us.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M.
TOMORROW

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move, pursuant to the provisions of Senate Resolution 176, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased Honorable JAMES G. FULTON, late a Representative from the State of Pennsylvania, and in accordance with the previous order, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 10 a.m. tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 1 o'clock and 57 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, October 8, 1971, at 10 a.m.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate October 7, 1971:

FEDERAL MARITIME COMMISSION

Clarence Morse, of California, to be a Federal Maritime Commissioner for the term expiring June 30, 1976.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Dudley C. Mecum, of Massachusetts, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Army.

U.S. ARMY

The following-named officer to be placed on the retired list, in grade indicated, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3962:

To be lieutenant general

Lt. Gen. John Arnold Heintges, xxx-xx-xx...
xxx-x... Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army).

1. Col. Edwin Howell Smith, Jr., xxx-xx-x...
xxx-x... Dental Corps, U.S. Army, for appointment as Assistant Surgeon General, U.S. Army, as major general, Dental Corps, Regular Army of the United States, and as major general in the Army of the United States, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3036, 3040, 3442, and 3447.

2. The following-named officers for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, to the grade indicated, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3284 and 3306:

To be brigadier general, Dental Corps

Col. Surindar Nath Bhaskar, XXXX
Dental Corps, U.S. Army.

Col. Jack Paden Pollock, xxx-xx-xxxx
Dental Corps, U.S. Army.

U.S. NAVY

Rear Adm. Frederick J. Harfingier II, U.S. Navy, having been designated for commands and other duties determined by the President to be within the contemplation of title 10, United States Code, section 5231, for appointment to the grade of vice admiral while so serving.

The following-named Reserve officers of the U.S. Navy for permanent promotion to the grade of rear admiral:

Line

Gayle T. Martin John B. Johnson
Alban Weber Michael Lorenzo
Frederick A. Wiggin

Medical Corps

Allan D. Callow Eugene P. Cronkite

Supply Corps

Frank E. Raab, Jr. Harland E. Holman

Civil Engineer Corps

George Reider

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Harold B. Scott, of Connecticut, to be an Assistant Secretary of Commerce.

IN THE ARMY

The nominations beginning Vincent R. Aceto, to be major, and ending Joseph P. Von Merveldt, to be second lieutenant, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on September 10, 1971.

IN THE NAVY

The nominations beginning William Benjamin Abbott III, to be captain, and ending Fran McKee, to be captain which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on September 13, 1971.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The nominations beginning Lewis H. Abrams, to be colonel, and ending Gary L. Yundt, to be colonel, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on September 13, 1971; and

The nominations beginning Louis R. Abraham, to be lieutenant colonel, and ending John T. Zych, Jr., to be lieutenant colonel, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on September 15, 1971.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

PULASKI DAY

HON. ELLA T. GRASSO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 7, 1971

Mrs. GRASSO. Mr. Speaker, October 11 marks the anniversary of a man's death—a man whose life and whose memory represent the symbol and the substance of love of freedom and personal responsibility and dedication. Pulaski Day is marked each year with special memorial to the gallant hero who fought for liberty in his native Poland and in the United States.

The son of Polish aristocracy, Count Casimir Pulaski was born at Podola, Poland, in 1748. With his father, Count Jozef Pulaski, Casimir was active in the revolutionary movements to liberate Poland from Russian encroachment. There, he distinguished himself as a cavalry officer.

The defeat of his armies forced him to leave his native land, and in the course of his travels he met Benjamin Franklin—a meeting destined to have a powerful impact on the birth of democracy in the New World.

At the time Pulaski volunteered to assist the American colonies in their revolutionary struggle, the Continental Army had no regular cavalry. Again dis-

tinguishing himself on the battlefield, Congress gave Pulaski permission to organize an independent corps of cavalry and light infantry. Through many of the most difficult battles of the war, Pulaski's aggressive and daring action inspired his men and intimidated the enemy.

Count Pulaski never lived to see the independent America he fought to achieve. He was fatally wounded in a fierce battle at Savannah on October 9, 1779. However, the banner of freedom for which he gave his life passed on to many of his countrymen who, despite years of oppression, have been indefatigable in the zeal for freedom. Even in the search for a new life in a new world—whether on farms in the Midwest, or in coalfields in Pennsylvania, or in the industrial centers of the East—Polish Americans have upheld the legacy of the valiant general and made magnificent contributions to our Nation.

Throughout our history, when the call has gone out for volunteers to defend this country, the Polish-American community has responded eagerly—as Pulaski did—to the great cause of freedom. The honor rolls of American dead include descendants from Warsaw and Krakow, and the battle of the Vistula. True to the tradition of a noble heritage, Poles have fought and sacrificed in order that the fruits of personal liberty might be preserved.

Mr. Speaker, as we pay tribute to Count Pulaski—soldier and patriot—we also honor the distinguished contributions of Polish Americans. Their achievements, as well as their valor, resourcefulness, and devotion to the ideals of liberty and patriotism, have earned the deep respect of all Americans.

GEN. CASIMIR PULASKI: HE DIED FOR AMERICAN FREEDOM

HON. R. LAWRENCE COUGHLIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 7, 1971

Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, on October 11 we will honor the memory of a great Polish patriot and Revolutionary soldier, Count Casimir Pulaski, who 192 years ago gave his life for a cause—the struggle for liberty—to which he was deeply pledged.

Pulaski was only 32 when he died from wounds received in the Battle of Savannah. Despite his youth, he had established a brilliant reputation in sharing the perils of the Revolutionary War. Although his stay and his service to the American Colonies was brief—less than 2 years—his fame has endured the cen-

turies and his name is endeared to all who are dedicated to the cause of liberty.

Pulaski best expressed his absolute dedication to the ideal of liberty when he said:

I would rather live free, or die for liberty. I suffer more because I cannot avenge myself against the tyranny of those who seek to oppress humanity. That is why I want to go to America.

And true to his words, Pulaski came to America to give his assistance to the colonists in their struggle for independence.

He first distinguished himself at the Battle of Brandywine, and then, in subsequent encounters with the enemy, he continued to demonstrate exceptional bravery and superb leadership under stress of fire. The Continental Congress, recognizing his contributions and ability, conferred on him the rank of brigadier general and placed him in command of all our cavalry forces.

Fired with an ambition to mold a crack fighting unit, Pulaski reorganized, trained, and drilled the American cavalry. He supplied this branch of the army with its first set of service regulations and tried to inspire his men with discipline and spirit. His book of drill regulations and rules for officers and privates still serves as the basis of cavalry drills in the U.S. Army.

Although he did not live to see America win her independence, Pulaski's gallantry in the field of battle and his complete devotion to the cause of freedom helped our country immeasurably in winning the ultimate victory.

Pulaski's courage in the face of tyranny, his patriotism, his warmth and generosity, are all characteristics that the Poles have demonstrated throughout centuries of strife and foreign domination.

I am particularly aware of these extraordinary qualities of the Polish people because there are many Polish Americans in my own 13th Congressional District of Pennsylvania who, together with Americans of Polish descent throughout the United States, have contributed much to the advancement of our culture and the preservation of our Nation.

Pulaski was the embodiment of the best traditions of Polish courage and chivalry. The man who was destined to become the "Father of the American Cavalry," and who twice saved General Washington's army from disruption, was a nobleman born to high social position and a life of ease and complacency. Yet he remained loyal to his ideals and chose a career of many hardships in order to advance the cause of liberty and uphold the fundamental rights of the individual.

General Pulaski was not an American for he represented a different culture, a different language, a different way of life. But he had the same love of liberty as the people of this country, and therefore, he was an American as much as he was a Pole.

With deep pride and gratitude, I join my colleagues in the Congress and my fellow Americans in commemorating the anniversary of General Pulaski's death. His fame will last as long as liberty remains upon the earth. It now remains

our task to recommit ourselves to the noble cause for which he lived and died.

TRIBUTE TO CASIMIR PULASKI

HON. JOSEPH G. MINISH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 7, 1971

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, October 9, 1971, marks the 192d anniversary of the tragic and untimely death of Count Casimir Pulaski during the American war for independence. A true believer in the democratic cause of the colonies, Casimir Pulaski came from Poland, his native land, to give his life for principle in the interest of all mankind.

The American cause of that period attracted talented supporters from many lands, but none could be said to excel Pulaski in fighting spirit and dedication to victory.

As a member of the Polish aristocracy, Count Pulaski had grown to manhood under harsh political circumstances. Under the reign of Stanislas II Augustus, Poland was reduced to the level of an occupied territory, with Russian troops quartered throughout the land, in preparation for the First Partition of Poland in 1772. Against the outrage, Polish patriots, fighting under Pulaski's father, established the Confederation of Bar. As a cavalry officer in the army of the Confederation, Casimir Pulaski fought brilliantly, establishing a great and glowing reputation. In time, however, the Confederates were overcome, and Pulaski, in company with others, was driven into exile.

His journeys took him to France in 1775, where he was advised of developments in the American colonies. Won to the American cause, Pulaski contacted Benjamin Franklin who in turn referred him to George Washington.

Pulaski arrived at Boston during the summer of 1777 and soon was involved in some of the most important fighting of the Revolution. Serving as a volunteer under Washington, he participated with distinction that September in the battle of Brandywine. The following month he served again at Germantown. An expert on cavalry operations, he was at first unable to exploit this skill for want of an effective American cavalry force. Such a force was raised, however, in the winter of 1777, and Pulaski became its commander. Almost at once the cavalry saw service at Trenton, where it performed with distinction. At Flemington, N.J., the cavalry engaged in a major foraging expedition, to feed the troops encamped at Valley Forge.

At the insistence of Washington, Congress granted Pulaski permission to organize an independent cavalry corps in 1778. The following year he was ordered with his troops to South Carolina with the object of bringing his talents to bear in behalf of forces under General Lincoln. On October 9, 1779, with victory in sight, the American cavalry charged the British lines in a dramatic assault. Pulaski was there at the front, urging

forward his cavalymen. In the midst of the fray, he fell, mortally wounded.

Count Casimir Pulaski was a true and great American hero. Like the millions who have followed his path from Poland to the United States, he distinguished himself as a patriot of the highest order who believed in, and fought for, democracy and freedom.

THE U.N. IN TROUBLE

HON. JOHN J. DUNCAN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 7, 1971

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I insert in the RECORD an interesting editorial on the United Nations from the October 4 Knoxville, Tenn., News-Sentinel:

THE U.N. IN TROUBLE

During the 25th anniversary session of the United Nations last year, speaker after speaker described the organization as "the last great hope of mankind."

Despite such flattery, the truth is that the countries of the world will do anything for the United Nations—except pay for it. In his latest report, Secretary-General U Thant disclosed that the United Nations is more than \$250 million in debt. In fact it faces bankruptcy and may not be able to meet its payroll later this year.

Thant cannot be blamed for this. For 10 years the poor man has been juggling books like an embezzling Texas banker to keep the organization going. But there are no more bonds to float, loans to make or special funds to strip, and the moment of financial truth is at hand.

Most of the trouble stems from the pernicious idea, pioneered by the Soviet Union, that a member need not pay for a budgeted or properly voted UN activity that it disapproves of. Thus the Kremlin owes and will not pay \$87.5 million for UN peace-keeping operations in the Congo, Middle East and elsewhere.

Russia's destructive precedent has encouraged the Soviet Bloc to withhold \$31 million in assessments and France \$17.7 million.

The United States hasn't helped matters by usually waiting until December or later to pay its share of UN expenses, which are due in February. This makes it easy for Russia, the entire Communist bloc, France and others to stall on their dues.

Among congressmen who care about the world organization, many point an accusing finger at Moscow and Paris for its troubles. How many have the guts to blame their own obstructive committee chairmen for not passing UN appropriations bills in time?

Another problem is the UN voting majority now enjoyed by have not and mini-states. They can pass any kind of General Assembly spending resolution they want—without worrying where the money will come from.

Of course, the richer, older countries freely lecture the new ones about responsible behavior. Their strictures would carry more weight if they would set an example, say, by paying their UN bills.

Finally, the organization's staff has ballooned from 9500 in 1956 to more than 33,000 today. Many of the employees are hard-working international civil servants. Many others are no-work paper shufflers living it up on tax-free incomes. U Thant himself could make a contribution to his beloved United Nations by using its poverty as a pretext for purging the drones.

Because of the United Nations' potential for preserving peace, statesmen are fond of saying, "If the United Nations didn't exist, the world would have to invent it." It would be nice if they would invent a way of financing it, not waiting for it to collapse in bankruptcy.

ADMINISTRATION WITHHOLDING FUNDS FOR PROGRAMS IN RURAL AMERICA

HON. ED EDMONDSON

OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, October 7, 1971

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, it is increasingly disturbing to millions of Americans to see the will of this Congress twisted or ignored by this administration on matters of great national urgency. Arbitrary administration withholding of appropriated funds is becoming almost a daily practice.

One of the most regrettable examples of this withholding is in funds for programs for rural America.

For example, Congress appropriated \$195.5 million for the rural environmental assistance program, which was \$55.5 million over President Nixon's budget. The result? All this money is frozen until the all-powerful Office of Management and Budget determines how much of the \$195.5 million it will allow to be spent.

The situation is the same with \$545 million in rural electrification funds.

In another case OMB has made a program decision which to me borders on irresponsibility. Congress, recognizing the growing national concern over pollution, appropriated \$100 million for the Farmers Home Administration rural water and sewer grant program. What level of spending has OMB approved? \$42 million, \$58 million less than this Congress felt was necessary.

Mr. Speaker, there are two things which are deeply disturbing about this. First, as I have mentioned, is the total disregard of congressional intent. There is not a more careful or harder working body of people in Washington than the House Committee on Appropriations.

Their decisions on funding levels are not made out of whim or fancy, but are based on hours of exhaustive hearings, study, and analysis. Congress is the representative body most responsive to the people's needs. The will and intent of Congress should not be taken lightly, as the OMB obviously takes it.

Much more important, however, is that the cases I have cited offer a clear illustration of the priority assigned to rural development by this administration. Rural development obviously ranks down around the bottom, if you look at the investment the administration wants to make in this area.

My personal view is that there are few goals ahead of us which are more important than the development of rural America. We must provide modern utility services, quality education, roads and highways, and jobs in the rural areas if

we are to reverse the national trend of migration to the cities.

These funds being withheld by the Office of Management and Budget are for programs aimed at just these national goals. These are programs aimed at making the rural areas better places to live. They are aimed at giving the rural people the modern conveniences that the city people enjoy.

When these are the goals we are pursuing, how can the administration justify withholding more than half the grant funds for rural water and sewer systems? It would be easier to justify doubling the expenditure in this area. The same holds true with rural electrification and with the overall rural environmental assistance program.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the budget experts downtown, who are elected by nobody, owe this Congress and the American people an explanation for their action in withholding these funds.

TRIBUTE TO CHARLES RAPER JONAS

HON. WILMER MIZELL

OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, October 7, 1971

Mr. MIZELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise at this time to pay well-deserved tribute to a man who has earned the respect of all of us who have served with him in the Congress.

The man is my distinguished colleague from North Carolina, the Honorable CHARLES RAPER JONAS. Mr. JONAS has recently announced his retirement at the end of this term and this Chamber will most certainly miss this man who has worked so well and with such dedication here for the past 20 years.

Mr. JONAS holds a very special place in the political history of my State, having served for so many years as the only member of my party in the North Carolina congressional delegation.

Since coming to the Congress in 1953, CHARLES JONAS has built an envied reputation as a watchdog of the Federal Treasury, as a man dedicated to responsible government, and as a public servant who takes his duty seriously.

There are those who have disagreed with Mr. JONAS in times past on matters of policy, but none has ever questioned the integrity of his position or his sincerity in fighting for it.

These are qualities that seem all too rare among politicians, but then CHARLES JONAS is no ordinary politician. He is a statesman in the truest and best sense.

I know that all my colleagues join me in wishing our colleague well in his retirement from public life, but even more, we are going to cherish what time we have left to benefit from his wise counsel, his long years of experience, and his dedication to the principles of good government.

His service here has greatly enhanced the work of Congress, and the Ninth Congressional District of North Carolina, the State and the Nation at large owe a

large debt of gratitude for his untiring efforts in their behalf.

CRIMINAL RECORDS OF ATTICA'S DECEASED RIOTERS

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 6, 1971

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, much is being said and made over the Attica prison riots, but information as to why the inmates were lodged in Attica is overlooked, almost as if suppressed.

So that the Members are reminded that these prison inmates were not sent to Attica prison as contest winners or to enjoy the comforts of a country club hotel, but rather for punishment, I include a breakdown on the crimes of the 30 prison inmate fatalities:

Murder or attempted murder.....	6
Manslaughter.....	4
Assault.....	2
Arson.....	2
Rape.....	1
Robbery.....	9
Sale of narcotics.....	1
Burglary.....	1
Possession of dangerous weapon.....	1
Grand larceny.....	1
Possession of drugs.....	1
Other.....	1

In order that our colleagues may have a better understanding of why the New York taxpayers were paying to protect society from these lodgers of Attica, I include the criminal records of those inmates killed in the riot:

DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONAL SERVICES,
October 1, 1971.

Congressman JOHN RARICK,
Longworth Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN RARICK: Enclosed are several copies of requested criminal records of inmate fatalities at Attica Correctional Facility. This list does not include the two latest casualties.

I regret that I was unable to provide copies sooner but the immediate demand by the press exhausted the copies I had and, since, I have had more made.

Thank you for your interest and concern.
Very truly yours,
GERALD T. HOULIHAN,
Director of Public Relations.

RECORD OF CONVICTIONS OF ATTICA INMATE FATALITIES

James Robinson, New York City: Murder 1st Degree—Natural Life. New York Supreme Court. Sentenced 11-27-68.

Previous criminal record:
4-9-61: Grand Larceny of Automobile—Morrison Training School—escaped.

1-15-62: Interstate Transportation of a Motor Vehicle—3 yrs.

10-24-64: Larceny of Automobile—1 yr. to 1½ yrs.

1-18-65: Assault with Deadly Weapon—1½ yrs.

10-9-67: Assault, Third Degree & Petit Larceny—9 mos.

Barry Jay Schwartz, Queens: Manslaughter 1st—10 to 20 yrs. Att. Robbery, 3rd—5 to 10 yrs. Queens Supreme Court—Sentenced 11-22-68.

Previous criminal record:
2-1-65: Leaving the scene of an accident—60 days.

10-11-65: Petit Larceny—Probation.
 3-25-66: Att. Burglary, Third Degree—Suspended Sentence & Probation.
 5-10-66: Disorderly Conduct—30 days.
 7-5-66: Violation of Probation—Committed to Nattaewan State Hospital.
 1-20-67: Unlawful Entry—Suspended Sentence of 60 days.
Robert Francis Joseph Hanigan, Valley Cottage, N.Y.: Murder 2nd degree, 20 yrs.—Life. Rockland County—Sentenced 1-27-65.
 Previous criminal record:
 1-14-61: Assault, Third Degree—Fined and 60 days suspended sentence.
Melvin Ware, New York City: Robbery 3rd Degree—5 yrs. Queens Supreme Court—Sentenced 11-25-69.
 Previous criminal record:
 2-3-61: Petit Larceny—Probation.
 1-8-62: Att. Assault, 3rd and Possession of a Weapon—Discharged on own recognizance.
 8-26-66: Resisting Arrest & Disorderly Conduct—60 days.
Milton Menyweather III, Buffalo, N.Y.: Attempt Arson 1st degree—10 yrs. Erie County—Sentenced 11-24-70.
 Previous criminal record:
 Three juvenile arrests.
 9-10-68 Possession of a Dangerous Weapon & Harassment—6 months.
 9-30-68 Criminal Tampering—6 months.
Samuel J. Melville, New York City: Arson 1st—6 to 18 yrs. Reckless endangerment 1st—2 Yrs., 4 Mos. to 7 Yrs. Assault 2nd—2 yrs., 4 Mos., to 7 yrs. New York Supreme Court, Sentenced 6-19-70.
 Previous criminal record: None.
Charles Lundy, New York City: Attempted Murder—15 yrs. Robbery 1st—15 yrs. Assault 1st—15 yrs. Assault 2nd—7 yrs. New York Supreme Court—Sentenced 3-13-69.
 Previous criminal record:
 9-19-62. Affray—Fined.
 1-5-68: Disorderly Conduct—Bond forfeited.
 4-23-68: Petit Larceny—Conditional Discharge.
Rafael Vasquez, Bronx, N.Y.: Att. Assault 2nd—3 yrs. Bronx Supreme Court—Sentenced 10-26-70.
 Previous criminal record: None.
Willie Fuller, Apopka, Florida: Rape 1st—10-20 yrs. Wayne County Court—Sentenced 10-31-60.
 Previous criminal record:
 12-30-56: Disorderly Conduct—90 days.
 5-10-58: Vagrancy—Fined.
 10-3-59: Simple Larceny—4 months.
Gidell Martin, Brooklyn, N.Y.: Att. Poss. of Dangerous Weapon—4 yrs. Kings Supreme Court—Sentenced 4-20-70.
 Previous criminal record:
 8-9-57: Auto Theft—1 yr.
 2-15-62: Disorderly Conduct (fists & feet)—90 days.
 5-23-67: Petit Larceny—1 yr.
Elliott James Barkley, Rochester, N.Y.
 Previous criminal record: None.
Alfred L. Williams, Buffalo, N.Y.: Manslaughter 1st—20 yrs. Robbery 1st—10-15 yrs. Robbery, 3rd—7 yrs. Erie County—Sentenced 3-31-71.
 Previous criminal record:
 1-15-57: Auto Theft—Indeterminate Term in Ohio State Reformatory.
 10-28-64: Unlawful Possession of Stolen Property—1 yr.
 5-23-66: Assault, third degree—1 yr.
 4-26-68: Theft by breaking and entering—3 months.
Thomas Hicks, Queens: Robbery 2nd—7 yrs. Kings Supreme Court—Sentenced 6-5-69.
 Previous criminal record:
 7-13-57: Petit Larceny—Committed to New York Reformatory.
 6-14-58: Disorderly Conduct—Fined.
 11-20-58: Unlawful Entry—1 yr.
 11-5-60: Robbery, 2nd degree—5 to 10 yrs.
Santiago Santos, Bronx, N.Y.: Burglary

3rd—4 yrs. Bronx Supreme Court—Sentenced 6-12-70.
 Previous criminal record:
 4-27-67: Petit Larceny—7 months.
 7-26-68: Attempted Grand Larceny—10 months.
Willie West, Buffalo, N.Y.: Robbery 2nd—15 yrs. Burglary 3rd—7 yrs. Gr. Larceny 2nd—7 yrs. Erie County Court—Sentenced 11-19-70.
 Previous criminal record:
 Three juvenile arrests.
 10-9-62: Assault, Third Degree—Suspended Sentence.
 11-13-64: Drinking in Public—Fined.
 6-25-65: Possession of Marijuana—Sentenced to Elmira Reception Center.
William Allen, Bronx, N.Y.: Manslaughter 2nd—4 yrs. Bronx Supreme Court—Sentenced 1-19-70.
 Previous criminal record:
 6-19-67: Committed to New York City Reformatory.
 12-28-67: Petit Larceny—Suspended Sentence.
Melvin Duvall Gray, Rochester, N.Y.: Crim. Selling Dangerous Drug—15 yrs. Monroe County Court, Sentenced 1-7-70.
 Previous criminal record:
 7-16-67: Unlawful Possession of Narcotic Drugs—Probation 5 yrs.
Carlos Joseph Prescott, Rochester, N.Y.: Murder 1st degree—25 yrs. to Life. Monroe County—Sentenced 2-5-70.
 Previous criminal record: None.
Allen Durham, Brooklyn, N.Y.: Murder 2nd Degree—20 yrs. to Life. Kings Supreme Court—Sentenced 9-17-68.
 Previous criminal record: Two juvenile convictions.
Kenneth Hess, Binghamton, N.Y.: Grand Larceny 3rd—4 yrs. Broome County Court—Sentenced 5-13-71.
 Previous criminal record:
 2-19-66: Public Intoxication—7 days.
 5-24-66: Disorderly Conduct—30 days.
 7-1-66: Disorderly Conduct—30 days.
 7-19-66: Assault, Third Degree—10 days.
 8-2-66: Assault, Third Degree—25 days.
 9-5-66: Resisting Arrest and Assault on Police Officer—3 years.
John Barnes, Brooklyn, N.Y.: Att. Robbery 3rd—5 yrs. Kings Supreme Court—Sentenced 1-16-68.
 Previous criminal record: No adult convictions.
Lorenzo McNeil, Queens: Robbery, 3rd—5 to 7 yrs. Queens Supreme Court—Sentenced 6-23-65.
 Previous criminal record:
 9-28-57: Disorderly Conduct—Suspended Sentence.
 9-24-59: Attempted Robbery, Third Degree—2½ to 5 years.
William McKinney, Brooklyn, N.Y.: Manslaughter, 1st degree—20 yrs. Att. Assault, 1st degree—7 yrs. Possession of a Weapon—7 yrs. Kings Supreme Court—Sentenced 1-26-71.
 Previous criminal record:
 11-25-58: Assault, Third Degree—Committed to New York City Reformatory.
 2-15-61: Attempted Petit Larceny—60 days.
 12-30-65: Violation of the Public Health Law (marijuana) 60 months suspended sentence.
Michael Privitera, Buffalo, N.Y.: Murder, 1st degree—25 yrs.—Life. Monroe County—Sentenced 10-14-68.
 Previous criminal record:
 1-23-50: Disorderly Conduct & Resisting Arrest—Suspended Sentence.
 10-2-53: Assault, Third Degree—1 year.
 5-26-55: Disorderly Conduct—Suspended Sentence.
 7-5-55: Possession of Instruments used in administering narcotics—1 year.
 5-10-57: Attempted Gr. Larceny, Second Degree—1 yr., 3 Mos., to 2½ yrs.
 7-26-62: Petit Larceny—1 year.

7-15-64: Attempted Gr. Larceny, Second Degree—2 to 4 years.
Bernard Davis, New York City: Robbery 2nd Degree—7 yrs. Robbery 3rd Degree—7 yrs. Queens Supreme Court—Sentenced 12/2/70.
 Previous criminal record:
 1-24-67: Committed to Elmira Reception Center—3 yrs.
 1-13-69: Criminal Trespass—Conditional Discharge.
Raymond Rivera, Bronx, N.Y.: Crim. Poss. of a Dangerous Drug—3 yrs. Bronx Supreme Court—Sentenced 3-10-70.
 Previous criminal record:
 10-15-64: Possession of Policy Slips—Fined or 20 days in jail.
 6-10-68: Criminally selling dangerous drug (consolidated with above three year sentence).
Harold Thomas, New York City: Robbery 1st (4 counts) 10 to 20 yrs. Robbery 2nd (4 counts) 7½ to 15 yrs. New York Supreme Court—Sentenced 5-14-68.
 Previous criminal record:
 3-27-61: Proceedings in Sanity following arrest for Robbery—Matteawan State Hospital.
 8-8-63: Petit Larceny—1 yr.
 7-22-64: Possession of Narcotic Drugs—60 days.
Kenneth Ivey Malloy, Queens, N.Y.: Robbery, 2nd Degree—3 yrs., 9 Mos., to 10 yrs. Queens Supreme Court—Sentenced 1-19-68.
 Previous criminal record:
 11-4-60: Petit Larceny—New York City Penitentiary.
 2-27-62: Escape from Custody—6 months.
 10-15-62: Petit Larceny—6 months.
 4-27-64: Robbery, Second Degree—5 years.
Jose Mentijo, New York, N.Y.: Assault, 1st degree—10 years. New York Supreme Court—Sentenced 6/24/71.
 Previous criminal record:
 12-23-53: Criminal Possession of a Pistol—Committed to New York City Reformatory.
 5-19-55: Possession of Narcotic Drug—30 days.
 6-14-55: Violation of Parole—Returned to New York City Reformatory.
 3-26-56: Possession of Narcotic Drug—60 days.
 8-1-58: Attempt to Feloniously Possess a Narcotic Drug—1 yr., 6 mos., to 1 yr., 9 mos.
 11-29-60: Unlawful possession of Narcotic Drug—6 months.
 2-26-62: Attempted Criminal Possession of a Pistol—3 to 5 years.
 10-21-63: Sale of Narcotic Drugs (Federal Court)—4 years to begin upon expiration of New York State sentence.
 2-5-71: Reckless Endangerment, First Degree—3 months.
Emanuel Johnson, Brooklyn, N.Y.: Robbery, 3rd Degree—5 to 8 years. Kings County Supreme Court—Sentenced 5-24-67.
 Previous criminal record:
 3-17-60: Attempted Petit Larceny—60 days.
 12-26-60: Assault, Third Degree—Committed to New York City Penitentiary.
 10-22-63: Assault, Third Degree—Time served.
 2-13-64: Assault, Third Degree—6 months.
 12-4-64: Robbery, Second Degree—2½ to 5 years.

MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN—HOW LONG?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 7, 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?

LITTLE IMPROVEMENT SEEN IN MAIL SERVICE

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 7, 1971

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee I am naturally interested in the developments which will be forthcoming under the new U.S. Postal Service. I am most interested in the public reaction to the postal reform legislation, which the Congress approved in 1970. Therefore, it is with special interest that I noted a column by Dean Linton, which appeared in the September 22 edition of *Suburban Life* and which, to say the least, is an interesting and fascinating commentary from a citizen's point of view on the Postal Service.

The article follows:

LITTLE IMPROVEMENT SEEN IN MAIL SERVICE (By Dean Linton)

Nearly three months have passed since the inauguration of the United States Postal Service, a semi-private governmentally controlled organization which inherited the mess left by the old U.S. Post Office Department.

Postal rates have increased, some changes visible to the public eye have been made, but, in my opinion, little improvement has been seen in postal service.

In recent weeks news releases have been received from area post offices lauding a new one day service within certain areas. It sounds great and I hope it works.

But personal observations during the past month make me more than a little skeptical of the Postal Service's ability to deliver on time.

One such occurrence happened last Saturday when I received at home an airmail letter which I had mailed exactly one week prior in front of the Oak Park post office. Lacking sufficient postage for its weight, this airmail letter was returned to my Hillside home seven days later for additional postage. It had made it as far as O'Hare during the week.

Several weeks ago a friend of mine mailed a parcel from the Berwyn post office to an address on Chicago's south side. It arrived 10 days later.

Again a personal experience: about a month ago I received a first class letter mailed from Berwyn, arriving nine days later in Hillside. At least that's better time than the parcel, but I doubt if it would break the old Pony Express record.

Perhaps these are isolated cases, but they seem to be occurring more frequently.

Postal Service efficiency won't happen overnight. I will be the first to admit that point. I know that changes are being made. Manpower has been reduced and belts have been tightened to put the department within its operating budget. This would be welcomed by any taxpayer.

Less pickups at collection boxes are being made, but as long as the remaining collections make the proper dispatches this can only be an efficiency measure. Mail is not speeded any faster if it is picked up every hour at the corner mailbox and then remains in the local post office for a late dispatch.

Somewhat angry Saturday when my airmail letter, which I thought had been delivered several days before, was returned, I proceeded to the post office, letter in hand, with its additional postage.

"I know it's not your fault, but can you tell me why it takes seven days for an airmail letter to go from Oak Park to O'Hare to Hillside," I asked of the sympathetic clerk.

Shaking her head in disgust, she said these things are happening "all the time."

"People better start writing letters to the right people before it's too late," she added.

Well, that's not a bad idea. But do you think they will get delivered in time?

A SOLID START—GI DRUG TREATMENT PROGRAMS

HON. ROBERT H. STEELE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 7, 1971

Mr. STEELE. Mr. Speaker, the military's new drug dependent treatment programs have come under strong criticism in recent weeks for allegedly being inept and ill-conceived. In my view, much of this criticism has been unfair and has obscured much of the progress that has been made in this field.

Military heroin addict treatment and rehabilitation programs were launched virtually overnight in mid-June 1971 concurrent with the appointment by President Nixon of Dr. Jerome H. Jaffe, special consultant on narcotics and dangerous drugs and as the director of the Special Action Office for Drug Abuse Prevention.

The implementation of any new and complex health care program will have its difficulties. Instead of seeking fault with the military's effort one might look at the expeditious manner in which the military established screening, treatment, and rehabilitation programs and their ongoing efforts to rapidly expand screening and to innovate and improve all programs despite great difficulty in finding military or even civilian experts who could advise on how to effectively treat drug dependent individuals.

The United States has a scarcity of qualified personnel who know how to implement, manage, and deliver direct care services in addiction treatment and rehabilitation programs. There is no reason to assume that the military should have had the expertise which the civilian sector of our society lacked. However, the military has recognized that its treatment and rehabilitation programs can use improvement and has taken constructive remedial actions. Some actions which have been taken in conjunction with the Special Action Office for Drug Abuse Prevention are:

First. Urinalysis testing of U.S. servicemen stationed in Vietnam was begun on June 18. This testing program has enabled the Army to identify approximately 5,214 addicts to date and place them in rehabilitation programs. The program has also provided the first scientific basis for estimating the size and seriousness of the heroin problem among our troops. Since June 18, 103,279 serv-

icemen were given urine tests and 5.1 percent showed positive reactions to opiates. This is the approximate percentage of men believed to be hard-core addicts. It is estimated that another 10 percent of the men used heroin intermittently while in Vietnam.

Second. From September 6 to 17, 1971, 20 military treatment specialists received intensive drug abuse rehabilitation training at the Illinois State drug abuse programs in Chicago. These 20 men have already left for Vietnam where their knowledge will be utilized to improve the treatment programs in Vietnam.

Third. On September 9, 1971, six hand-picked civilian treatment specialists, who are ex-addicts, departed for Vietnam to advise military treatment personnel there on the latest methods employed in civilian addict treatment programs. These six specialists will be in Vietnam for 21 days.

Fourth. On November 1, 2, and 3, 125 military treatment personnel from 39 bases in the United States providing treatment and rehabilitation will attend a special 3-day training course at Fort Sam Houston, Tex. The curriculum is being developed by the Special Action Office for Drug Abuse Prevention and the faculty for this 3-day Drug Abuse Training Institute will be conducted by 12 recognized authorities in the drug abuse field.

Anyone with the slightest degree of familiarity with heroin addicts is aware that a common trait of addicts is their propensity to complain about their treatment program. Obviously, one of the characteristics of addicts is a lack of self-discipline and a distrust of most institutions. These are some of the reasons why they have become drug abusers. The fact that a drug treatment program imposes discipline or the fact that the addict does not trust the program are signs that the program is trying to change self-destructive life styles by not indulging the addict. The additional fact that many of the young servicemen have been directed into drug treatment programs by the military, not voluntarily as in similar civilian programs, has heightened the propensity for individual displays of "dislike, distrust, and disenchantment."

It is difficult for a lay person to understand the complexities involved in swiftly initiating treatment programs for heroin addicts. The dynamics of clients in such treatment programs can be deceiving to the lay person who tries to draw hasty conclusions as to whether or not the program is effective.

It has been charged that the administration is inflexible. Clearly the record, as partially outlined above, speaks for itself. Innovation and acquisition of new knowledge is the keystone of the programs being developed by the Special Action Office for Drug Abuse Prevention and is, therefore, policy guidance which the Department of Defense has faithfully pursued.

We clearly have a long way to go in meeting the serious hard drug problem which exists among the military in Vietnam. However, this fact should not obscure the solid start which has been made.

DAMAGE EFFECTIVENESS

HON. JOHN G. SCHMITZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 7, 1971

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Anthony Harrigan has written an excellent short analysis of the deteriorating state of the United States defenses in relation to the Soviet Union.

Mr. Harrigan mentions that Gen. Bruce K. Holloway, commander in chief of the Strategic Air Command, testified before the Senate Committee on Armed Services about the extreme importance of increasing the accuracy of our missile force to the point where they have a hard target or counterforce capability.

General Holloway stated:

A few important words on damage effectiveness: The probability of inflicting damage on a target depends on three basic factors: Target hardness, weapon yield and the accuracy of weapon delivery. The most important of these factors is accuracy—and I think this is the least understood.

We would like options to accomplish second strike damage limitation to the extent technology practicably offers—as well as assured destruction of selected urban-industrial war-supporting resources. And we have to accomplish defense suppression before any objective target system can be struck effectively. These are difficult targets—even more so in a retaliation strategy—and they are being progressively multiplied and hardened.

Another stimulant for more precision is reduction of collateral damage.

I think it is very unrealistic to suppose that if we became involved in nuclear conflict, we would be unconcerned about limiting collateral damage. It is difficult for me to think that the only way weapons of such widespread destructive potential would possibly be used is indiscriminate attacks to maximize human death tolls.

In addition to the matter of purely quantitative economy, I think these are good reasons why we should address the accuracy of our nuclear weapons. This issue sometimes becomes obscured in discussion of first strike versus retaliation. I personally believe this is a misunderstanding—and a terrible one—which need not foreclose reasonable discussion of and attention to accuracy.

It is extremely unfortunate that the amendments introduced by Senator BUCKLEY to the military procurement authorizations for 1972 on the floor of the Senate Tuesday, which would have provided our Minuteman and Poseidon forces with just such a capability, were defeated. There seems to have been some confusion between a "counterforce capability," the qualitative capability to render certain classes of strategic offensive forces ineffective prior to launch, and a "first-strike capability," the capability to reduce the enemy's retaliatory capability, through the use of counterforce and ballistic missile defense, to a level at which the damage they could inflict in response would not be unacceptable.

These are two entirely different ket-tles of fish. A first-strike capability implies both a quantitative and qualitative

relationship while a counterforce capability is simply qualitative. Of prime importance in first strike calculations is a determination of what is acceptable and what is unacceptable damage. There can be little doubt in the minds of anyone that the level of acceptable damage to the United States is several magnitudes lower than what the Soviet Politburo might consider to be acceptable damage. The most generally accepted criteria for unacceptable damage to the United States is the detonation of any nuclear weapon on any of our population centers. This low threshold of unacceptable damage makes the credibility of the Soviet deterrent effective at very low levels.

The Soviets actually have the necessary deterrent capability, that is the capability to inflict unacceptable damage to the United States, in their bomber force alone. Soviet basing procedures deny our submarine launched missile force the capability to destroy the requisite number of these weapons prior to launch and our bomber defense, as is well known to practically everyone who keeps up on these matters—as the Soviets surely do, are virtually nil. The critical number of Soviet bombers immune to our SLBM's could easily be flushed and on their way to the United States prior to the arrival of our land-based ICBM's. Our lack of adequate bomber defenses assures Soviet penetration and destruction of at least several large U.S. cities.

In other words even if the United States were to achieve the capability to completely destroy prior to launch the Soviet ICBM force we would still not have a first strike capability and the Soviets would therefore still maintain a realistic deterrent to U.S. attack. This means that it would be unnecessary for the Soviets to launch a disarming strike on the United States in a crisis since we could not successfully disarm them even if we were to initiate an attack. Their bombers alone provide them with a deterrent. Our inability to neutralize this force prior to launch, coupled with our lack of adequate bomber defenses, combine to produce a condition of deterrence no matter what might happen to the Soviet ICBM force.

Of course the Soviet bomber force is only one portion of the triad which we cannot effectively destroy through a first strike. There also exists a Soviet ballistic nuclear submarine force also immune to attack. The Soviet force of Y-class ballistic nuclear submarines—similar to our Polaris—now consists of 20 vessels and is being rapidly expanded at a rate of 8 to 10 per year. By the time the improvements in our Minuteman and Poseidon forces advocated by Senator BUCKLEY were operational the Soviet Y-class force would probably be larger than ours.

It is generally conceded that the state of the art of anti-submarine warfare techniques are such that these submarines are presently invulnerable. If there is no radical breakthrough in submarine detection methods in the next several years the Soviet ballistic nuclear submarine force by itself will provide them

with an extremely credible deterrent against the United States.

There is no point within the United States which is more than 900 nautical miles from the open sea, approximately half of our urban industrial targets lie within 500 nautical miles of SLBM launch points in the Atlantic Ocean, and the Soviet SLBM range is approximately 1,500 miles. Is there anyone who would contend that a Soviet retaliatory capability sufficient to destroy up to 50 percent of our urban industrial areas would not serve as an adequate deterrent against the United States?

If there were a breakthrough in ASW techniques the damage limiting option for our land based missile force is obviously critical to the survival of our Nation.

We see then that even if we were to give our land- and sea-based missiles a counterforce or damage limiting capability on a quantitative level necessary to completely neutralize the Soviet ICBM force prior to launch we would still not have anywhere near a first strike capability. Even one surviving element of the Soviet triad provides them with the capability to inflict unacceptable damage on our Nation, and they would still have two increments of the triad surviving.

But Senator BUCKLEY was not asking even for that capability. He was simply asking that we make our missiles as accurate as the state of the art permits in order to foreclose developing Soviet options for a successful attack on the United States. He was asking for the upgrading of our forces necessary to maintain the credibility of our deterrent, not to impair the Soviet deterrent of the United States. The United States does not have the capability at this point, and will not have in the future unless Senator BUCKLEY's amendments are acted upon favorably, to eliminate the 900 Soviet SS-11's which can serve as a counter-city reserve force in conjunction with an SS-9-SLBM strike against our Minuteman and SAC bomber forces. If the Soviets are able to critically degrade our land-based Minuteman force and strategic bomber force through a combined SS-9-SLBM attack while holding hundreds of hardened and invulnerable ICBM's in reserve we are going to be in a pretty fix. As was noted in a recent critique of the 1969 ABM debate in the Senate by the Operations Research Society of America a synchronized attack on both land-based elements of our triad is hardly impossible. In this situation the President, if still alive, will have only the option of launching our SLBM's at Soviet urban-industrial targets, with a resulting massive SS-11 attack on American cities, or surface our Polaris-Poseidon force and surrender. With a counterforce or damage-limiting capability against hard targets the President would not have to make a choice between these two extremely undesirable alternatives but could order the destruction of the Soviet counter-city reserve force. Giving the Commander in Chief this option fore-closes the possibility of the Soviets successfully attacking the United States using this type of strategy, other things

remaining equal, and thus greatly decreases the chances that they would attack.

By equipping our missile forces with a damage limiting capability of the type advocated by Senator BUCKLEY we are eliminating one of the possible attack strategies which could lead Soviet planners to believe that a successful first strike against the United States is possible. By failing to make our missiles as accurate as they could be we are increasing the danger that the Soviets will conclude that an attack can succeed and thereby increasing the possibility that such an attack will take place. We are allowing our deterrent to be called into question and bringing to the fore that very situation which is used time and time again to argue against upgrading our missile force—that in a crisis the Soviets will attack.

It is time to completely rethink our entire approach to nuclear strategy. Senator BUCKLEY has done the Nation a real service by bringing his amendments to the floor of the Senate. Hopefully this action will stimulate debate of a new type and allow the Congress to emerge from the suffocating and unreal concepts propagated by the McNamara theorists which have for so long dominated discussion of the issue most directly effecting the survival of our Nation.

The article by Mr. Harrigan follows:
THE NATIONAL SECURITY CRISIS: AMERICA'S
DETERIORATED DEFENSE POSTURE
(By Anthony Harrigan)

(NOTE.—Anthony Harrigan is Executive Vice President of the Southern States Industrial Council. Mr. Harrigan is a frequent writer and lecturer on national defense topics. His articles on military matters have been published in Proceedings of the U.S. Naval Institute, Military Review, Armor, Marine Corps Gazette, Ordnance, Canadian Military Journal, Wehrkunde, Australian Army Journal, NATO's Fifteen Nations, Revue Militaire Generale. He has lectured at the U.S. National War College and at Harvard University. Excerpts from this Report have appeared in Modern Age and New Guard.)

In the last decade, the American people have been witnesses to a shocking reduction in their national military power. Whereas in the 1950's the United States was the dominant country in the world, possessed of military might second to none, American strength in the 1960's and early 1970's has ebbed rapidly. The erosion of America's defense forces can be seen in terms of expenditures for defense purposes. The \$71.8 billion proposed for defense in Fiscal Year 1971 was \$9.8 billion below the Johnson administration budget for Fiscal Year 1970 and constituted the lowest percentage of the gross national product since 1951. In the judgment of U.S. Sen. Barry Goldwater, a member of the Senate Armed Services Committee, the United States is fast on its way toward becoming a second-rate power in the world and "is no longer in a position of parity with the Soviets."

The total significance of the erosion of America's armed might is what thoughtful citizens must seek to understand. Warships, military aircraft and missiles are instruments of national purpose. The history of the U.S. armed forces is the history of the American Republic—an index to the survival instinct and goals of the American people. If the American people are unwilling to provide adequately for their own defense, it is clear

that their survival instinct has been impaired.

Historically, the armed forces of the United States have been the shield of the Republic. This has been especially the case in the cold war years. Though it is fashionable now to say that the cold war has ended, realists know strife with the communist powers has simply entered a new phase. Today the communist states evidence both the capability and intention of new aggressive moves against the capitalist world.

For almost a generation, America's nuclear armaments have deterred the Soviet Union from starting a third world war—a massive strike against the free world nations. The conventional armed forces of the United States have been busily employed in the quarter-century past in fighting limited wars against communist aggression and in checking Soviet and Communist Chinese advances in many parts of the world. In the Cuban missile crisis of 1962, America's nuclear superiority and supremacy at sea prevented the Soviets from establishing domination over the West.

Today, however—less than a decade after the Cuban missile crisis—the United States no longer is the first military power in the world. In a few areas such as the design of multiple warhead (MIRV) missiles, the U.S. is technologically more advanced than the Soviet Union. But in terms of overall military capability the Soviet Union is ahead of the United States. Where the Soviets are now on a basis of parity with the U.S., they are moving ahead rapidly to overtake America.

The U.S. public has heard the facts from the Joint Chiefs of Staff. But the full significance of the erosion of U.S. military strength seems to have escaped the public. In Congress the weight of opinion is on the side of reducing U.S. military expenditures. Those members of Congress who press for dramatic action to restore America's strategic superiority are in the minority. The grim facts they recite fail to impress many key legislators and large and influential segments of public opinion.

MISSILE FORCES

Yet facts are facts. The most ominous of these relate to the comparative strength of U.S. and Soviet nuclear forces. In 1965 the Soviet Union's strategic missile force consisted of approximately 220 missile launches.

The missiles were comparable to the first generation of American ICBM's. At that time the U.S. missile force consisted of 880 ICBM's. We not only had the advanced land-based Minuteman missile but we had absolute supremacy in sea-based Polaris missiles.

Today the Soviets possess approximately 1,500 ICBM's, whereas the U.S. has only 1,054.

The giant Soviet SS-9 missiles have a capability far exceeding anything in the U.S. arsenal. All in all, the Soviets have 50 per cent more land-based missiles than the United States.

That is only part of the story; the United States has stabilized its missile force, whereas the Soviets are pushing ahead with construction of new land-based and sea-based missiles. At the present rate of Soviet missile deployment, the USSR should have 2,500 ICBM launchers by 1975. Unless dramatic action is taken this year, the United States will still have only 1,054 missile launchers four years from now. This dangerous imbalance is the result of the doctrine of nuclear "parity" developed by former Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara and continued by the Nixon administration under the guise of nuclear "sufficiency." Other nations, with no need to resort to euphemisms, will see this nuclear situation in terms of alarming U.S. weakness.

Some recent policy decisions are nothing less than extraordinary. For example, Gen. Bruce K. Holloway, head of Strategic Air

Command, told Congress that the United States has purposely passed up the opportunity to make its Minuteman intercontinental ballistic missiles more accurate. He blamed the situation on those who "fear" that the improved ICBMs might be used as a "first strike weapon."

If the nuclear balance situation is gloomy now, it will be even less cheering in the mid and late 1970's. Consider the situation with respect to missile firing submarines. No U.S. missile-firing submarines have been built in more than two years. None are definitely scheduled for the future. The only significant change in the U.S. missile submarine force is in installation of advanced missiles in submarines conceived in the 1950's. There are studies of an ULMS (underwater long-range missile) submarine class, but no firm plans for construction. This advanced missile submarine is essential in view of the USSR's lead in land-based missiles.

The Soviets, meanwhile, are expanding their missile submarine force at a rapid rate. Adm. Elmo R. Zumwalt Jr., USN, Chief of Naval Operations, told the Society of Naval Architects and Marine Engineers last fall that the Soviet strategic naval forces take the form of the modern "Yankee" class nuclear powered ballistic missile submarines similar to our Polaris boats. They currently have 15 of these submarines in operation and are building 12 a year, a clear indication of their desire to back up their land-based missile systems with a powerful strategic naval force.

Gen. John C. Meyer, Vice Chief of Staff of the Air Force and an expert in missiles, has pointed out the long-range effects of this submarine construction program, saying that if they continue at their present rate, the Soviets will match the U.S. sea-launched ballistic missile inventory by 1974 or 1975. The Soviets also are testing a new, longer range submarine-launched ballistic missile.

MANNED BOMBERS

The situation with respect to manned bombers—another factor in strategic deterrence—is equally discouraging. In 1965, the United States had two and one-half times as many bombers as the Soviet Union, consisting of B-52's and B-58's. Today, the American bomber force has been reduced from about 750 to 450. All of the very fast B-58's have been retired from service. The proposed B-1 bomber, designed as a replacement, is receiving only limited development funding.

Another element in strategic deterrence is aircraft and missile defense. A limited anti-ballistic missile defense was authorized by the Congress—after the most difficult of struggles, but the Soviets are well along on building a strong ABM defense system. While SALT talks were in progress last year, the Soviets started construction of giant ABM radar units. Dr. M. B. Schneider, writing in *Ordnance*, has reported that "about a half dozen are operational or nearly so." Dr. John S. Foster Jr., director of Defense Research and Engineering in the Department of Defense, has warned that these radars "can in the near future provide the same radar coverage which we will have some eight years from now if all the Safeguard ABM program is completed." Dr. Foster noted that the "vast network of Soviet radars and defense sites, whether anti-aircraft or antimissile, has already complicated the problem of arms control of ABM to the point where it may not be practical." It is estimated that the Soviets have more than 1,000 surface to air missile sites. The United States has one-tenth this number of SAM's and no ABM radars operational today. Moreover, U.S. surface to air missiles are Bomarc and Army missiles developed in the 1950's. The Soviets have had wide experience with operational SAM's in both North Vietnam and in the Suez area.

Tactical fighter forces still have an important role in air defense against bombers armed with nuclear weapons. Here again, the United States is at a marked disadvantage. The Soviets have 3,600 jet aircraft. The United States tactical fighter strength is about 1,600 aircraft. Moreover, the Soviets have a qualitative edge. In the last decade, they introduced nine new fighter aircraft. In the same period, the U.S. failed to develop a single new aircraft for the air-to-air combat role. The new military realities are evident in Europe where the Soviet Air Force is now using the new supersonic strike version of the MIG-23 fighter in large numbers. This fighter, labeled "Foxbat" by the NATO command, is faster than comparable aircraft used by American forces. Its reported speed is Mach 3—three times the speed of sound—compared with a speed of Mach 2.2 for the F-4 fighter.

All of these situations with respect to diminishing inventories of American weapons reflect an alarming decline in research and development—the elimination or cutback of defense programs leading to advanced weapons systems. Existing U.S. armaments date back to programs launched 10, 15, or even 20 years ago. In many cases, there is nothing in the mill to replace them. The studies undertaken during the McNamara years proved sterile. New weapons simply were not authorized. For example, the Soviet Union's new bluewater fleet is superbly equipped with surface-to-surface rockets. The United States has yet to develop such a naval missile, though the uniformed professionals have cited the need for years.

NAVAL FORCES

The deterioration of America's combat strength is especially apparent in the U.S. Navy. Failure to start a major naval construction program in the 1960's led to today's sharp curtailment of U.S. naval strength.

During the sixties, the United States depended on warships built to fight the Japanese and the Germans in the 1940's. They were patched and repaired, but replacements were not authorized. These ships have reached the end of their useful lives and are being decommissioned in large numbers. Severe budget cuts in the last two years have forced decommissioning of other ships which still have combat capability. Adm. Zumwalt is on record as nothing that—

"The budget cuts that have been taken in the last two years have been in the field of sea control forces. As a result we have, during the last two years, come down on the order of 35 percent of these forces. We can go no further without great risk."

Robert D. Heini Jr., a leading authority on naval affairs, has said that the U.S. Navy in 1971 is likely to reach the point at which it was in 1936 in numbers of ships in commission.

In the four years from June 30, 1968 to June 30, 1972, the U.S. Navy will have retired 463 ships from the active list. During that same period, 141 new ships will have been commissioned, leaving a net reduction of 322 ships—more than one-third of the entire American fleet.

Control of the seas depends on a complex of naval weapons systems: carriers, submarines, destroyers, intelligence-gathering ships, mine sweepers, and service ships. The United States has need of new ships in all of these categories. The current naval shipbuilding program is grossly inadequate to meet accumulated needs of many years. For example, under the fiscal year 1971 defense appropriations bill, only one new nuclear guided missile frigate was approved, only one fast combat support ship, only two general assault ships, and so forth. Great need exists for an entirely new class of fast surface-to-surface missile armed, small destroyers. Anti-defense elements in Congress oppose funds for such vessels. Yet, the Navy's manpower

situation will become critical in the mid-1970's and small, heavily armed ships will be more important than at any time in decades.

SOVIET SEA POWER

Throughout the 1960's, U.S. naval forces went largely unchallenged. In the 1970's, there may be numerous direct and indirect challenges. The Soviets have powerful naval forces in the Mediterranean. They have used them in daring and dangerous ways, including collision-course tactics with U.S. warships. Soviet naval vessels frequently operate in the Caribbean. Indeed Sen. Strom Thurmond has asserted that "current intelligence reports also indicate the Soviet have broken their 1962 agreement with the U.S. by deploying nuclear missile launching submarines at Cuban bases." With the installation of a Marxist regime in Chile, it seems only a matter of time before the Soviet Navy has access to the port of Valparaiso. Then the Soviets will be in position to menace the Panama Canal from both the Pacific and Atlantic.

To see Soviet naval growth and operations in perspective it is necessary to survey the decade past. In 1960, the Soviets were engaged in major naval construction. High seas operations were rare. The first Soviet exercises in the Norwegian Sea were held in 1961. The next year saw new operations by Soviet maritime aircraft and the Cuban crisis, in which the USSR learned a lesson in the importance of sea power. In 1963, a pattern of bi-annual naval exercises in the Iceland-Faroes Gap was established.

The Soviet Navy introduced missile-carrying warships in 1964 and the Soviet Mediterranean squadron was established. By 1965, the Soviets were holding numerous large exercises in the North Atlantic. The year 1966 marked the maturing of the Soviet high seas fleet. Adm. V. A. Kasatonov, first Deputy Commander in Chief of the Soviet Navy, said: "The USSR Navy flag can be seen in all parts of the world's oceans." In 1967, the Soviet fleet stepped up all its activities. A Soviet-built Komar rocket boat, operated by Egypt, sunk an Israeli destroyer, impressing on the world the power of new Soviet naval weapons. In 1968, the Soviets deployed their helicopter carriers in the Mediterranean for the first time. The next year saw large-scale relief of the Mediterranean forces by the Soviet Northern Fleet and deployment of a task force to the Caribbean. The fleet was being used to "show the flag" on a worldwide basis. In 1970, the Soviets conducted major naval maneuvers in the Atlantic and Pacific and vastly extended their Indian Ocean operations.

It is against this backdrop of Soviet military and naval activity in many parts of the world that the visible decline of U.S. strength must be viewed. In several important areas, such as the Persian Gulf, the U.S. has only token forces. And many of the units are aging vessels which compare unfavorably with the new, heavily armed Soviet warships in the same areas. For example the Soviets have dispatched rocket-armed destroyers to the Persian Gulf where the commander of the U.S. Middle East Force flies his flag from an antique seaplane tender with no combat capability. The occasional U.S. destroyer in the area usually is an old gun ship built during World War II. In the 1950's American naval forces often could be supported by land-based air forces. But the United States has been compelled to leave many key air bases throughout the world such as Wheelus Air Base in Libya. America's tactical air power is locked out of North and Central Africa and the Middle East.

While the U.S. has retreated from air bases in Libya, Morocco and elsewhere, the Soviets have created a massive military bastion bridging the zone between the Mediterranean and the Indian Ocean and providing a jumping-off point for Central and Southern Africa.

U.S. Rep. Michael A. Feighan of Ohio has

summed up the character and importance of this Soviet Middle East bastion, noting:

"In the Middle East the Soviets have established a vast complex of sophisticated weaponry scattered in a 50-mile belt extending from Alexandria, Egypt, southward 180 miles to the Gulf of Suez. Stationed here are the most advanced surface to air missiles manned by Soviet crews, amphibious equipment and 8-inch artillery."

THE INDIAN OCEAN

The Soviet objective in this region seems comparable to the Japanese objective, prior to World War II, in creating secret naval and military bases in the South-Central Pacific mandated islands: a launching site for major operations. The Soviets are aiming at a new short route to the Persian Gulf, the Indian Ocean, the strategic islands and rich lands of Southern Africa and the Pacific beyond. In short, they seek total domination of the virtually unprotected Indian Ocean world.

Today the Soviet Indian Ocean fleet consists of approximately 15 warships including missile-armed ships. At times this force has numbered as many as 30 vessels, however. The Soviet ships call at ports around the rim of this 28 million square mile ocean, showing the flag and impressing weak nations with the growing naval power of the Soviet Union. The Soviets reportedly enjoy repair and fueling facilities in India, and the strategic island of Mauritius has become another frequent and important port of call for the Soviet squadron.

Another aspect of the Indian Ocean situation that should be more widely understood in the United States is the movement of Soviet and East Bloc ships through the area. In 1969 more than 3,900 Soviet flag ships rounded the Cape of Good Hope en route to Africa, Middle Eastern and Asian ports. Soviet merchant vessels have to be regarded as an arm of the Soviet fleet. Many of these ships have a military potential or carry military goods to client states of the USSR.

While the Soviet Union is engaged in the same kind of naval buildup in the Indian Ocean that it carried out in the Mediterranean, the United States has not made any attempt to provide a counter-force—except for an occasional fleet visit by ships from the 7th Fleet in the Pacific. In the late 1950's Adm. Arleigh Burke, then Chief of Naval Operations, cited the strategic importance of the Indian Ocean. Adm. John McCain, Commander in Chief Pacific, also has stressed the U.S. security interest in the Indian Ocean in many speeches and writings. But the failure to modernize the U.S. Navy has resulted in inaction with respect to that vital global region.

TECHNOLOGICAL CHALLENGE

Even as the U.S. must prepare for new military challenges in remote global regions where America has not been involved in the past, the American people must bear in mind the importance of the technological challenge posed by the Soviet Union. It is not enough for a nation to have a strong will to win or a grasp of global strategy; a country determined to remain free must appreciate the extent to which an effective defense depends on investment in research and engineering. There isn't any technological plateau to which the United States can climb and rest comfortably thereafter. New advances in nucleonics, radar, surveillance systems, metallurgy—all have a direct bearing on America's national security. Nothing is more mistaken than the notion that the U.S. is safe against attack because it has a large arsenal of nuclear weapons.

The element of surprise is still a key element in warfare—as much as it was at Pearl Harbor in 1941. And the foes of freedom are constantly seeking technological means of gaining the advantage of surprise—the advantage of a first strike that would eliminate the possibility of a retaliatory strike by U.S.

forces. To deny the enemy the advantage of surprise means technological effort and vigilance on the part of the United States and this, in turn, means substantial, continuing investment in defense research and development.

To augment U.S. defenses in any meaningful way is extremely difficult these days. As Adm. Zumwalt has noted, "there is a tremendous disenchantment with the military, and a disinclination on the part of many of our countrymen to be concerned." There is no similar disenchantment on the part of the enemies of the United States. On the contrary, the Soviet Union's traditionally aggressive foreign policy is now wedded to the most aggressive military policy in the country's history. The leadership of the USSR has set its sights on the acquisition of supremacy in every military field—on land, sea and air. The Kremlin is busily establishing a global military presence to advance both the Soviet political system and to secure national strategic objectives.

In the main the American people—or a very large segment of our population—do not want to hear about the Soviet Union's military buildup, its drive towards supremacy in all areas, any more than the French people in the late 1930's wanted to hear about Germany's rearmament. The American people seem tired of sustaining the defense effort—even though that effort has given them a generation free of direct enemy assault. The American people are preoccupied with social issues and with domestic expectations of one sort or another. They long to enjoy an even more comfortable existence at home. They respond to warnings about Soviet military expansionism with the counterstatement that there is not any real threat or that increasing Soviet military capabilities don't indicate dangerous intentions on the part of the USSR. It is difficult to deal with such denials of reality or to reach those who persist in arguing that danger to America is nonexistent. Thus defense budget levels are not in accord with national requirements. The capability of the U.S. armed forces to deal with threats to the nation is being reduced year by year.

ANTIDEFENSE MOOD

The problem of maintaining a moderately strong defense establishment, let alone augmenting its strength to deal with new Soviet threats, may worsen in the year ahead as the Vietnam war winds down. In the past, the end of conflicts in which the U.S. has been engaged has produced hasty dismantling of essential armed forces. This was the case at the end of World Wars I and II. The U.S. Army may face the brunt of the demands for "economy" in defense spending. Certainly, the size and composition of the Army will have to change after the Vietnam war is ended. But the Army must not be sacrificed. On the contrary, the Army will need to be re-equipped for missions elsewhere on America's strategic frontiers.

No one can deny that it will be expensive to refashion the Army, to undertake new naval commitments, and to provide new offensive and defensive nuclear systems. But since when has freedom been obtained at a cut-rate price? The British people maintained their freedom in World War II only at a staggering price in national treasure, not to speak of lives. There is no suggestion that the British are sorry they paid the price. Today the captive peoples of Eastern and Central Europe unquestionably would be willing to pay any price to be free of the Soviet yoke. If the American people, possessing the greatest amount of wealth in the world, are unwilling to make the necessary financial sacrifice for their own safety and national survival, the freedom and security they now enjoy will elude them in the future. The American people are truly fortunate in that they can, with good manage-

ment and elimination of welfarism, afford both guns and butter—missiles and desirable public services.

The principal need today—even before military hardware—is to renew the American people's understanding of the vital importance of strong national security forces. These forces are not unreasonable burdens, as some citizens insist, but an opportunity to preserve freedom. Great peoples are willing to bear heavy burdens in order to ensure their freedom. In totalitarian countries ruling elites simply commit the nation. The people have no voice on defense issues. The American people, however, must understand the issues. They must acknowledge the need for a strong national defense and give their consent to expenditures for this purpose. It would be tragic beyond words if the American people, in their period of greatest prosperity and comfort, failed to understand the necessity of defense and refused to approve the essentials.

For America and its values to survive, it is imperative that Americans arrest the decline in U.S. military strength and acquire the arms essential to defense in the mid and late 1970's and 1980's. The American people can't afford to be outgunned by the enemies of Western civilization and freedom. Certainly, our people don't want to go the way of Carthage in the classical world. But if they want to avoid the fate of Carthage they must reject the counsels of those who are sounding the trumpets of retreat.

If the American people are awake, they will insist that the U.S. armed forces be provided with all the tools of defense—the nuclear navy, missiles and conventional forces—that spell the difference between national life and death.

A NEW OPPORTUNITY TO FIGHT CANCER

HON. BROCK ADAMS

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 7, 1971

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend to my colleagues an article by Dr. H. Marvin Pollard, president of the American Cancer Society, entitled, "A New Opportunity To Fight Cancer," which appeared in the Washington Post on October 6, 1971. Dr. Pollard clearly expresses the intent and thrust of the Conquest of Cancer Act—S. 1828—which is now being considered by the Public Health Subcommittee of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee and on which the House may soon be called to vote. The article follows:

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

A NEW OPPORTUNITY TO FIGHT CANCER

The current House hearings in Washington and those scheduled to take place October 11th in Roswell Park Memorial Institute, Buffalo, New York, again make pertinent for the public an examination and clarification of Bill S. 1828, designed to establish an independent conquest of Cancer Agency, within the National Institutes of Health. The purpose is to expedite the Conquest of cancer.

Although the Senate passed this bill 79 to 1, there again appears to be some public, medical profession, and journalistic misunderstanding as to the effect of this bill.

To summarize:

1. The majority of doctors who are cancer specialists are for the bill. Most of the opposition comes from those who may be fine scientists in their own fields, but are not ex-

perts in cancer, and do not therefore fully understand the situation.

2. The bill is based upon a 7 months exhaustive study by a panel of experts, who, after interviewing 200 witnesses, reluctantly came to the conclusion that an Independent Cancer Authority is necessary. (We would have liked to arrive at a conclusion supporting the *status quo*, but the facts dictated otherwise).

3. None of the opposition, honest but not fully informed, has made any parallel study.

4. Actually all that S. 1828 boils down to is an advance in mechanics of administration. The essential intellectual and scientific relationships would remain the same, but there would be less bureaucratic, structural, and more financial saving in overhead and administration. The National Cancer Agency would have autonomy and budgetary independence, while keeping within the structure of the NIH.

5. Concern has been expressed that the proposed National Cancer Agency will cause a fragmentation of the NIH. On the contrary, it will strengthen it. The American Cancer Society was one of the original supporters of the creation of the National Cancer Institute. Obviously, we would not embrace any proposal that would harm what we helped to create.

6. The time is ripe for an all-out attack against cancer. We cannot stand still in the cancer fight just because there may be a standstill in some other diseases. It took over a year to arrive at the cancer administrative idea. Cancer cannot wait while proponents of support for other diseases make their plans.

7. The provisions of S. 1828 will not financially harm the budgets of the other institutes. In fact, the appropriations passed in July, for fiscal 1972, for NIH (excluding the National Cancer Institute) are 142 million dollars more than the President's proposed budget. Bio-medical science benefits by this increase.

8. Conclusion: S. 1828 offers a new opportunity to fight cancer, which will not be met if the *status quo* is retained. It is vital that this bill be passed in the House, as it was in the Senate. About 300,000 persons in this nation will die of cancer this year.

H. MARVIN POLLARD,

President, American Cancer Society, Inc.
New York.

FIRE PREVENTION WEEK

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 7, 1971

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to call to the attention of the Members that this is National Fire Protection Week.

In accordance with the serious purpose of the week the many excellent volunteer fire companies in my congressional district are observing the week with a number of important undertakings. There are open houses at the fire stations, visits to schools to lecture on fire prevention, fire drills, and the inspection of schools for fire hazards.

It is entirely appropriate that the volunteer and paid firemen on Long Island, throughout New York State and, indeed, across the country, are playing an active role in the affairs of fire prevention week. It is these men who through selfless service and devotion to community service

provide the year-round firefighting that protects our population.

Fire Prevention Week is an appropriate time to pause and reflect on the invaluable services performed by firefighters throughout this country. Without their concern our children and grandchildren would not be as safe as they are today. I am certain my colleagues join me in recognizing National Fire Prevention Week and in extending our sincere appreciation to all the excellent paid and volunteer firemen throughout this country. We owe them a lasting debt of gratitude.

SURPRISING RESULTS FROM SURVEY OF BUSINESS EXECUTIVES' ATTITUDES TOWARD SST

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 7, 1971

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, the magazine *Dun's* recently polled the 300 corporate executives of its President's panel concerning their attitude toward the Government's decision to rescue the Lockheed Aircraft Corp. Surprisingly, according to *Dun's*, "almost all agree that the Government action set a dangerous precedent." The complete article follows:

SHOULD THE GOVERNMENT RESCUE COMPANIES?

The Lockheed bail-out, says the Presidents' Panel, has dangerous implications for American business.

Few recent issues have stirred up such widespread debate among politicians, businessmen and citizens alike as last month's Congressional decision to guarantee \$250 million in bank loans to save ailing Lockheed Aircraft Corp. from bankruptcy. Certainly few measures have squeezed through Congress by narrower margins—by one vote in the Senate and three in the House—or cut so sharply across normal ideological lines, with conservatives, moderates and liberals forming "unholy alliances" on both sides of the issue.

And the dust has not settled yet. Although the Lockheed question has been resolved, at least for the time being, Congress' action has raised some serious questions about the role of the government in a free economy and about the future of the free-enterprise system itself. Should the government rescue private corporations from the perils of the marketplace? If so, what should be the criteria for such assistance? and what are the long-range implications of such a policy?

To get the thinking of the nation's business community on this controversial subject, *Dun's* put these questions to the 300 corporate presidents and chairmen who make up its Presidents' Panel. The panelists' overall view: While some of them believe that Lockheed might have been a special case, almost all agree that the government action set a dangerous precedent. As President Orin E. Atkins of Ashland Oil puts it: "Greater influence of government on the economic system is perhaps an inevitable consequence of the increasing complexity of our social and economic institutions. Nevertheless, private enterprise will regret anything that accelerates this trend, such as dependence on Big Brother."

In other words, the industry leaders caution, business will pay a high price for government help. "Capitalism," comments Pres-

ident J. Peter Grace of W.R. Grace & Co., "is a risk/gain, loss/reward system. If one limits the risk, it is inevitable that the gain will also ultimately be similarly limited, which means a breakdown of the basic tenets of our economic system."

Or, as Chairman William W. Keeler of Phillips Petroleum Co. warns: "Undoubtedly, severe government controls would be involved."

And that is not the only thing industry would have to watch out for if government got into the habit of rescuing sick companies. John T. Connor, the former Secretary of Commerce under Lyndon Johnson who is now chairman of Allied Chemical Corp., makes the point. "Political favoritism," says Connor, "would be bound to prevail."

Even disregarding these potentially dangerous factors, say the panelists, at the very least such a policy would have a deleterious effect on corporate management. For the knowledge that the government could be counted on to keep a company from going under would remove much of the incentive for managerial efficiency or increased productivity. Indeed, declares Chairman William P. Drake of Pennwalt Corp., "The incentive to succeed might well dissolve completely."

In effect, this would mean rewarding inefficiency and mismanagement by providing "a crutch"—a favorite word of the panelists—for the poorly run corporation. "To be efficient," says President Herbert E. Markley of The Timken Co., there must be rewards, and there must be penalties. We can't expect to survive if we wish to pay only the rewards."

Inherent in this general view, of course, is business' fear that large-scale government bail-out programs would only hasten the U.S.' already obvious trend toward socialism. The concept of government loans could snowball, with demands for similar aid for banking, insurance and other industries. Says Chairman Harleston R. Wood of Alan Wood Steel Co.: "We might as well give up capitalism and have socialism if the government is to rescue private corporations."

A SPECIAL CASE?

Some of the panelists, to be sure, say that Lockheed *might* be a special case, since it is so heavily dependent on the government for its livelihood. They point out that, as everyone knows, government procurement policies are sometimes ill-conceived at best, and are often changed in midstream. "There may be circumstances," says Chairman George R. Vila of Uniroyal, "where government policies, regulations and restrictions . . . may contribute to the financial difficulties in which the company may find itself."

But a lot of the panelists do not consider this a good enough reason. Speaking for the majority, Herbert Markley of Timken argues, "Any corporation that does business with the government should have to meet the same tests for being in business as any other private corporation. I think it is unfortunate," Markley adds, "that the government makes contracts in the way it does, because it encourages inefficiency, pays for questionable management and business practices, and thereby many times keeps a company alive unnaturally."

Even if Lockheed is a special case, the chief executives stress, the implications of the government action overshadow any other consideration. As President Roger W. Gunder of Stauffer Chemical Co. expresses it, "I believe Lockheed has a somewhat better case for federal aid than the typical corporation. But by no means do I consider the reasons sufficient to create such an important, far-reaching precedent."

Moreover, several of the panelists note, the TriStar jumbo jet (the planes for which the government loans are guaranteed) is not

a defense product. "In my opinion," says Allied Chemical's John Connor, "Lockheed had a very weak case because its contract with Rolls [Rolls-Royce, the British company chosen to make the TriStar engines, which went bankrupt] was a private-sector contract, which was made possible by preferential financial arrangements by the British government that were unfair to the U.S. competitors of Rolls."

And what about the now bankrupt Penn Central Transportation Co., the most obvious comparison to the Lockheed situation? Last year the Nixon Administration also sought direct help for the nation's largest railroad, but backed off after key Congressmen refused to go along.

Some of the panelists believe that government action in the Penn Central case would have been more justified than in Lockheed's situation, on the grounds of both the nation's economy and public interest. And, of course, because the railroads are so heavily—and, most believe, badly—regulated. "Penn Central had a much better case for a government loan," says Harleston Wood of Alan Wood Steel, "since it is maintaining an essential service, and a large part of its trouble arose from over-regulation by government agencies." Agrees President J. Henry Smith of Equitable Life Assurance Society, "Its services are desperately needed; it is more of a public utility than Lockheed."

Still, the majority of the panelists hark back to one theme: The Penn Central's bankruptcy, they say, was largely caused by bad management. And even if the railroad had reached the point of no return, they add, bailing it out was not the answer. "I don't believe in rescue operations," says Chairman M. Wilbur Townsend of Handy & Harman. "But I do believe in the government acting responsibly to help preclude the need for rescues, such as proper legislation."

Several panelists go further. In the words of Chairman Ralph J. Kraus of Giddings & Lewis, Inc.: "If the railroads must be nationalized in the public interest, then it appears to me this should be the route rather than loans."

Nor was there widespread sympathy among the panelists for resurrection of the old Reconstruction Finance Corp., which was formed during the Great Depression to make loans to banks, businesses and public agencies. Some Administration officials have mentioned in private the possibility of forming a new RFC, although so far nothing has been proposed in Congress as yet.

The panelists are afraid that "political favoritism," which led in part to the end of the RFC in the late 1950s, would follow any new Administration action in this regard. "The political pressures would be fantastic," says President Leo H. Schoenhofen, Jr. of Marcor. "It would adversely influence good business judgments and increase risks of more failures."

The whole system of defense contracts, the business leaders argue, needs to be reevaluated. For one thing, they say, companies should not be allowed to submit bids when it is obvious they will not be able to make a profit or may need outside help later on. The defense companies, says President Bruce E. Horst of Barber-Colman Co., get into trouble not only through bad management, but "by bidding too low on government work with the hope that they can get an 'add on' to their contract in the future."

Perhaps the most interesting "solution" to the problem is suggested by President Victor H. Pomper of H. H. Scott, Inc., who urges an American version of "Japan Inc.," an acronym applied to the close cooperation among government, business and labor in Japan. Says Pomper: "We need a new cliché to replace 'free enterprise,' which has too many outmoded, emotional overtones. In a shrinking, ever more complex world, government, industry and labor should be inter-

dependent, not independent. They should cooperate, not always be at each others' throats. Let's copy Japan for a change. They have the most intelligently directed economy in the world."

F. HURLBUT CO.

HON. JOHN W. BYRNES

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 7, 1971

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the F. Hurlbut Co. of Green Bay, Wis., is this year celebrating its 100th anniversary. During the past 100 years, the F. Hurlbut Co. has established itself as an innovative and progressive leader in a variety of business endeavors throughout Wisconsin. The company has played an important role in the economic growth of Green Bay and many other communities in the State.

The present officers and shareholders of the company are descended from or related to descendants of the original founder, Mr. Frederick Hurlbut, a Civil War veteran.

The chairman of the board, Mr. F. J. Lenfestey, and the president of the company, Mr. Wesley H. Garner, are the grandsons of the original Fred Hurlbut. Mr. Fred L. Garner, secretary and treasurer, is a great-grandson and Mr. Charles H. Bennett, vice president, is related by marriage.

Mr. Fred Hurlbut first went into business in 1871 as a wholesaler of building materials, coal, and foodstuffs, which were brought to his dock in Green Bay by sailboats via the Great Lakes.

In the early 1900's, the provisioning was phased out, and, as more immigrants came into Wisconsin to live and educate their children, the F. Hurlbut Co. supplied much of the brick and mortar used to build their homes, schools, churches, and factories.

Fred Hurlbut also was active in civic affairs and invested in and started other business firms in the area. In 1913, he died and a corporation was formed with Fred Hurlbut, Jr., as president.

Through the years the Hurlbut Co. expanded its operations and services, introducing higher quality coal to Wisconsin in the 1930's and at the request of the Federal Government during World War II, bringing in thousands of tons of agricultural limestone for Wisconsin farmlands which had gone sour.

After the war, the company went into the concrete production business, soon becoming a recognized leader in the industry for its many innovations and inventions.

At the present time, the company consists of four divisions: the dock operation; the concrete products division, which produces block, brick, telephone and electrical conduit, concrete culvert and sewer pipe, steel and aluminum pipe and casings; the prestressed concrete department; and the farm products division.

I extend my congratulations to the F. Hurlbut Co. on its anniversary. All those

involved with the company can be proud of the fine service they have rendered to community, State, and Nation.

LONG BEACH NATIVE NOW NO. 1 WOMAN ATHLETE

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 7, 1971

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the other day, President Nixon took a moment to recognize a tremendous achievement by a young lady from my congressional district, Mrs. Billie Jean King, the world's No. 1 woman athlete.

Billie Jean last week became the first woman to earn more than \$100,000 in 1 year as a professional athlete when she won the 1971 Virginia Slim Thunderbird Tennis Tournament in Phoenix, Ariz.

As a schoolgirl in Long Beach, Billie Jean Moffitt was a natural, all-around athlete. She played softball, touch football, and basketball. Once she scored 42 points in a single basketball game. She once outraced a group of boys in the 60-yard dash.

More important her parents, Mr. and Mrs. William Moffitt, decided to send their daughter for free tennis lessons at a public park in Long Beach when Billie Jean was 11. Soon she was winning at every local competition.

In 1966—just 11 years later—Billie Jean won the singles championship at Wimbledon, a feat she repeated in 1967 and 1968. During 1967, she also won the U.S. open as an amateur.

Mrs. King became a professional in 1968. This year her string of victories, including winning the U.S. Open without the loss of a single set, stamps her as one of the greatest athletes in the 98 years of world tennis history. She won 11 tournaments in the Virginia Slims series, including the season's largest purse—\$10,000 in the Houston Invitational.

Before Billie Jean King came onto the scene, women athletes in America were woefully behind men in earning power. The peppy Californian not only spearheaded the movement for more equal prize money in tennis—but she went on to win a good portion of the new prize money herself.

While the names of famous women athletes—chiefly in tennis and golf—are often as well known as their male counterparts, many kept their amateur standings over the years, because of the relatively small reward offered by professional competition. In tennis, Helen Wills Moody, Helen Jacobs, Althea Gibson, and the late Maureen Connolly all played as amateurs for most of their playing years.

In golf, the late Babe Didrikson Zaharias played professionally for only 4 years, winning \$15,087 in 1951, her best year. The female golf earnings record is held by Carol Mann, who won \$49,152 in 1969. The year before, Kathy Whitworth reached \$48,379.

In an era when women are demanding

and achieving equality with men in a variety of fields, Mrs. King's achievement stands out.

PROVIDING TUTORIAL AND RELATED INSTRUCTIONAL SERVICES FOR HOMEBOUND CHILDREN

HON. HERMAN BADILLO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 7, 1971

Mr. BADILLO. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to introduce on behalf of myself and 74 other Members of the House an amendment to the Education of the Handicapped Act to provide tutorial and related instructional services for homebound children through the employment of college students.

Approximately 1 million youngsters in our Nation fall into the category of the homebound handicapped. These children for varying lengths of time, are unable to attend school. As a consequence, they suffer academically and emotionally. A considerable portion of those who are eventually enrolled into regular classes experience all the difficulties of children coming from a deprived background—poor social adjustment, academic difficulties, emotional problems.

In some parts of our Nation handicapped youngsters enjoy more academic advantages than in others. There are localities that provide for 5 or more hours of home instruction weekly. In other cases, however, children receive a scant hour a week, and some educational agencies, due to lack of funds, have been unable to make an assessment of their needs.

I have discussed with many State educational officials my intention to introduce legislation providing financial compensation to qualified college students, of their choosing, who could act as home tutors for these youngsters. Forty-eight States have responded to my proposal and have supplied me with suggestions that I have incorporated into the bill we are introducing today.

I am grateful to my colleagues for the interest they have shown in the plight of these youngsters. I want to express my appreciation for the truly bipartisan response I have received and would like to take this opportunity to request the support of all the Members of the House for this very necessary legislation.

For the information of my colleagues, I am inserting here the full text of the bill and the list of the cosponsors:

H.R. 11132

A bill to amend the Education of the Handicapped Act to provide tutorial and related instructional services for homebound children through the employment of college students, particularly veterans and other students who themselves are handicapped

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Education of the Handicapped Act (20 U.S.C. 1421-1426) is amended by adding at the end thereof, a new part II, as follows:

"Part H—USE OF COLLEGE STUDENTS AS TUTORS AND INSTRUCTIONAL ASSISTANTS FOR HOMEBOUND CHILDREN

"AUTHORIZATION OF PROGRAM

"Sec. 671. (a) The Commissioner is authorized to make grants to State educational agencies to enable them to develop and carry out programs, at their and at local educational agency levels to provide, through the use of students in institutions of higher education, tutoring and instructional assistance, under the supervision of a qualified teacher, for homebound handicapped children who, though able to benefit from preschool, elementary, or secondary education, are prevented by their handicaps, by lack of facilities, or because they experience special difficulties when in school, from attending school. Homebound children for whom services under this part may be provided include but are not limited to those as defined under section 602, paragraphs (1) and (15), and such services may be provided to children who are homebound for short or long terms.

"(b) For a local educational agency to receive assistance under this part from a State education agency, it shall make a proposal to the State educational agency for a tutorial or instructional assistance program to be carried out through a cooperative arrangement with one or more institutions of higher education. The local educational agency shall give assurances that:

"(1) in selecting students to participate, (A) special consideration will be given to veterans qualified for vocational rehabilitation under chapter 30 of title 38, United States Code, and to other handicapped students (provided in either case that their handicaps do not make their working with homebound children ineffective); and (B) among students otherwise equally eligible to participate in the program, preference will be given to those having greater financial need.

"(2) the program will be administered by the local educational agency in accordance with its rules and regulations relating to homebound instruction, and

"(3) participation in the program will not interfere with the academic progress of participating students.

"(4) compensation paid to participating students will be set by agreement between the local educational agency and the student's institution, the maximum to be established at the direction of the Commissioner. In no case shall the compensation be established below the prevailing minimum hourly wage.

"(5) funds will be used in such manner as to encourage equipping the homebound handicapped children for eventual full assimilation by society, with every effort to avoid development of a segregated, permanent system of education for the handicapped.

"(6) Federal funds made available under this part will be so used as to supplement and, to the extent practical, increase the level of State, local, and private funds expended for the education of handicapped children, and in no case supplant such State, local and private funds.

"APPLICATION

"Sec. 672. (a) The Commissioner shall make grants under this part to State educational agencies on the merits of their proposals to him which shall be submitted on such application forms and under such guidelines, as he shall prescribe. Proposals shall contain, among other information as required by the Commissioner (1) all data from local education agencies' proposal to the State, as is required to support the total amount of funding requested by the State; (2) the State's detailed plans for conducting, or providing for the conduct of, evaluation of the program supported under this part;

and (3) the State's detailed plans for locating and identifying all of its homebound children who could benefit from this program.

"(b) An amount not to exceed 10 per centum of the total funds awarded to a State under this part shall be available to the State for it and its local education agencies to administer the program.

"AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATION

"Sec. 673. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated \$55,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, and such sums as may be necessary for fiscal year ending June 30, 1974 and for fiscal year ending June 30, 1975, for carrying out the provisions of this part.

"ALLOTMENTS TO STATES

"Sec. 674. All of these sums shall be granted at the discretion of the Commissioner; however, the Commissioner shall set aside 25 per centum of the total appropriation and preliminarily allocate (but not automatically grant) to each State (as defined by Sec. 602(6) an amount which bears the same ratio to such amount as the number of children aged three to twenty-one, inclusive, in the State bears to the number of such children in all the States. The Commissioner shall approve or disapprove applications from the States, and any funds preliminarily allocated to a State whose application is disapproved, or which fails to file timely application, shall be added to, and be included for distribution under, the remaining 75 per centum of the funds. The Commissioner shall not disapprove any State's application until he has offered and (if the State accepts his offer) provided technical assistance to that State in an effort to bring that State's application to a level of approvable quality, so that the State may then be granted its proportionate share of the 25 per centum set aside, and, if then applicable, an appropriate portion of the remaining 75 per centum."

COSPONSORS

ALASKA

Hon. Nick Begich, M.C.

CALIFORNIA

Hon. Phillip Burton, M.C.
Hon. George E. Danielson, M.C.
Hon. Augustus F. Hawkins, M.C.
Hon. Robert L. Leggett, M.C.
Hon. Thomas M. Rees, M.C.
Hon. Edward R. Roybal, M.C.
Hon. Jerome R. Waldie, M.C.

CONNECTICUT

Hon. Ella T. Grasso, M.C.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Hon. Walter E. Fauntroy, M.C.

FLORIDA

Hon. Claude Pepper, M.C.

GEORGIA

Hon. Jack Brinkley, M.C.
Hon. Benjamin B. Blackburn, M.C.

HAWAII

Hon. Spark M. Matsunaga, M.C.

IDAHO

Hon. Orval Hansen, M.C.

ILLINOIS

Hon. George W. Collins, M.C.
Hon. Kenneth J. Gary, M.C.
Hon. Ralph H. Metcalf, M.C.
Hon. Abner J. Mikva, M.C.
Hon. Melvin Price, M.C.

INDIANA

Hon. Andrew Jacobs, Jr., M.C.
Hon. Ray J. Madden, M.C.

IOWA

Hon. Fred Schwengel, M.C.

KENTUCKY

Hon. Tim Lee Carter, M.C.
Hon. Carl D. Perkins, M.C.

MARYLAND

Hon. Gilbert Gude, M.C.
Hon. Lawrence J. Hogan, M.C.
Hon. Clarence D. Long, M.C.

MASSACHUSETTS

Hon. Robert F. Drinan, M.C.
Hon. Michael Harrington, M.C.
Hon. Louise Day Hicks, M.C.

MICHIGAN

Hon. Charles G. Diggs, M.C.

NEW JERSEY

Hon. Edwin B. Forsythe, M.C.
Hon. Henry Helstoski, M.C.
Hon. Peter W. Rodino, Jr., M.C.

NEW YORK

Hon. Bella Abzug, M.C.
Hon. Joseph S. Addabbo, M.C.
Hon. Herman Badillo, M.C.
Hon. Jonathan B. Bingham, M.C.
Hon. Frank J. Brasco, M.C.
Hon. Emanuel Celler, M.C.
Hon. Seymour Halpern, M.C.
Hon. Edward I. Koch, M.C.
Hon. Otis G. Pike, M.C.
Hon. Charles B. Rangel, M.C.
Hon. Benjamin S. Rosenthal, M.C.
Hon. William F. Ryan, M.C.
Hon. James H. Scheuer, M.C.
Hon. Lester Wolf, M.C.

NORTH CAROLINA

Hon. James T. Broyhill, M.C.
Hon. Wilmer Mizell, M.C.
Hon. Ray A. Taylor, M.C.

OHIO

Hon. Louis Stokes, M.C.

PENNSYLVANIA

Hon. John H. Dent, M.C.
Hon. Joshua Ellberg, M.C.
Hon. William J. Green, M.C.
Hon. William S. Moorhead, M.C.
Hon. Robert N. C. Nix, M.C.
Hon. Joseph P. Vigorito, M.C.
Hon. Gus Yatron, M.C.

RHODE ISLAND

Hon. Fernand J. St Germain, M.C.
Hon. Robert O. Tiernan, M.C.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Hon. Mendel Davis, M.C.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Hon. James Abourezk, M.C.

TENNESSEE

Hon. LaMar Baker, M.C.
Hon. Richard H. Fulton, M.C.

TEXAS

Hon. Wright Patman, M.C.
Hon. Robert Price, M.C.
Hon. Richard C. White, M.C.
Hon. Jim Wright, M.C.

VIRGINIA

Hon. Joel T. Broyhill, M.C.
Hon. G. William Whitehurst, M.C.

WEST VIRGINIA

Hon. Ken Hechler, M.C.

HEARINGS ON THE OPERATION OF THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS ACT RESUME OCTOBER 26

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 7, 1971

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, on October 26 the special subcommittee on labor will resume its oversight hearings on the operation of the National Labor Relations Act.

Earlier this year, the subcommittee examined the effectiveness of the remedies available to labor and management under the act, and explored the problems caused by the National Labor Relations Board's high caseload and the long delays already built into the act. We received valuable criticisms and suggestions from labor, management, the Board itself, and the academic community.

Now we are turning to a study of the administrative and legislative restrictions on the Board's jurisdiction and will once again seek the views of all segments of the labor-management community.

We will first look at groups over which the Board has recently either asserted or declined to assert jurisdiction. These are professional sports, race tracks and gambling casinos, proprietary hospitals and nursing homes, and educational institutions. Our purpose is to take a before-and-after look at labor-management relations within these groups and see whether the act made a difference where jurisdiction was asserted.

Then we will examine the statutory exemptions for nonprofit hospitals, domestic workers, State and local Government employees, and the exemption by Supreme Court decision for workers on foreign flagships. Our purpose here is to reassess the validity of these exemptions in the light of the changing conditions in these fields.

Our tentative hearing schedule is as follows: October 26 and 27, professional sports; November 3, race tracks and gambling casinos; November 9, educational institutions; November 10, 16, and 17, proprietary and nonprofit hospitals and nursing homes. The hearings will resume in January with the exemptions for foreign flagship workers, domestic employees, and State and local government employees.

The hearings I have announced today, together with those held earlier this year, represent the most comprehensive legislative review of the National Labor Relations Act by the House since 1961. We will be issuing a detailed report of our findings and conclusions sometime during the second session of this Congress.

NEW ECONOMIC POLICY

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 7, 1971

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I insert in the RECORD an excellent editorial reply by Mr. Tom Turner, president, Metropolitan Detroit AFL-CIO, appearing on WJBK-TV2, Detroit, Mich.

Mr. Turner's comments on the views of labor with regard to the President's actions on setting a new economic policy merit careful consideration:

COMMENTS BY TOM TURNER

TV2's most recent editorial noted that the President has actively sought the views of labor in setting a new economic policy, making planned union demonstrations during his Detroit visit unnecessary or at least premature. Replying to that editorial

here is the president of the Metropolitan Detroit AFL-CIO, Mr. Tom Turner:

The Metropolitan Detroit AFL-CIO has called for peaceful, responsible picketing of Cobo Hall during President Nixon's visit Thursday to try to convince him to put some fairness in his so-called economic game plan.

We reject TV2's position that our demonstration of concern is unnecessary on the grounds that President Nixon is responsive to the suggestions of labor leaders.

Quite the contrary. The record shows that Mr. Nixon has been most unresponsive.

For more than two years, we have cried out against rising unemployment, rising prices, rising interest rates and a sagging economy. For more than two years, Mr. Nixon did not respond. He said the economy was doing fine.

Then, abruptly, unfairly, and without consulting with labor or the people, the President slapped together a freeze which put the burden on the backs of the working people and the poor.

No, Mr. Nixon has not responded. Not on the economy, not on ending the war, not on meeting the needs of the cities, and not on most of the other pressing problems confronting us.

Our lawful, orderly protest at Cobo Hall Thursday night is designed to let the President know what we think of his programs and his lack of programs. If you agree, please join us in this peaceful demonstration. We hope that this time the President will listen, and that he will be fair to all of us.

Replying to a TV2 editorial, you have heard Mr. Tom Turner, president of the Metropolitan Detroit AFL-CIO.

PAN AM RESCUES STRANDED YOUTH

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 7, 1971

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I know I speak for many of my colleagues when I express my concern over the recent stranding of untold numbers of American youth in Europe by unscrupulous charter organizations and nonscheduled airlines.

Many of these youth had saved their allowances and worked for years in order to accumulate sufficient money to make this trip.

During the summer of 1970, my own son, John Michael, was stranded in Europe following the collapse of the World Academy Tour. I have introduced legislation (H.R. 266) aimed at correcting the abuses which lead to such situations, and many Members have cosponsored or introduced similar bills.

The inconvenience generated by the stranding of innocent American citizens abroad must be brought to a halt and all reasonable efforts made to insure that those Americans who have been victimized by the charter strandings will be protected and that those still remaining abroad, and there are many, will be returned safely to their homes with a minimum of inconvenience and cost.

Mr. Speaker, it is in connection with this last expressed hope that I would like to commend Pan American World Airways and Najeeb E. Halaby, president and chief executive officer, whose con-

cern for the public interest and the consumer was dynamically displayed by the recent rescue of many of these stranded youth by Pan Am.

I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD an article which appeared in the September 7 issue of San Francisco Chronicle.

[From the San Francisco Chronicle, Sept. 7, 1971]

TICKETS ON CREDIT—PAN AM RESCUES STRANDED YOUTHS

LONDON.—Pan American Airways said yesterday it has handled over 1000 young Americans wanting cut-price tickets home on credit in the five days since the company offered the credit ticket plan.

"A good 700 of these youngsters have come to us because their charter companies have sold them worthless round-trip tickets," a spokesman said.

"This is a huge number of people who are either stranded or broke," he said.

"Some of the stranded students we couldn't help because they hadn't the money back home to pay even \$95."

ONE-WAY

Many of the students paid full round-trip prices to phony "student charter associations" and received a one-way ticket and a voucher for the return ticket, which the associations claimed could be redeemed in Europe.

But, when the students attempted to redeem the voucher, they were told it was worthless.

James Black, president of a Dallas travel agency, flew into London Thursday to give free tickets home to stranded students who couldn't get credit.

"I must have seen between 300 to 400 young people in the time I've been here," he said.

"But the trouble is sorting out the genuine cases from the ones that are just on the make. I've been really saddened by the number of young people around who will do anything to get something free. They talk about a generation gap—I guess the gap can't be too wide between me and that sort," 51-year-old Black said.

"The government will have to take immediate and decisive action to stamp out these crooked charter companies who are prepared to milk kids of their money and then leave them stranded in Europe. I have heard cases that make me ashamed I'm in the travel business," he said.

New York State Attorney General Louis Lefkowitz and the U.S. State Department are investigating fraudulent air charter companies based in New York.

EMERGENCY STRIKE LEGISLATION

HON. JAMES HARVEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 7, 1971

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege this morning to appear before the Labor Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. This committee is currently holding hearings on emergency strike legislation, and I discussed the legislation that 70 cosponsors and I have introduced on this subject in the House.

I am most grateful for the strong support my proposal has received among my colleagues in the House, and I am delighted that the Senate is also considering this very important matter. I

look forward to prompt and positive action by both bodies on this issue. I am happy to report that my good friend and former colleague, Senator ROBERT STAFFORD, has agreed to sponsor my proposal in the Senate, and the bill has been introduced as S. 2655.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I would like to include my complete statement presented this morning:

STATEMENT OF REPRESENTATIVE JAMES HARVEY

Mr. Chairman, as a member of the Transportation and Aeronautics Subcommittee of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, I have long been aware of the problem now being studied at these Senate hearings and at the hearings just recently concluded in our Subcommittee in the House. National railroad strikes have been recurring with all-too-familiar regularity since I first came to Congress almost eleven years ago. Each time, to prevent economic hardship and to protect the public welfare, Congress has enacted temporary, eleventh hour solutions.

It's time—unquestionably late but still of great necessity—that this Congress show both the political courage and leadership that is so necessary in controversial legislation such as this. The 92nd Congress, unlike those of the past, must have the courage to tell both management and labor that our nation's 220 million people can no longer be pawns in all too frequent and crippling rail strikes. The kind of courage that I refer to was best recorded some years ago by a Member of this great body, the late President John F. Kennedy, in his book, "Profiles In Courage." It has been easy—too easy—for past Congresses to "ride the tide" of management-labor rail disputes. Emergency strike legislation has languished over the years. I submit, however, it's time that this Congress seize the opportunity and enact historic permanent legislation that is reasonable and fair to all concerned.

I believe sincerely that if Congress fails to act soon, we who serve as Senators and Representatives had better "bone-up" on how to run the railroads. "Nationalization" used to be a dirty word. More and more thought, however, is being given to such Government action. Just last week, in testimony before our House Subcommittee, C. L. Dennis, Brotherhood of Railway, Airline and Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers, Express and Station Employees, outlined a legislative proposal that would authorize the President to "take possession and control and to operate the rail transportation system or systems involved in unadjusted labor disputes." On the same morning, a representative of the American Bar Association listed "Executive Receivership" as a possible alternative for the settling of rail disputes. Two of my colleagues in the House—Congressman Pickle and Congressman Dingell—have introduced legislation that calls for government seizure in times of emergency disputes. I note also that Senator Javits' "Emergency Labor Disputes Act of 1971" includes possession as a possible alternative solution.

I do not believe this is what our country wants or needs. We in Congress have an obligation to give our free enterprise system a chance. Frequent rail and air disputes are economically devastating. We cannot and we must not tolerate them any longer.

Just recently, the United Transportation Union concluded the first selective rail strike in railroad history. The difference, however, between this so-called selective strike and a national walkout was hard to discern. Without court-imposed limitations, the strike affected 17% of the revenue ton mile capabilities in the Eastern region, 26% in the Southeastern region, and 43% in the Western region. In all, ten Class-I carriers were struck. If the unions had escalated the walk-

out on August 6th as planned—fortunately the strike was settled on August 2nd—43% of the Eastern region and 55% of the Western region would have been without rail service. Technically, the U.T.U. stoppage was a selective strike; to the California farmer, the West Virginia coal miner, the Georgia poultry grower, or the Oregon lumberman, whose reliance on rail services is total and limited to one carrier, the effect was hardly selective.

During the August recess, I contacted some of the nation's major industrial and agricultural associations to determine the effect of the U.T.U. selective strike on their industries. The answers are startling! Curtailment of rail service in Oregon alone amounted to a \$19.4 million daily loss in the forest products industry. The daily loss to the California economy from the inability of the farmers to ship their produce reached \$11.2 million. Chrysler reported that if the strike had continued for another two weeks, it would have been forced to close 35 plants and to lay off an estimated 110,000 workers.

While the strike is generally accepted as a basic right of the American worker, it is clear that the "selective strike," as currently practiced, is little improvement over the national strikes which have occurred in the recent past in the railroad industry. In light of the Delaware and Hudson decision, we in Congress must admit that the rail unions now have the right to call selective strikes. From the testimony in my own Subcommittee, it is obvious that the Railroad Brotherhoods have fought long and hard for this right, and they do not intend to relinquish it. It is unrealistic to assume that Congress will act to remove this right and, yet, we clearly cannot permit selective strikes to remain unbridled. What is needed—and what is provided in the legislation which 70 cosponsors and I have proposed—is that the right to a selective strike be circumscribed with appropriate safeguards for the public interest. Both the burden of unlimited selective strikes and the threat of nationalization require that this Congress find a solution to rail industry disputes.

In my remarks this morning, I will address myself only to those issues relating to emergency rail and air disputes. While I realize that this Committee has before it legislation—notably Senator Javits' "Emergency Labor Disputes Act of 1971" and Senator Brock's "Management Labor Commission and Court Act"—which speaks to labor disputes in general, my work has been confined to amending the Railway Labor Act of 1926, chiefly because the inadequacies of that Act have brought emergency rail disputes to Congress so many times in recent years.

This Committee has and will hear testimony supporting the positions of both labor and management. Both groups have presented legislative packets favorable to their own positions. Clearly, we need a compromise solution, one that addresses itself to the realities of a very complex situation. We need legislation that will not neglect the court-imposed right of selective strikes, while at the same time provide for mechanisms that will handle these strikes should they escalate to a point that threatens the national health or safety. It must be an equitable solution, and one that is favorable to the Administration, for they will have the burden of enforcing it.

In recent years, the outcome of rail strikes has been fairly predictable: the threat of a complete stoppage of rail transportation forces the President to turn the matter over to the Congress. Here the substantive details of the individual dispute are settled, in whole or in part, in committee and on the Floor of the House and the Senate, the unions are required to resume their jobs, and the nation's railroads operate again.

During the recent U.T.U. strike, however, the circumstances were somewhat different.

The Supreme Court, by refusing to overturn a District Court ruling, affirmed the right of the railroad unions to strike selectively. When national bargaining between the U.T.U. and the carriers broke down, and all provisions of the Railway Labor Act were exhausted, the United Transportation Union elected to strike first four and then six additional carriers; five more were scheduled to be struck if the walkout had not ended when it did. Since it is no longer required to shut down all of the nation's carriers simultaneously, and since a major part of the rail transportation system was supposed to continue to operate, the U.T.U. presumed that there would be no national emergency, and consequently, no need to involve the Congress in order to terminate the strike. Eventually, the U.T.U. felt, a settlement between the disputing parties would bring the selective strike to an end. That is precisely what happened, but not until the nation suffered very severe economic consequences and the Administration came within a whisker of calling once again for emergency legislation.

There is much to be said for using selective strikes in the rail industry labor disputes, provided, however, that proper safeguards and limits are applied. It has been the advent of national bargaining and a presumption that all carriers had to be struck, together with a public antipathy to such nationwide strikes, that have led to the unique situation in which the rail industry finds itself. Any possible remedies, such as the judicial ruling for selective strikes, which will preserve the benefits of national bargaining without inducing the national strike/Congressional settlement syndrome, should by all means be given serious consideration.

The public interest, however, is still not met under the present new selective strike situation. That is, the resulting economic impact on business and commerce, as well as the general disruption of public affairs, is such that public opinion will not long permit the Administration and the Congress to stand idly by. In addition, under the present law and judicial rulings, any selective strike is very apt to escalate to a full, nationwide strike. This could occur either as a result of careful move and counter-move by the carriers and union managements, or uncontrollably through individual carrier lockouts or wildcat strikes as the situation deteriorates across the country.

Now it must be admitted that the concept of public interest is one which has never been, and may never be, satisfactorily defined. For example, a major auto manufacturing strike such as we experienced last year, or a shutdown of the steel industry, may well be fundamentally more disruptive of the country's well-being than would stopping the nation's trains. Whether any one of these is to be considered a national emergency, however, depends on many factors, including the decisions of the Chief Executive, as well as the mood of the public.

Consequently, we can never hope to see laws written which will specify exactly to what degree a union can strike, or precisely when management is justified in a lockout. It may be that some day we will, in fact, proceed beyond today's acceptance of the strike and lockouts as tools of legitimized economic warfare in the settlement of questions of working conditions. But until that new day dawns, we need somehow to find a balance between three contending rights: that of the individual to work only under conditions acceptable to him, that of management to operate its business in an efficient and profitable manner, and that of the public to be protected from undue disruption of its affairs due to conflicts between the first two rights.

I believe that there are solutions to the problem. Certainly, the present law covering the railroad industry has not worked, as evi-

denced by the number of times the Congress has been required to intervene. And the recent interpretation of the right to strike selectively cannot be the final answer, since escalation to a national or near national shutdown is highly probable. What is needed is twofold. First, a revision of law which will restore the incentive to the parties to undertake serious collective bargaining and to reach settlements without, each time, resorting to Congress. Second, a revision of law which will enable the President, if and when negotiations nevertheless have failed, to take administrative actions until a resolution of the conflict is achieved.

With regard to this latter point, a key requirement is flexibility. Certainly, no one administrative procedure will be appropriate for all of the different situations and the wide variety of substantive issues which will arise in the future. The President must, therefore, be provided with a variety of tools with which to work. And, if these tools are in fact sufficient, he must be given the power—indeed, he must be required—to use them judiciously but inexorably until the dispute at hand is settled.

But this very flexibility, which is so necessary when finally needed, is also the key element in avoiding the need for its use in the first place. For almost every knowledgeable observer agrees that it has been the *certainty* of governmental action which has, in the past, contributed most to the failure of collective bargaining in the railroad industry. A situation is needed in which *neither* party can foresee that the Government will intervene to their potential advantage. Then, and only then, can the usual procedures of collective bargaining move forward fruitfully.

What solutions have been proposed to remedy the present, unfortunate situation? Several distinguished Members of the Senate have proposed solutions to emergency rail disputes which are contained in the various bills now before this Committee. Since the bill which I and my 70 cosponsors introduced on the House side adopts many of the best points of these various bills, I would like to take a few moments to describe and compare their various approaches. I have not attempted to describe Senator Taft's novel proposal simply because time only permits me to discuss those bills which had a direct influence on my own legislative work.

Let me illustrate with the first chart how the Railway Labor Act functions with regard to major disputes concerning changes in pay, rules, or working conditions. If the labor-management bargaining conference fails to solve a dispute, the National Mediation Board is required to use its best efforts to bring them to agreement. If it fails, and if either party then refuses to submit the dispute to arbitration, the parties are then required to retain the *status quo* for a period of thirty days.

During this period, the President may create an Emergency Board to investigate and report within an additional thirty days. After which the parties are free to resort to "self-help." That is, the carriers can institute changes unilaterally, and the unions can strike, either nationally or, now, selectively.

Among the various proposals now under consideration, the one which will most drastically affect not only the major dispute provisions, but also the entire Railway Labor Act, is the Administration bill, S. 560. This bill would transfer rail and air labor relations bodily from RLA to the Taft-Hartley Act. Then it would add new provisions to Taft-Hartley to cover major disputes in the entire transportation industry. This approach is somewhat over reactive, in my view. There are many useful provisions which have evolved over the years under RLA, and they probably should not be scuttled wholesale. Organized labor, in its testimony before my House Subcommittee, continually reaffirmed

my opinion that the RLA should be kept intact. In addition, I believe the record shows that the maritime, longshore and trucking industry problems are all unique—and surely are all different from those of rail and air—and should not be linked together in new legislation.

The major provisions of the Administration bill are outlined on the second chart, where three presidential options are shown. The first option, Partial Operations, would have a committee decide how much each railroad should curtail operations to simulate the pressures of a strike. The approach is bureaucratic in the extreme, and would have the effect of having the Federal Government involve itself in the details of a pseudo-strike, hardly a situation to encourage collective bargaining settlements.

The other two options provided in the Administration bill are very promising, and I will defer speaking to them until later. A major limitation to the bill, however, is contained in the provision that only one of the options can be selected by the President in any dispute. If that selection fails to achieve a settlement, there would be no recourse but to send the dispute back to Congress. This flaw is so major I cannot emphasize too strongly how this provision undermines the whole idea of improving the present law. If we want to encourage collective bargaining and remove the Congress from the role of arbitrator, the President must be free to find solutions within the administrative process.

The bill supported most strongly by the railroad unions, S. 832, is outlined on the third chart. It quite simply modifies RLA by providing that, when all other provisions have been exhausted, the unions are free to strike either nationally or selectively. On the one hand, provision in law for a national strike would prohibit either the President or Congress from intervening, and the public interest would seem not to be adequately protected. On the other hand, the right to strike, while in accord generally with practice in other industries, needs both balance safeguards. S. 832, while permitting strikes, effectively removes from the carriers the balancing right to institute work rule changes (as they did in the U.T.U. strike) or to lock out.

An essential requirement in any attempt to reduce strife in the railroad industry, and to encourage the peaceful settlement of disputes, is that a careful balance between the parties should be fashioned. The main effect of this bill would be to place almost unlimited power in the hands of one party to the dispute. For this reason, although I accept the strike as an inherent right, I cannot support the bill as it is written.

Now, I would like to mention the major provisions of the bill my cosponsors and I have introduced. As I have suggested earlier, I believe RLA should be retained as enabling legislation, and I have added three options for Presidential action as shown on my last chart.

First, I would suggest that selective strikes be permitted by the President unless he finds, in a particular instance, that they would cause immediate imperilment of the national health and safety. However, this option must be circumscribed with appropriate safeguards to insure that the resulting shutdown of transportation does not immediately result in, nor escalate to, a situation which the public refuses to countenance.

In particular, our bill would require that any settlement arrived at between the union and any struck carrier must be offered, intact, to all of the other carriers who had participated in the national bargaining. This will help avoid any tendency to "whipsaw" by gaining successively better settlements from each carrier, in turn. In addition, the limitations on the selective strike are more firmly drawn, so that no more than 20% of the na-

tion's rail service would be affected at any one time, regardless of the number of simultaneous disputes.

As a second option, I would, of course, permit the President to call for additional time at the bargaining table. Many instances will arise where the vagaries of calendars and of argument will require only more time to resolve.

Third, I would adopt the novel suggestion put forward by the Administration under the title of Final Offer Selection. This process, not yet tried anywhere to my knowledge, holds the promise of eliminating the divisiveness of compulsory arbitration while providing an extremely strong impetus to collective bargaining, and an assurance to the public that a final resolution of the dispute will be achieved. What this proposal provides is that, after the parties have bargained to their best ability, each puts forward a final offer which constitutes a complete and binding agreement. Then one and only one of these offers will be selected, complete and intact, by a board composed of public members. The essence of this procedure is that each party is induced, first to resolve as many issues as possible during bargaining, and, second, to make the most reasonable possible final bid on all outstanding issues. For the selection board, which is charged with the public interest, will select that final offer they find to be most reasonable in view of the facts of the situation.

In addition, I imagine that there are other options which might be given to the President to increase the flexibility of his response. In particular, I would like to stress the sequential aspects of my bill, which would permit the President to choose from among the three options until a solution is reached. As I mentioned earlier, the Administration's bill, on the other hand, permits the President one and only one option. However, the important point is that the Administration must be given the power to deal with labor disputes which threaten the nation, to deal with them fairly, and firmly, so that Congress does not have to be involved in each individual dispute, and so that the public interest will be protected.

The legislation that I have sponsored embodies the three major points that I have just mentioned. Since May 13, 1971, when I first introduced my proposal as H.R. 8385, I have received bipartisan support of 70 of my colleagues in the House. My bill has been reintroduced with minor technical modifications six times, as H.R. 9088, H.R. 9089, H.R. 9571, H.R. 9820, H.R. 10433 and H.R. 10781.

The broad support that my proposal has gained is both personally gratifying and significant, for it indicates the depth of feeling that exists in the House for permanent rail strike legislation. Naturally, I am very pleased that this distinguished Senate Committee has scheduled hearings on this very important subject, and it was an honor to speak with you today. I look forward to the rapid emergence of sound and equitable legislation that will serve the interests of all the people.

NATIONAL 4-H WEEK

HON. WILMER MIZELL

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 7, 1971

Mr. MIZELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise at this time to remind my colleagues that this is National 4-H Week, which is set aside each year to recognize the many contributions to our national life that 4-H Club members make every day.

The theme for this year's observance is

"4-H Bridges the Gap," signifying that the 4 million youths now participating in the 4-H program have proven they can combine all the zeal and idealism of youth with the pragmatism and temperance of adulthood.

The many 4-H members in the Fifth District of North Carolina, which I represent, are excellent examples of this rare combination, and I am proud to represent them in Congress.

These young people take very seriously the 4-H pledge:

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.

The 4-H members in my district literally live by those words, as evidenced by their active participation in a great many worthwhile projects in agriculture, citizenship, personal development, and leadership training.

I know that my colleagues in the House join me in congratulating the 4-H Club members in North Carolina's Fifth Congressional District and throughout the Nation. They are America's finest.

REPRESENTATIVE SMITH LAUDS
RECORD OF FLOYD D. SNYDER,
TOWN OF LOCKPORT, N.Y., SUPERVISOR

HON. HENRY P. SMITH III

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 7, 1971

Mr. SMITH of New York. Mr. Speaker, within the past several weeks, this administration, with the cooperation of millions of Americans all across this Nation, has taken the initiative in a comprehensive program to defeat a debilitating inflationary spiral that for many years has been eroding the economy of our country. To anticipate ever-increasing prices and wages has become an accepted way of life for most Americans. Spending and taxation by all levels of Government have reached staggering proportions. Unfortunately the heaviest burden of this fiscal irresponsibility and unbridled taxation appears to fall on those who can least afford to pay.

Despite efforts made by Federal and State governments to curb spending, no final victory can ever be won in this war against inflation until local citizens and local governments commit themselves to the achievement of this same urgent goal. For this reason, Mr. Speaker, I am proud to call attention to the tremendous record of public service rendered by Floyd D. Snyder, supervisor of the town of Lockport in Niagara County, N.Y.

The record shows that during the 10 years of his administration, the town of Lockport has experienced an enviable record of progress while Mr. Snyder has secured for his taxpayers, lower town tax rates and lower water tax rates, each and every year. The first 8 years of this record of annual tax reduction was accomplished before the advent of a county sales tax. During this same period, coun-

ty tax rates and school tax rates nearly doubled. Supervisor Snyder has achieved this record while at the same time providing great commercial, industrial, and residential expansion. During his administration, the town of Lockport witnessed: 17 contracts to extend water services; a 300-percent increase of water customers usage; a 10-percent increase in mileage of roads; a 30-percent increase in population; a 150-percent increase in sewer areas of the town; an expanded youth recreation program; and increased financial support of town of Lockport volunteer fire companies. All of these accomplishments have resulted in a \$30 million gain in full value assessment: up from \$25,471,982 in 1961 to its present level of \$55,497,824.

Mr. Speaker, I must mention one final and almost unbelievable point. At a time when local, State and Federal payrolls are skyrocketing, Supervisor Snyder's record of unprecedented growth and increased services has been accomplished while decreasing the town payroll by one worker during the 10 years of his administration.

Let us have more local public officials like Floyd Snyder, Mr. Speaker, who will do this kind of a job for their constituents and for their country.

THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE
RUKERT TERMINALS CORP. OF
BALTIMORE, MD.

HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 7, 1971

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, September 24, I attended a dinner in celebration of the 50th anniversary of Rukert Terminals of Baltimore, Md.

This event was made memorable by the appearance of the Honorable Helen Delich Bentley, Chairman of the Federal Maritime Commission and distinguished Baltimorean. Mrs. Bentley delivered an inspiring speech in honor of Captain Rukert, who is one of the leading businessmen in Baltimore's maritime industry. I think the fact that this man became successful in a highly competitive industry without the aid of Federal help—and solely on his own—is an example of how private enterprise can and should be the back bone of America's economic strength.

The deserved tribute paid to Captain Rukert by Mrs. Bentley is certainly worth reading by my colleagues and I insert her remarks at this point in the RECORD:

REMARKS BY MRS. HELEN D. BENTLEY

This is one of the highest privileges and distinct honors ever accorded me to be invited to pay tribute tonight, not only to an outstanding frontiersman in the maritime industry, but to a real American.

Captain W. G. N. Rukert is a very, very special friend of Bill and me. In fact, he gave me away at my wedding.

Cap, Bill is very sorry he could not be with us tonight, but he has an antique show in Oxford, Maryland and just couldn't be in two places at once. He wanted me to let you know that he was here in spirit with us.

While we are paying tribute to Cap Rukert,

we also are saluting a real Maryland company—Rukert Terminals Corporation—which has done so much for the Port and City of Baltimore.

The fact that Rukert still has some customers who began doing business when Captain Rukert first began operating fifty years ago, is in itself a testimonial of the company's excellence and honesty as a firm with which to do business.

Cap, some of your 50-year customers are here along with many of your other friends tonight to express their warm regards to you.

You know, ladies and gentlemen, fifty years is a long time. Not in the course of history or the development of man—but in the history of a port and in development of the maritime industry by men trying to make it great.

Tonight we celebrate 50 years in the history of a local waterfront firm founded by a man who has been doing just that: trying—no, helping and succeeding in making the port of Baltimore great.

For the Golden Anniversary, we mark here this evening represents not just the Jubilee of Rukert Terminals Corporation, but the culmination of a half century of unprecedented achievement in this world port of Baltimore, this modern maritime center which has played an integral part in building a city, state and nation.

Cap, the following text, for the most part, are excerpts from a story I wrote about you in the Sun on your 80th Birthday. You know to learn from Captain Rukert—and I learned a great deal about the waterfront from him and many others here tonight—I used to sit on his musty old leather hassock in his momento-filled office down there on Thames Street. He would loll back in his high-back chair and begin to recount events as he knew them around the waterfront. Sure, there was plenty of dust on all of the momentos and the odor from the fertilizer—that precious cargo—which has meant so much to Rukert and the port over the years—permeated the room. Some of that same dust and fertilizer is still there, I'm certain, Cap, if anyone is interested in tracing it a bit further.

One little story never printed about Cap, and never related publicly before, is how he was saved from staying in the newspaper business as a reporter and instead entered a business that became a very profitable venture for him.

As a fourteen-year-old youth, he got a job as a copy reader on the old Baltimore American. One of the greatest thrills in his life was that he covered the old Baltimore fire in 1904, even though he wasn't a full-fledged reporter at the time, but he was doing some leg work.

After being on the newspaper for nearly a year, one of the older reporters arranged for him to go to the burlesque house to see a "girlie" show. He thought this was really great and enjoyed it immensely as a 15 or 16 year-old boy would.

When he returned home, he told his father about his newest venture—thinking it was a great gag. His father took a very dim view of him staying in the newspaper business and a week later, Captain Rukert found himself at work as a clerk at the Pennsylvania Railroad. This experience at the Pennsylvania waterfront terminals prepared him for helping direct the Army in its military operations during World War I. It was that Army experience, in fact, which convinced him to go into business for himself instead of working for others as he had done before the War. So, in 1921, Cap Rukert and his brother George, established the company which now is one of Baltimore's leading private terminal operators, probably the only one left.

His early success in handling potash

movements from France and later Germany, started him on the road to becoming Baltimore's most innovative terminal operator.

More than 15 years ago, a railroad executive in Philadelphia made this discerning remark about him. He said: "Cap Rukert is ahead of all of 'em. Marginal wharves are the only type for the future, with trucks playing such an important role in moving freight today—unless you can afford a finger pier 400 or 500 feet wide."

Well, Cap invested in marginal wharves long before it was fashionable to do so, and he's still investing. Matter of fact, Rukert Terminals is virtually the only firm that has invested personal funds in public waterfront facilities in Baltimore in recent decades. Outside of the Maryland Port Administration, Cap is today the *only* one doing any such investing.

His complex currently includes Lazaretto Terminal, Pier 5 Clinton Street, Brown's Wharf and Jackson's Wharf. Major construction is presently under way at Pier 5, representing a \$500,000 investment to increase warehousing capacity and extend and expand the pier. But expansion at Rukert Terminals is nothing new. For Cap's biggest dream—one that has been with him since he first bought the old Miller's Wharf at the foot of Caroline Street—is to have a modern marginal terminal running all the way from Broadway to Chase's Wharf right in the heart of downtown Baltimore.

He owns all but two buildings in that area now, and who is to say that the stalwart white-haired octogenarian, with his unyielding determination, will not end up owning those also? Though nearly 85 years old he still carries himself erectly and with pride. And he is still a workhorse—on the job five days a week from 8 a.m. on.

The principal regret of this man who is considered the port of Baltimore's most rugged individualist is that he is not 30 years younger, so that he could really give the newcomers stiff competition by putting over some of his new ideas and dreams.

Just let someone try to interfere with his operation or steal some of his business—particularly if that someone is the Maryland Port Administration—and his powerful voice can be heard all the way uptown. The day he stormed an MPA commissioners' meeting several years ago after learning that the state agency was going to get an account he had nurtured and brought to Baltimore he has become local waterfront legend.

But what Cap really hates most is the infiltration of out-of-towners—particularly New Yorkers—into Baltimore waterfront circles. He gasps and swears vehemently whenever he learns of another New York branch office opening here. In this opinion the New Yorkers are not interested in the welfare of the port as he is: their interest is only to make money while business is good here, and pull up stakes as soon as it begins sliding downhill, he believes.

"We Baltimorans have to stay here forever," he roars. "No one is interested in this port as are Baltimore companies, and we have to stick together."

We all know Cap never hesitates to speak his mind. Yet his lusty lungs and sarcastic tongue—to which Joe Stanton and the old Port Authority and his son Norman and most of his other employees can well attest—have endeared him to nearly everyone, even his most intense competitors.

For when you add to those traits his crackling sense of humor, provocative personality, relentless drive and fierce sentimentalism—all of which belie the rugged outward appearance—you have a man with the proverbial heart of gold, a real soft touch whenever someone is in trouble.

This story old soul is like a ship at sea when trouble brews: "Let's see what we can do to save the situation and help humanity," is his typical response. Cap has probably financed more funerals, more births,

more hospital bills, more mortgaged homes and more automobiles for his people than any other single individual around the port of Baltimore.

Yet even those persons who have been, and still are, on opposite sides of the fence in legal dealings, rate fights and what-have-you, hold the highest regard for this remarkable old man who well realizes that change must be made if progress is to be made, and who keeps in close touch with every move made by Baltimore's competitors, always mindful that he might somehow be able to lure additional cargo this way.

Cap: the Port of Baltimore is in your debt. And we here tonight are proud to acknowledge it. You've come a long way these fifty years, and the rest of the Baltimore port community will likely have to go a long way to equal your achievements.

But you've set a noble example—a standard—for the rest of us to follow. We salute you! May you have many more years of prosperity and good health—and may you and the Rukert Terminals Corporation invite us all back again in 2021 for your company centennial!

OUR FRIENDS, THE ARABS: AN APPEAL FOR REASON IN THE MIDDLE EAST

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 7, 1971

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, much has been written during the last two decades about the Arab-Israel conflicts in the Near East. But few writers have had the knowledge, background or experience or vision required for making realistic appraisals. Moreover, I have observed that many who have been most vociferous in demanding a pullout of our forces from the jungles of South Vietnam have been generally silent as regards sending them to fight in the deserts of Sinai.

In an unusually able article in the New York Times of October 4, 1971, Maj. Gen. Thomas A. Lane, an experienced officer with combat experience on the staff of General MacArthur in the southwest Pacific and careful student of history, describes the Arab-Israel situation and summarizes the lessons to be learned from their protracted conflict. He emphasizes that Arab countries are rightly a part of the free world, deplors the bankrupt U.S. policies that have converted differences between free world countries into a confrontation with Soviet power, and calls for new policies that will restore Arab countries to their rightful position with the West and peace among neighbors in that divided area.

Because of its relevance to present policy problems facing our country, I quote the indicated article as part of my remarks:

[From the New York Times, Oct. 4, 1971]

OUR FRIENDS, THE ARABS

(By Thomas A. Lane)

McLEAN, VA.—The Arab neighbors of Israel have for some seventeen years been embarked upon an alliance with the Soviet Union. There are lessons to be learned from the experience—lessons of special import to the Arab countries but important also to all free countries.

In the historic practice of Western politics nations have made alliances to serve special

common interests. Whatever their differences in other matters, they had a common interest which brought them together. Thus, although the United States and the Soviet Union had irreconcilable political tenets, they were thrown into alliance in World War II by the circumstance that one was attacked by Germany and the other was attacked by Japan. Their sole common interest was to defeat the common enemy—though U.S. policymakers lost sight of that reality.

There is in alliance a tacit understanding that the differences of allies will be subordinated to the common purpose during the term of the alliance. During World War II, the United States overdid this obligation with praise of Soviet "democracy," and the Communist party, U.S.A., supported President Roosevelt, though it supported Stalin more.

The Communist powers do not of course subscribe to the traditional norms of Western diplomacy. Their object is conquest, and they follow the guidance of Lenin in achieving it. The criterion for policy in any circumstance is the advantage of the Communist interest.

In the Soviet-Arab alliance, the aim of the Arab countries has been to defeat Israel and to restore Arab sovereignty in Palestine. But is this also the Soviet aim? Does the Soviet Union really care about defeating Israel or is it more interested in conquering the Arab countries? Aren't the strategic locations and the oil wealth of the Arab countries richer prizes than the barren plains of Palestine, made fruitful only through heavy investment?

We must look for answers in the experience of the alliance. Seventeen years is a long time to take to arm and train forty million Arabs to defeat three million Israelis. The years have been studied with one Arab defeat after another. In the face of the alliance, Israel has expanded its territory. Why?

The Arabs are divided, they are technologically backward, they are not conditioned to the needs of modern tank and air warfare. Granting all this, it is still possible to develop competent military forces from technologically backward nations in less than seventeen years. The Greeks, the Turks and the Koreans have done it. Maybe the Soviet Union wanted to fail.

With the Arab world in these years, the extension of Communist influence has been the primary aim of Soviet policy. Under cover of the alliance, the Soviet Union has schemed for the ascendancy of its own power. This thrust of the internal Communist parties has kept the Arab world in continuous turmoil. Soviet intrigue has encouraged the Marxist Palestine Liberation forces to attack King Hussein, not Israel. It has worked to overthrow King Hassan in Morocco. In Libya and the Sudan, the Soviet Union has supported pro-Soviet nationalists. But we have seen in the Sudan that even a pro-Soviet nationalist can be the target of a Communist coup. General Nimeiry is lucky to have survived the attack on his Government. He had been slow to learn from the experience of others.

When will the Arab leaders awaken to the true aims of Soviet policy? Far from conquering Israel, they are wasting the resources of their people in futile armaments and risking their own survival in freedom. Their true destiny lies in the free world, which respects their sovereignty, honors their religious sentiments and offers the true course for the development of Arab culture. All the potential of modern technology lies open to their people if the leaders have the wisdom to choose freedom.

It is sorry U.S. policy which converts a difference between free-world countries into a confrontation with the Soviet Union. The U.S. and Israel have a duty in wisdom and prudence to offer a generous settlement of Middle-East differences which will detach the Arab countries from their Soviet alliance and restore them to the family of freedom.

TRIBUTE TO LYMAN GREEN HINSON

HON. DAWSON MATHIS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 7, 1971

Mr. MATHIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I received sad news indeed last week when I learned of the death of my friend, Lyman Green Hinson of Mitchell County, Ga. Mr. Hinson was my friend, but even more important than that, he was a friend of his fellow citizens, and especially of rural families in south Georgia.

Mr. Hinson was a man of foresight and vision, who provided leadership for his fellow Georgians in many ways. He was one of the first to realize what electricity would mean to rural Georgia, and in 1937, he and other men of vision came together and founded the Mitchell County Electric Membership Corp. He served as a member of the board of directors of the Mitchell County EMC since the incorporation, and he served with distinction as the president of that group since 1954.

Lyman Hinson will be missed by those who knew him, and his presence will be missed by many who never knew him, but have benefits from his foresight and perception. He was a good man.

There are two fine newspapers in Mitchell County, and both eulogized Mr. Hinson in front page stories last week. I include both accounts, from the Camilla Enterprise and the Pelham Journal so that Members of this Congress may know of the life and works of Lyman Green Hinson:

[From the Camilla Enterprise, Sept. 29, 1971]

LYMAN HINSON DIES SUDDENLY OF HEART ATTACK

Countless friends throughout the county joined members of the large family connection in mourning the death of Lyman Green Hinson, sixty-four year old farmer and county leader, which occurred early last Saturday morning, September 25th, at Mitchell County Hospital in Camilla. He had attended the football game at Ravenwood Friday night and became ill on the way home and was carried to a doctor's office in Pelham, later transferred to the hospital in Camilla where he succumbed.

Funeral services took place Sunday afternoon at five-thirty o'clock at the Hinsonton Baptist Church with the Rev. H. T. Montgomery officiating. Interment was in the family lot at Liberty Hill Church Cemetery.

Nephews served as pallbearers and they were Ricky Hatcher, David Hatcher, Earl Flowers, Walter Williford, Tim Glenn and Joey Glenn.

Honorary pallbearers were Y. M. Blanchard, James H. Holton, Mack Lodge, R. E. Amason, H. C. Lamar, C. E. Rigsby, O. L. Cook, N. B. Jordan, C. F. Coker, Thomas Thornton, Lamar Cooper, H. E. McNeal, George Kirksey, J. R. Odom, Hugh Gleaton, J. C. Brim, Jr., Ernest Smith, C. W. Joiner, Keaton Cox, Erwin Glauster, and E. D. Hilliard. Braswell Funeral Home of Pelham was in charge of funeral arrangements.

Survivors include his wife, Mrs. Maxine Hatcher Hinson, Hinsonton; two sons, John L. Hinson of Thomasville and Cecil L. Hinson of Cairo; five grandchildren, three brothers, Watt and Hubert Hinson of Deerfield Beach, Fla., and P. L. Hinson of Indiantown, Fla.; five sisters, Mrs. Ernest (Grace) Meyer of Pleasantville, New York, Mrs. D. D. (Annie Mae) Autry and Miss Lucile Hinson, both of

Hinsonton; Mrs. Robert (Ruth) Ward of Tampa, Fla., and Mrs. J. W. (Sara) Glenn of Cotton.

He was born in Hinsonton January 19th, 1907, son of the late John D. Hinson and Mamie Rackley Hinson, pioneer citizens of this county for whom the community of Hinsonton is named. He was a member of Hinsonton Baptist Church for many years and served as a member of the Board of Deacons.

[From the Pelham Journal, Sept. 30, 1971]

LYMAN G. HINSON DIES AFTER BRIEF ILLNESS

Clouds of sorrow hovered over the entire County last Saturday morning when the death of Lyman G. Hinson, 64, of Hinsonton was learned.

Mr. Hinson, well known, loved and respected farmer died at the Mitchell County Hospital early Saturday morning September 25, following a brief illness.

Mr. Hinson attended the ball game at the Ravenwood stadium on Friday night.

Funeral services were held at the Hinsonton Baptist Church at 5:30 P.M. September 26, with Rev. H. T. Montgomery officiating, with interment in Liberty Hill Cemetery.

Mr. Hinson was born in Hinsonton, January 19, 1907 the son of the late John D. and Mamie Rackley Hinson.

He married Miss Maxime Hatcher Dec. 21, 1940.

He was a member of the Hinsonton Baptist Church and was a deacon.

Mr. Hinson was a loyal and devoted citizen of both his community and county. He was recognized as a successful farmer, provided a wonderful home for his family. Those who knew him best knew him to be a devoted husband, a loving father, and loyal and faithful friend.

He was a faithful member of his church, and lent his time in the spiritual uplift of his community.

He loved his fellowman and he contributed much of his time in doing those things beneficial to his friends and neighbors. He served Mitchell County Board of Tax Equalizers, Chairman of the Board of Mitchell County Electric Membership Corp., Chairman of the Mitchell County A.S.C.

During his life he served on many committees and groups working for the betterment of his county.

He is survived by his wife, two sons, John Lyman Hinson of Thomasville and Cecil Hinson of Cairo. Five grandchildren also survive.

Three brothers survive, P. L. of Indiantown, Fla.; T. W. and H. D. Hinson of Deerfield Beach, Fla.

His five sisters are Mrs. Annie Mae Autry and Miss Lucile Hinson, Hinsonton, Mrs. Robert Ward, Tampa Mrs. Ernest Meyer, Pleasantville, N.Y., Mrs. Sara Glenn, Cotton.

His nephews served as active pallbearers.

Honorary pallbearers, Y. M. Blanchard, James H. Holton, Mack Lodge, R. E. Amason, H. C. Lamar, C. E. Rigsby, O. L. Cook, N. B. Jordan, C. F. Coker, Thomas Thornton, Lamar Cooper, H. E. McNeal, George Kirksey, J. R. Odom, Hugh Gleaton, J. C. Brim, Jr., Ernest Smith, C. W. Joiner, Keaton Cox, Erwin Glauster, E. B. Hilliard.

Braswell Funeral Home in charge.

VIETNAM ELECTION CRITICISM**HON. THOMAS M. PELLY**

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 7, 1971

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, a great many Senators—especially those who are seeking the Democratic nomination for

President—complain about the election in South Vietnam.

As for the claim of rigging, certainly the Democrats in Tammany Hall rigged elections in New York City for years. And, in 1960, rigging in Cook County, Ill. and Texas, cost Richard Nixon the election. So, Democrats should not throw rocks at presidential rigging elections.

However, if the Vietnam election were rigged as an editorial in the Christian Science Monitor on October 6, 1971, pointed out, it was rigged by people of our choice, not by Hanoi or by Peking or by Moscow.

As the Monitor says, no one else on the outside picked him. He is a native of South Vietnam. He is supported by a regime and an armed force which comes from South Vietnam. He owes the United States a great deal, but he owes nothing to Hanoi, Peking, or Moscow.

To quote the Monitor:

So, today, there is a non-Communist government in Saigon which has been chosen by an electoral process devised by the people of South Vietnam which is totally independent of any Communist Government anywhere and that is precisely what Washington always said it wanted to do for Saigon.

Mr. Speaker, I am glad to note that the Christian Science Monitor has made this important point and I commend its wisdom in the conclusion that the President has reason to continue military support to the Army of South Vietnam. He wants to spare the Americans rear guard ordeal in withdrawing and also wants to give President Thieu a best possible chance of survival.

On the other hand, Hanoi wants to diminish survival prospects of the non-Communists.

If the American people are patient and do not listen to much to those Senators who want to undermine the President's leadership we could achieve yet the objectives for which 50,000 Americans have laid down their lives.

SOME VITAL ELEMENTS PERTINENT TO THE PRICE-WAGE FREEZE**HON. GEORGE A. GOODLING**

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 7, 1971

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, while we are making adjustments to the price-wage freeze instituted by President Nixon, we might reflect on some of the vital elements pertinent to this freeze.

An article that appeared in the September 13, 1971, issue of the Wall Street Journal does a remarkable job of focusing on these elements, and I insert it in the RECORD and commend it to the attention of my colleagues:

APPRAISAL OF CURRENT TRENDS IN BUSINESS AND FINANCE

While we wait for what's to come after "the 90 days," it may be well to ponder the most widely ignored fundamental fact about the so-called "wage-price spiral" that prompted the freeze. It is the heavily lopsided nature of the spiral. For every point of gain on the price side, there has been a two-point rise on the wage side. The popular idea

that it has been more or less an even trade-off between the two sides of the spiral is just not based in fact.

It is human nature, of course, for every man (and his wife) to see only the "run-away" prices and forget any increments in income. It is human nature for journalists to emphasize the prices. And it is political nature for politicians—especially those out of office—to do the same. But any close look at the record since 1965, when the inflationary bulge began, suggests that the emphasis is clearly misplaced.

The table below traces the widely followed consumer price (cost of living) index and this country's median family income from 1965 through 1970. The family income figure for 1971, of course, is not yet available. The price index uses the new 1967 base as 100:

Year	Cost of living	Median family income
1965	94.5	\$6,957
1966	97.2	7,500
1967	100.0	7,974
1968	104.2	8,632
1969	109.8	9,433
1970	116.3	9,867

What these figures add up to, over the five-year span of inflation, is—

Cost of Living: up 23%.
Family Income: up 42%.

There is a story here on the question of who has the power to push prices up. It is common to lump "big business" and "big labor" together as a team having this power. The reasoning is that labor, through organization, forces wage costs up more or less at will, and then business, somehow because of its "bigness," simply passes these costs right along to the public in higher prices.

But it doesn't work out that way. Business cannot hold up its end of the log. The country's huge corporations, and especially those in industries where output is concentrated in a few firms, do have economic power, of course. But the idea that they can pass on all cost increases in an increasingly competitive world just doesn't stand up.

Vastly expanded productive capacity, both in this country and abroad in Europe and Japan, making this passing along process steadily more difficult year after year.

This can be put sharply in focus by comparing the rise in producer prices on consumer goods (1967 equal 100) with the rise in weekly wages. The wages cover all private nonfarm payrolls of production workers or nonsupervisory employes. The 1971 figures are for June:

Year	Consumer goods prices	Average weekly earnings
1965	96.1	\$95.06
1966	99.4	98.82
1967	100.0	101.84
1968	102.7	107.73
1969	106.6	114.61
1970	109.9	120.16
1971	113.1	127.57

Both of these columns, too, show big gains. But a little quick pencil work comparing the gains of each, reveals—

Consumer Goods Prices: up 17.7%.
Average Weekly Earnings: up 34.1%.

Footnote to the above: Prices on these manufactured products are up less than the cost of living index because the latter index contains the really big gainers—such things as services and taxes. A big factor in putting family income up more than weekly wages is the ever increasing number of double paychecks (working wives) enjoyed by American families.

On the prices-vs-wage costs question, it can be assumed that producers do not ab-

stain from passing on all wage costs out of charitable feelings for the consumer. Any business will pass on its costs—if it can. And it must be concluded that the failure to do so is due to lack of power to do so—in the face of competition.

Wouldn't this sort of lopsided "spiral" have a fundamental impact on the structure of the country's economy? Indeed it would. It has. While GNP and consumer income have climbed steeply over the past half-decade, corporate profits have just about been stopped in their tracks. Here is the record for (1) gross national product, (2) wage-and-salary income of individuals, and (3) after-tax corporate profits. All figures represent billions. The 1971 figures are second quarter annual rates:

Year	GNP	Wages, salaries	Corporation profits
1965	\$685	\$359	\$46.5
1966	750	394	49.9
1967	794	423	46.6
1968	864	465	47.8
1969	929	509	44.5
1970	974	541	41.2
1971	1,041	572	44.6

The percentage figuring on these columns over the period since 1965, comes out—

Gross National Product: up 52%.
Wages and Salaries: up 60%.
Corporate Profits: down 4%.

This record, of course, as has been pointed out by people in and out of government, puts any talk of curbing "excess profits" in the ludicrous area. Profits in excess of what? Today's severely deflated level?

It is unfortunate that the word "profit" is so widely misunderstood. Millions undoubtedly think of profits and dividends as being the same thing. Actually, of course, profit is divided into two parts, (1) that retained within the business and (2) that paid to stockholders in dividends. When profits are good, the retained part is usually the larger.

Retained profit is used to modernize a business or expand it. Modernization directly benefits employes by making their employer's products more competitive—with imports, for example. And business expansion (new plants) creates new jobs, of course.

The last half-decade's wage-price spiral, with all the action on one side of the "spiral, is clearly not an ideal generator of new jobs.

WASHINGTON SEWAGE TREATMENT AUTHORITY

HON. GILBERT GUDE

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 7, 1971

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, an editorial recently broadcast on WRC-TV by Mr. Bryson Rash deals with a suggested solution to the sewage treatment problems in the Washington metropolitan area. I have for some time been most concerned over this problem. The serious threat posed to the Potomac River, which has already been declared unsafe for human contact by the Environmental Protection Agency, by the daily dumping of millions of gallons of raw sewage is inexcusable.

Mr. Rash and WRC agree with a proposal by the Environmental Protection Agency that a regional sewage authority would effectively deal with the deplorable situation in Washington. Mr. Rash, however, suggests that such an authority be federally funded and come under the

Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments rather than be another independent superagency dealing with area affairs. I believe that there is much to be said for this approach, and I commend the text of the editorial to my colleagues for their consideration:

SEWAGE TREATMENT AUTHORITY

The sewage treatment, water supply, air pollution and trash disposal problem in the Washington metropolitan area are enormous and equally pressing. For the moment let's discuss sewage treatment.

Maryland, Virginia and the District have signed an agreement to undertake a multi-million dollar improvement program at Blue Plains. It can't be completed until late 1974. Meanwhile, millions of gallons of raw sewage are being dumped daily into the already polluted Potomac.

Most of the excess sewage nearly 40 million gallons a day comes from Montgomery and Prince George's Counties.

To try to alleviate this problem, the District proposed a chemical treatment process as an interim measure. That was great except the Maryland communities haven't found a place to dump the 360 tons of sludge created daily by the process. So the chemical treatment is not being implemented and the millions of gallons of sewage continue to spew into the Potomac.

Virginia is getting impatient with the continued abuse of Blue Plains by Maryland and the lack of power in the District government to move on the sewage problem—and that goes back to the disinterest of Congress in the Washington area.

The Environmental Protection Agency has proposed a super regional authority to handle sewage treatment and other pollution problems. Certainly it is needed, but WRC-TV would prefer to see it federally funded, as part of the Council of Governments rather than another agency dealing with area affairs.

H.R. 11125 TO REQUIRE BANKS TO PAY INTEREST ON PUBLIC MONEYS

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 7, 1971

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I introduced H.R. 11125, a bill to require banks to pay interest on certain public moneys which are deposited by the Secretary of the Treasury in demand deposit accounts.

I felt prompted to introduce this legislation in the interest of our taxpayers and the overextended financial condition of our Federal Government on learning that the "custom" of the Treasury Department has been to deposit millions—possibly billions of dollars each year—free of interest or charge in less than 10 percent of the country's commercial banks.

I refer especially to the recent report concerning the First National City Bank of New York City, which upon learning it had made a \$38.8 million error to the U.S. Government was permitted by the U.S. Treasury to use \$38.8 million of Government funds free of charge from July 2 through September 27. At the prime rate of 6-percent interest, such a sum could earn a minimum of \$482,000 by the bank; and by the use of the rule of 10, probably earned a great deal more. It

also generated additional credit promoting the runaway inflation which is hurting our people so severely that the President has invoked a freeze on wages and prices but not on interest and profits.

I believe the American people feel that our Treasury Department in handling taxpayers' dollars should adhere to principles of good business practices. In fact, if anything, the Treasury Department using tax dollars should be held to a higher degree of responsibility and frugality than commercial banks handling private funds.

We would all agree that if such action were taken by private banker with our personal funds and we received no interest for the use of our money, individually we would each demand satisfaction and recompense. Since public funds belong to the American people and we in Congress are delegated the responsibility for the people's money, then it is our duty to see that our people's tax dollars are handled properly and that no one gets the use of free money or preferential treatment.

I insert a copy of my bill and a related newspaper story:

H.R. 11125

A bill to require banks to pay interest on certain public moneys which are deposited by the Secretary of the Treasury in demand deposit accounts

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (1) the Secretary of the Treasury shall not permit any public moneys for which he has responsibility to be deposited in any bank or other financial institution in a demand deposit account unless the depository agrees to pay interest on such demand deposit account at a rate or rates determined by the President of the United States to be appropriate.

(2) (a) The payment of interest shall be applied against the average daily balance in each such demand deposit account over each quarterly period.

(b) To the extent that any Federal law which applies to any bank which is an insured bank under the Federal Deposit Insurance Act prohibits the payment by any such bank of interest on demand deposits, such prohibition shall be held and considered to apply only to demand deposit accounts containing moneys other than public moneys for which the Secretary of the Treasury has responsibility.

(c) For the purpose of this Act, public moneys for which the Secretary of the Treasury has responsibility refers to any public moneys with respect to which the Secretary of the Treasury has the authority to deposit, or cause to be deposited, in a bank or other financial institution.

(d) This Act shall take effect on the day following the expiration of the 180-day period which begins on the date of the enactment of this Act.

[From the Baton Rouge Morning Advocate, Sept. 21, 1971]

GIGANTIC GOOF NETS HUGE BANK WINDFALL
WASHINGTON.—The nation's second-largest bank lost almost \$39 million through a bookkeeping error earlier this year, but quickly got the chance from the U.S. Treasury to turn the mistake into a windfall.

The error occurred when First National City Bank of New York paid twice in the same day for one government security worth \$38.8 million.

Despite a federal banking system described by the Treasury as "truly the envy of gov-

ernments around the world," it was the bank and not the government which discovered the error—2½ months later.

It immediately notified the Treasury by telegram and the money was returned.

But the bank also asked for, and got, an additional \$38.8 million to use free of charge for 2½ months so it could make up for what it could have earned on private loans during the time the money was missing.

Furthermore, the lending rate subsequently increased, thus giving National City the chance to make more off the government's \$38.8 million than it would have made with its own money.

The amount of the misplaced money and its potential yield in interest, are minute when compared to National City's total deposits of \$19.6 billion, but the incident, confirmed by officials of the Treasury and the bank, illustrates the close relationship between the government and the country's commercial banking industry.

In a statement commenting on the transaction Patman said he thinks it is highly improper for the Treasury to use public funds to compensate the bank for its own internal bookkeeping mistake.

He said he is asking the General Accounting Office, Congress' fiscal watchdog, to investigate and would insist that the bank "return to the federal government any proceeds gained from the use of this money."

Exactly what the bank might earn from the money is difficult to determine since repayment to the Fed is not due until next week. At the prime rate of 6 per cent it could earn a minimum of \$582,000. But Treasury officials said the bank could earn twice that in quick turnover loans to smaller customers whom they would charge much more.

The Nixon administration has actively sought to increase government deposits in the country's 32 minority banks. But, according to Edward Gannon, the Treasury official coordinating the year-old drive, government deposits in these banks had reached only \$17 million by mid-September.

National City's error occurred March 3 when its London office and a New York branch paid \$38.8 million for an Export-Import Bank series BB promissory note.

The error went undetected until May 19. Harry Conover, a National City vice president, said the mistake was discovered by the bank's controller.

FREE OF CHARGE

Conover notified the Treasury by telegram. The Treasury repaid the \$38.8 million and agreed to let the bank have another \$38.8 million free of charge from July 2 through Sept. 27.

If National City had not made the error, it would have been able to lend that amount between March and May, charging a minimum of 5.5 per cent interest, the prime rate banks charge their most favored customers.

On July 7, National City and other leading banks raised the prime rate to 6 per cent.

Asked why Treasury should help the bank make up for its own mistake, Conover replied:

"They had the use of the money, the Treasury did."

This comment underlines a major point of contention among those, notably Patman, who are critical not only of the close relationship between commercial banks and the Treasury, but also of Treasury depository practices generally.

Even if the Treasury had been aware it suddenly had \$38.8 million extra and—speaking purely hypothetically, didn't want to give it back, it most likely would have deposited it in another of the nation's largest banks without charge and without collecting any interest.

This is what the federal government does with millions, possibly billions, of dollars

each year—puts the money free of charge in less than 10 per cent of the country's commercial banks. The Treasury defends the practice on the ground that it compensates the banks for services rendered the government.

BANKERS RELUCTANT

The practice has been going on for decades, but bankers and Treasury officials are reluctant to discuss it.

"It's not a question of trying to withhold or conceal," said Bruce Budlong, chief of domestic banking in the Bureau of Accounts, the obscure agency which handles government deposits. "We don't want to confuse the public."

There is nothing unusual about the National City incident except for the amount of money involved. "You don't see amounts like that very often," Budlong said.

Budlong agreed with Conover's comment that the bank had been deprived of the money even though National City made the mistake. "It was a transaction, a normal transaction and a defensible one," he said.

Budlong attributed to routine bookkeeping another interesting fact about the National City incident: Although the bank isn't required to repay the money until Sept. 27, the Bureau of Accounts assumes it will be repaid and changed its records Aug. 31 to show it had been.

The change was made when the Bureau received a copy of an Aug. 26 letter from the Treasury's Office of Cash Management directing the bank to repay the Federal Reserve System Sept. 27.

CASIMIR PULASKI—POLISH PATRIOT

HON. FRANK ANNUNZIO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 7, 1971

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, October 11 marks the 192d anniversary of the death of Count Casimir Pulaski. His name is well-known to all Americans for this great Polish patriot left an indelible mark on the development of our great country.

Born in 1748 in Poland to a distinguished and well-to-do family, Pulaski early joined the struggle to prevent the partition of Poland. Though initially successful in his fight against Russian oppression, Pulaski was eventually defeated. His father and a brother were killed, and Pulaski himself lost his position and wealth.

Undaunted, however, he managed to escape to France where he met Benjamin Franklin and learned of the desperate need for trained soldiers and leaders in the United States, which was engaged in its own war of independence. Because of Franklin's encouragement, Pulaski came to America where he offered his services to General Washington. They were accepted, and Pulaski quickly took on America's fight for freedom as his own.

General Washington immediately recognized Pulaski's military skills and personal qualifications for leadership which were demonstrated time and again on the battlefield. Soon Pulaski merited promotion to the rank of brigadier general. He was placed in command of a division, and by his determination and

perseverance, Pulaski succeeded in training the first American cavalry units during the Revolutionary War.

General Pulaski commanded the cavalry during the winter of 1777 at Trenton and later at Fleming. Working with Gen. Anthony Wayne, he scouted for supplies to feed starving troops at Valley Forge. In 1779, he assumed command for both the French and American cavalry at Savannah. Bravely charging the enemy lines at the head of his forces, Pulaski was mortally wounded, and 2 days later on October 9, 1779, he died at the age of 31.

This great son of Poland made the supreme sacrifice in order that America might win her independence and take her place among the free nations of the world. This week, as we mark the 192d anniversary of his death, it is appropriate to note the legacy that Poland has left to America. Polish-Americans have contributed substantially to the economic, cultural, and spiritual growth of our country. The priceless contribution of Casimir Pulaski almost 200 years ago is reflected today in the continuing contributions of Polish-Americans to our country.

The Seventh District in Illinois which I represent has many thousands of Americans of Polish ancestry. They are active in every field of endeavor—in the professions, in business, and in civic, educational, religious, and political activities of the community. Because I represent a great number of Polish-Americans, I have come to know them well. I am particularly aware of their warmth, their talent, and their extraordinary characteristics. Over the years, they have indeed given generously to the enrichment of American culture. It is, therefore, with genuine pride that I join my colleagues in commemorating the anniversary of General Pulaski's death.

DAY CARE IN OTHER COUNTRIES: THE SOVIET UNION

HON. DONALD M. FRASER
OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, October 7, 1971

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, on September 10 the Senate approved a child care bill and on September 30 the House passed a comparable version of the same bill. This legislation is considered by many as one of the most important new pieces of social legislation in recent years. This legislation originated without any initiatives from the executive branch and has been supported by a broad base of liberal and conservative opinion in both bodies of Congress.

Since there are so few models within the United States of good day care facilities, I feel it might be helpful to become familiar with some of the programs that have been instituted in other nations. The fact is inescapable that the United States lags badly in comparison with other industrialized nations. I have submitted to the RECORD studies on day care institutions in Sweden and

France—CONGRESSIONAL RECORDS of September 28 and 29, 1971.

Today I would like to submit a study done by Urie Bronfenbrenner of day care in the Soviet Union. Dr. Bronfenbrenner is one of the acknowledged experts in the world, and this excerpt is taken from "Two Worlds of Childhood: U.S. and U.S.S.R." published by the Russell Sage Foundation, New York 1970.

As he points out, the major difference between the two countries in the upbringing of children lies in the source of responsibility. In the United States we ordinarily think of this responsibility as centered in the family. In the Soviet Union there is a much greater sense of collective upbringing. One of the most influential publications for parents in the Soviet Union, a sort of Russian Dr. Spock, is "A Book for Parents," by Anton Semyonovich Makarenko. A quote from this book best describes this fundamental difference:

Our family is not a closed-in body like the bourgeoisie family. It is an organic part of Soviet society, and every attempt it makes to build up its own experience independently of the moral demands of society is bound to result in disproportion, discordant as an alarm bell. In our country the duty of a father toward his children is a particular form of his duty toward society.

Dr. Bronfenbrenner accurately states the magnitude of the problem facing us in the United States: We are faced with the necessity of developing a new style of socialization, one that will correct the inadequacies of our contemporary pattern of living as it is affecting our children and provide them with the opportunities for humanizing experience of which they are now bereft.

In sum, it is not a question of whether or not there will be changes in the way in which we bring up our children, but rather what direction the changes will take. Shall we continue to drift, or shall we try to determine our course? If so, which approaches are both effective and feasible?

The excerpts follow:

TWO WORLDS OF CHILDHOOD—U.S. AND U.S.S.R.
(By Urie Bronfenbrenner, with the assistance of John C. Condry, Jr.)

INTRODUCTION: A CRITERION FOR TWO CULTURES

How can we judge the worth of a society? On what basis can we predict how well a nation will survive and prosper? Many indices could be used for this purpose, among them the Gross National Product, the birth rate, crime statistics, mental health data, etc. In this book we propose yet another criterion: *the concern of one generation for the next*. If the children and youth of a nation are afforded opportunity to develop their capacities to the fullest, if they are given the knowledge to understand the world and the wisdom to change it, then the prospects for the future are bright. In contrast, a society which neglects its children, however well it may function in other respects, risks eventual disorganization and demise.

In this book, we shall explore the "concern of one generation for the next" in the two most powerful nations of our time, the Soviet Union and the United States. We shall examine what each country does for and with its children both intentionally and, perhaps, unintentionally. Then, drawing upon existing research and theory in the behavioral sciences, we shall ask what are, or might be, the consequences of the modes of treatment

we observe; that is, what values and patterns of behavior are being developed in the new generation in each society. Finally, we shall look into the possibilities for introducing constructive changes in the process as it is taking place in our own country. In pursuing this last objective, we shall draw even more extensively on available resources of behavioral science to identify what we know of the forces affecting the development of human behavior, the principles on which the forces operate, and how these principles might be exploited by our social institutions in a manner consistent with our values and traditions.

In the language of behavioral science, this volume is concerned with the process of *socialization*, the way in which a child born into a given society becomes a social being—a member of that society. It should be clear that being socialized is not necessarily the same as being civilized. Nazi youth were also products of a socialization process. The example is an instructive one, for it reminds us that the family is not the only possible agent of upbringing. The process typically begins in the home but does not end there. The outside world also has major impact, as the child becomes exposed to a succession of persons, groups, and institutions, each of which imposes its expectations, rewards, and penalties on the child and thus contributes to shaping the development of his skills, values, and patterns of behavior.

Accordingly, in our comparative study of socialization in the Soviet Union and the United States, we shall be examining the process as it occurs in a series of social contexts beginning with the family but then proceeding to other settings such as preschool centers, children's groups, classrooms, schools, neighborhoods, communities, and, indeed, the nation as a whole.

Our selection of the Soviet Union as the object of paired comparison was not dictated by considerations of power politics but by those of social science. We wished to profit from the contrasting perspective provided by a society which differs substantially from our own in the process and context of socialization but at the same time faces similar problems as an industrialized nation with highly developed systems of technology, education, and mass communication. In terms of socialization, the major difference between the two cultures lies in the localization of primary responsibility for the upbringing of children. In the United States, we ordinarily think of this responsibility as centered in the family, with the parents playing the decisive part as the agents of child rearing, and other persons or groups outside the family serving at most in secondary or supplementary roles. Not so in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. The difference is nowhere better expressed than in the following passage from one of the most influential Soviet publications in this sphere: *A Book for Parents* by Anton Semyonovich Makarenko, an eminent educator whose methods for rehabilitating juvenile delinquents in the nineteen-twenties and -thirties became the primary basis for the techniques of collective upbringing currently employed in all Soviet nurseries, schools, camps, children's institutions, and youth programs. In this volume, which came to be regarded as a guide to ideal Soviet family life, Makarenko defined the role of the family as follows:

Our family is not a closed-in collective body, like the bourgeoisie family. It is an organic part of Soviet society, and every attempt it makes to build up its own experience independently of the moral demands of society is bound to result in a disproportion, discordant as an alarm bell.

Our parents are not without authority either, but this authority is only the reflection of social authority. In our country the duty of a father toward his children is a

particular form of his duty toward society. It is as if our society says to parents:

You have joined together in goodwill and love, rejoice in your children, and expect to go on rejoicing in them. That is your own personal affair and concerns your own personal happiness. But in this happy process you have given birth to new people. A time will come when these people will cease to be only a joy to you and become independent members of society. It is not at all a matter of indifference to society what kind of people they will be. In handing over to you a certain measure of social authority, the Soviet state demands from you correct upbringing of future citizens. Particularly it relies on a certain circumstance arising naturally out of your union—on your parental love.

If you wish to give birth to a citizen and do without parental love, then be so kind as to warn society that you wish to play such an underhanded trick. People brought up without parental love are often deformed people.

Nor is the family the sole or even the principal delegate of the society for the upbringing of children. Such primary responsibility is vested in still another social structure, the *children's collective*, defined as "a group of children united in common, goal-oriented activity and the communal organization of this activity." As we shall see, such collectives constitute the basic structural units in all Soviet programs designed for the care or education of children.

The first difference, then, between the United States and the Soviet Union in the way in which children are socialized lies in the contrast between a family-versus-a collective-centered system of child rearing. But of course, the family is not the only context of upbringing in American society. Children's groups also exist in the United States. But unlike their more formalized Soviet counterparts, they are more fluid, and relatively independent of the adult society.

Accordingly, in our comparative study, we shall focus major attention on similarities and differences in two principal contexts of socialization—the family and the children's group.

We begin with a consideration of the process of upbringing in the Soviet Union.

PART I: THE MAKING OF THE NEW SOVIET MAN

To date, no systematic studies of methods of child rearing have been carried out in the Soviet Union either by Soviet or non-Soviet investigators. The generalizations which follow are based on field notes of observations and interviews made by the author as a visiting scientist on seven different occasions from 1960 to 1967. Over the course of these visits, which ranged in length from two weeks to three months, opportunities were provided, through the courtesy of the Academy of Pedagogical Sciences, to observe and talk with children and adults in a variety of settings, including nurseries, kindergartens, regular schools, boarding schools, and the so-called schools of the prolonged day, as well as Pioneer palaces, camps, parks, and other community facilities for children and parents. In addition, particularly after the first one or two trips, there developed informal opportunities to become acquainted with Soviet family life. The presence of our own children on three of these visits not only increased such contacts considerably, but also set in high relief the contrasts between Soviet and American modes of upbringing both within and outside the family.

Although some observations were made in rural areas in the Russian, Ukrainian, and Georgian republics, and in the Asian republics of Uzbekistan and Kazakhstan, the great bulk of the field work was done in several large cities in various parts of the U.S.S.R., specifically Moscow, Leningrad, Kiev, Odessa, Tallin, Tbilisi, Tashkent, and Alma-Ata.

1. UPBRINGING IN THE SOVIET FAMILY

The descriptions which follow are drawn both from field data and from published manuals on child care. Although the latter have wide circulation throughout the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, with translations published in the languages of the several republics, the observations were essentially limited to Russian-speaking families in and around large metropolitan centers.

We begin with a discussion of parental treatment in infancy and early childhood. Patterns of Maternal Care.

In this sphere, differences between Russian and American practices are most apparent in three areas.

PHYSICAL CONTACT

Russian babies receive substantially more physical handling than their American counterparts. To begin with, breast feeding is highly recommended and virtually universal. And even when not being fed, Russian babies are still held much of the time. The nature of this contact is both highly affectionate and restricting. On the one hand, in comparison with American babies, the Russian child receives considerably more hugging, kissing, and cuddling. On the other hand, the infant is held more tightly and given little opportunity for freedom of movement or initiative. Manuals on child care, prepared by the Academy of Pedagogical Sciences, frequently inveigh against this practice. Witness the following excerpt:

There are still mothers who, when the child is not asleep, never allow him to remain in his bed but continually hold him in their arms. They even cook holding the child with the left arm. Such a position is very harmful to the child, since it leads to curvature of the spine.

SOLICITOUSNESS

The mobility and initiative of the Soviet child are further limited by a concerted effort to protect him from discomfort, illness, and injury. There is much concern about keeping him warm. Drafts are regarded as especially dangerous. Once the child begins to crawl or walk, there is worry lest he hurt himself or wander into dangerous territory. For example, children in the park are expected to keep in the immediate vicinity of the accompanying adult, and when our youngsters—aged nine and four—would run about the paths, even within our view, kindly citizens of all ages would bring them back by the hand, often with a reproachful word about our lack of proper concern for our children's welfare.

DIFFUSION OF MATERNAL RESPONSIBILITY

The foregoing example highlights another distinctive feature of Russian upbringing, the readiness of other persons besides the child's own mother to step into a maternal role. This is true not only for relatives, but even for complete strangers. For example, it is not uncommon, when sitting in a crowded public conveyance, to have a child placed on your lap by a parent or guardian. Strangers strike up acquaintances with young children as a matter of course, and are immediately identified by the accompanying adult or by the child himself as "*dyadya*" [uncle] or "*tyotyia*" [auntie].

Nor is the nurturant role limited to adults. Older children of both sexes show a lively interest in the very young and are competent and comfortable in dealing with them to a degree almost shocking to a Western observer. I recall an incident which occurred on a Moscow street. Our youngest son—then four—was walking briskly a pace or two ahead of us when from the opposite direction there came a company of teenage boys. The first one no sooner spied Stevie than he opened his arms wide and, calling "*Ai malysh!*" [Hey, little one!], scooped him up, hugged him, kissed him resoundingly, and passed him on to the rest of the company,

who did likewise, and then began a merry children's dance, as they caressed him with words and gestures. Similar behavior on the part of any American adolescent male would surely prompt his parents to consult a psychiatrist.

Given this diffusion of nurturant behavior toward children, it is hardly surprising that Soviet youngsters exhibit less anxiety than their American age-mates when their mother leaves them in the care of another person or in a nursery. Such delegation of the care of the child is, of course, standard practice in the U.S.S.R., a nation of working mothers in which 48 per cent of all age-eligible women are in the labor force. But before turning to methods of upbringing outside the family, we must consider another aspect of parental child rearing, values and techniques of discipline.

VALUES AND TECHNIQUES OF DISCIPLINE

It would be a mistake to conclude that the affection and solicitousness that Russians, in particular Russian mothers, lavish on children imply permissiveness or indulgence with respect to conduct. On the contrary, much emphasis is placed, no less by parents than by professional educators, on the development of such traits as obedience [*poslušanie*] and self-discipline [*disciplinirovanost*].

What is meant concretely by these terms? For an answer we may turn to the authoritative volume, *Parents and Children*, prepared by a group of specialists from the Academy of Pedagogical Sciences with the aim of "helping parents to bring up their children properly so that they can grow up to be worthy citizens of our socialist nation." In a chapter on discipline, we read the following:

What is necessary and possible to demand of young children? First of all, a child must be obedient toward his parents and other adults, and treat them with respect. . . . The child must fulfill requests that adults make of him—this is the first thing the child must be taught. The child must fulfill the demands of his elders. In following the orders, instructions, and advice of grownups, the child manifests obedience. By becoming accustomed to obey from early childhood, to react to the demands of adults as something compulsory, the child will begin successfully to fulfill later demands made of him in family and school.

But to obey is not enough; the child must also develop *self-discipline*. On this score, our manual speaks as follows:

It is necessary as early as possible to develop in the young child an active, positive relation to the demands of adults, the desire to act in accordance with these demands, to do that which is necessary. Herein lies the great significance of our efforts in developing conscious self-discipline, indeed its very elements. Every person, including the young school-age child, will better, more quickly, and more joyously fulfill demands and rules once he has a desire to do so.

In other words, in the parlance of Western psychology, self-discipline is internalized obedience—fulfilling the wishes of adults not as commands from without but as internally motivated desires.

A more recent work by one of the Soviet Union's most popular writers on child rearing, I. A. Pechernikova (the first edition of 150,000 copies sold out in a few months), reiterates much the same idea and then poses a critical question.

Obedience in young children provides the basis for developing that most precious of qualities: self-discipline. Obedience in adolescents and older school children—this is the effective expression of their love, trust, and respect toward parents and other adult family members, a conscious desire to acknowledge their experience and wisdom. This is an important aspect of preparing young people for life in a Communist so-

ciety. We shall be asked: what about developing independence [*samostoyatel'nost'*] in children? We shall answer: if a child does not obey and does not consider others, then his independence invariably takes ugly forms. Ordinarily this gives rise to anarchistic behavior, which can in no way be reconciled with laws of living in Soviet society. Where there is no obedience, there is no self-discipline; nor can there be normal development of independence. Training in obedience is an essential condition for developing the ability of self-discipline.

We quote at some length from these contemporary Soviet educators for several reasons. First, Soviet books on upbringing are widely read and taken very seriously by parents, teachers, and others engaged in work with children. Indeed, the interest extends beyond those directly concerned, since upbringing [*vospitanie*] is virtually a national hobby in the U.S.S.R. Daily newspapers frequently carry articles and letters on the subject, public lectures on the topic are widely attended, and questions of upbringing constitute a common subject of conversation among parents and non-parents alike.

Second, consistent with the foregoing statements, the passages cited present in more succinct form ideas frequently heard in conversations with Soviet parents, teachers, child-care workers, and the general public.

Third, parents, professionals, and people in general, when dealing with children, often act in accord with these stated convictions; that is, they actively strive to develop in children the traits of obedience and self-discipline described in the passages quoted.

Fourth, as we shall see, these efforts are not without success; many Soviet children do exhibit in their behavior the qualities so strongly recommended and admired by professional educators.

Finally, as we shall see also, the dilemma of obedience versus independence, which Pechernikova poses and then so readily resolves, at least at the ideological level, is likewise manifest in the behavior of Soviet youngsters, and may present problems for Soviet society in the light of changing educational, social, and economic needs.

But before considering the products of Soviet upbringing it is necessary to acquaint ourselves with the methods employed for achieving the stated goals. Once again we begin by examining recommended practices. The treatment of this subject in Pechernikova's book, which is the most recent at our disposal, is typical of its many predecessors. In her chapter on "How to Develop Obedience," Pechernikova recommends the following as the methods of choice.

The development of obedience is especially fostered by a brief and precise explanation to the child of the reason why he should behave himself in the given fashion and not otherwise. In pedagogy, we call this the method of persuasion.

Second only to persuasion in its presumed effectiveness is the use of encouragement and praise [*pooshchrenie*], but such techniques "should be employed only when necessary." For example, if a child is already doing well in school and is following the rules of conduct, he should not be praised for it.

The method of encouragement and praise should be used only in those cases when, under the influence of the teacher, the parents, or one's friends, the child is striving to correct faults of character, to become better organized, to begin to obey his elders.

Finally, Pechernikova takes up the question of how to punish disobedience. First of all, she sounds the primary proscription of Soviet experts on upbringing: "the inadmissibility of physical punishment," a measure which is viewed not merely as ineffective but harmful. However, after inveighing against this particular form of discipline for seven pages, Pechernikova warns against the oppo-

site extreme, "the denial of any form of punishment whatsoever, on grounds of liberalism and spontaneity in child rearing." The so-called method of natural consequences, which allows the child to learn by touching the hot samovar and burning himself, is to be vigorously rejected.

We cannot risk our children's future by allowing their upbringing to be determined by spontaneous drift. The school and the parents [note the order] must hold the reins of upbringing in their own hands and take all measures necessary to insure that children obey their elders.

What measures are these? On first glance, we recognize familiar phrases, "reprimand," "dressing down," "deprivation of privileges," that is, the usual armamentarium of frustrated parents everywhere. But a more careful reading reveals a special emotional tone somewhat alien to present-day parental practices, especially recommended ones, in our own country, but possibly reminiscent of an earlier era. Witness the following examples:

A "talking-to" [involves] a brief but sharp evaluation of the behavior of the disobedient child including an expression of one's own indignation at such behavior. Moreover, after giving the reprimand, one should not permit himself to resume his usual affectionate manner with the child, even when the parent feels that the youngster has genuinely repented. For a period of time it is necessary to remain pointedly reserved with the child and somewhat cold, thereby showing him that his disobedience has hurt the adult. This measure turns out to be very effective and in most instances gives a palpable result. . . . Depriving the child of the adult's companionship in enjoyable activity as a punishment for disobedience is also a very effective means of influence.

For example, a mother says to her son: "Once again you disobeyed me by not coming home on time. Now I no longer wish to finish the chess match we began yesterday. It is even unpleasant for me to look at you." For the rest of the evening, she confines herself only to cold responses to her son's questions. About the same behavior toward the boy is shown by his father.

Sometimes the parents can resort to an even more severe method of punishment: for a period of time to cease talking to the child entirely. For example, a daughter not only disobeyed her mother by refusing to change her ridiculous hair-do but allowed herself to hurt her mother's feelings by a harsh word. The latter said nothing, but cast a reproving glance, showed by all her appearance how deeply insulted she was, and refrained from speaking with her daughter for several hours.

Students of Western research on parent-child relationships will recognize this pattern as a classic example of discipline through what has been called "withdrawal of love." Shortly, we shall review available evidence on the effects of this parental technique. For the moment, we must turn to the prior question of the extent to which Soviet families actually employ the methods recommended to them by professional educators.

Here we can rely only on the informal observations and interviews conducted primarily with urban professional families but also including more casual contacts with working-class parents and children in public conveyances, parks, recreation centers, and other public places. In general, the field notes indicate considerable correspondence between practice and precept, especially among professional families. Less-cultured parents do on occasion resort to physical punishment, and are less likely to engage in reasoning and persuasion. But what most differentiates Russian parents from their American counterparts is the emotional loading of the parent-child relationship,

both in its positive and negative aspects. On the one hand, both adults and children in the U.S.S.R. are more demonstrative toward each other. On the other hand, any departure from proper behavior evokes from the parent a curtailment of this demonstrativeness. By gesture, word, intonation, or eloquent silence the parent is quick to convey this emotional wound. The child is made to feel not so much that his behavior was wrong as that he himself was ungrateful and had betrayed an affectional bond.

This same principle of discipline through withdrawal of emotional support turns out to be central in the second major context in which upbringing takes place for the Soviet child—the children's collective.

2. UPBRINGING IN COLLECTIVE SETTINGS

Although in the Soviet Union the use of communal facilities for the rearing of children is as old as the Soviet government itself, collective upbringing received its greatest expansion following the Twentieth Party Congress in 1956, which called not only for the expansion of existing institutions, such as nurseries and kindergartens, but also for the introduction of the so-called schools of the new type—the "internats" or boarding schools, and the "schools of the prolonged day," which offer essentially the same program as the boarding schools, except that the pupils go home at about six in the evening and return early the next morning.

The present scope of these programs can be gleaned from the following summary figures. Over 10 per cent of all Soviet children under two years of age are currently enrolled in public nurseries. The corresponding percentage for children between three and six years of age who attend preschool institutions is about 20 per cent. Approximately 5 per cent of all school-age children—i.e., those seven years old and older—are enrolled in boarding schools and "schools of the prolonged day."*

For all of these institutions, the stated aim is to provide the child, from early infancy onward, with the physical, psychological, and social conditions regarded as necessary for his full development but not readily available in his own home. In accordance with this aim, priority in admission is given primarily to children from families to which one parent is absent or away for long periods of time, or where the parents work on different shifts. Infants may be entered at three months of age.

What is the nature of the methods of child rearing employed in these collective settings? The following account is based on observations in some thirty centers visited by the author in various parts of the U.S.S.R.

TECHNIQUES OF UPBRINGING IN PRESCHOOL CENTERS

Training in the first year of life involves two major features. The first is early experience in collective living. The infants are placed in group playpens with six to eight children in each. To permit face-to-face interaction between staff members and children the pens are raised on legs, the one for the three-to-six-month-olds being higher than the near-toddlers. At these age levels,

* For a more detailed account of the development of institutions of communal upbringing in the U.S.S.R., including available enrollment figures, see Urie Bronfenbrenner, "The Changing Soviet Family," in Donald R. Brown (ed.), *The Role and Status of Women in the Soviet Union* (New York: Teachers College Press, Columbia University, 1968). Although in his 1956 address, Nikita Khrushchev predicted "the education of all children in boarding schools," his successors have markedly reduced further expansion of this type of institution in favor of the cheaper and more popular extended-day schools.

there is one "upbringer" for every four charges.

The second core principle of upbringing is the so-called *regime*. Each child is on what a Western psychologist would view as a series of reinforcement schedules; that is, the upbringer spends a specified amount of time with him in stimulating and training sensory-motor functions. For example, at the earliest age levels, she will present a brightly colored object, moving it to and fro to encourage following. A bit later, the object is brought nearer and moved slowly forward to induce the infant to move toward it. Still later, the child is motivated to pull himself up by the barred sides of the playpen to assume a standing position. And infants learn to stand in such playpens not only in Moscow, but 2,000 miles away in Soviet Asia as well.

From the very beginning, considerable emphasis is given to the development of self-reliance, so that by eighteen months of age the children are expected to have completed bowel and bladder training and are already learning more complex skills such as dressing themselves. Physical activity outdoors is encouraged and it is usually followed by rest, with windows wide open and the smallest children swaddled in thick quilts.

During the first year of life, especial attention is focused on language training. The following passage from the official manual on the preschool program provides an accurate summary of our own observations:

The upbringer exploits every moment spent with the child for the development of speech. In order that the infant learn to discriminate and understand specific words, the upbringer speaks to him in short phrases, emphasizes by her intonation the main words in a given sentence, pauses after speaking to the child, and waits for him to do what was asked. It is important that the words coincide with the moment when the child engages in the action, looks at the object which the adult has named, or is watching a movement or activity being performed by the adult. The speech of the upbringer should be emotional and expressive, and should reflect her loving tender relation to the child.

In activities with children of this age, the upbringer develops the understanding of speech and enriches the children's impressions. Toward this end she carries the baby to different objects and shows him large colorful sound-making and wind-up toys; with children eight to nine months of age, she encourages them to pick out from a collection of many toys the one which she names; in order to acquaint the child with names of adults and other children she conducts games of hide-and-seek.

In order that the child can learn the words associated with certain actions ("Clap your hands," "Goodbye," "Give me your hand," "So-o big," etc.), she teaches these actions, accompanying them with the appropriate words. The upbringer encourages the child to duplicate sounds which he already knows how to pronounce, as well as new ones, and structures his babbling and imitation of simple syllables.

The development of speech becomes the vehicle for developing social behavior. Thus in speaking of the nine- to twelve-months age level, the manual states:

It is important to cultivate in the baby a positive attitude toward adults and children. At this age the child's need to relate to the adults around him increases. Interest develops in what others are doing. Sometimes children of this age play together: they throw balls into the same basket, roll downhill one after the other, smile at each other, call to one another. If the upbringer is not sufficiently attentive to the children, negative relations may arise among them; for example, the result of the attempt by one child to take a toy held by another.

How does the upbringer respond to such expressions of selfishness? The following example from our field notes is typical of a number of observations.

Kolya started to pull at the ball Mitya was holding. The action was spotted by a junior staff member who quickly scanned the room and then called out gaily: "Children, come look! See how Vasya and Marusya are swinging their teddy bear together. They are good comrades." The two offenders quickly dropped the ball to join others in observing the praised couple, who now swung harder than ever.

Nor is such cooperation left to chance. From the very beginning stress is placed on teaching children to share and to engage in joint activity. Frequent reference is made to common ownership: "*Moe eto nashe; nashe moe*" [mine is ours; ours is mine]. Collective play is emphasized. Not only group games, but special complex toys are designed which require the cooperation of two or three children to make them work. Music becomes an exercise in social as well as sensory-motor articulation. As soon as children are able to express themselves, they are given training in evaluating and criticizing each other's behavior from the point of view of the group. Gradually, the adult begins to withdraw from the role of leader or coordinator in order to forge a "self-reliant collective," in which the children cooperate and discipline themselves, at meal time and in play activities, too. As is apparent in some of the photographs, play often takes the form of role-playing in real-life social situations, which gradually increase in complexity (e.g., taking care of baby, shopping, in the doctor's office, at school). Beginning in the second year of nursery and continuing through kindergarten, children are expected to take on ever-increasing communal responsibilities, such as helping others, serving at table, cleaning up, gardening, caring for animals, and shoveling snow. The effects of these socializing experiences are reflected in the youngster's behavior, with many children giving an impression of self-confidence, competence, and camaraderie.

3. THE PSYCHOLOGICAL IMPLICATIONS OF SOVIET METHODS OF UPRINGING

We begin our analysis by considering the possible impact on a child of the pattern of demonstrative maternal warmth to which Russian youngsters are exposed from earliest infancy. The most relevant research in this connection is found in the pioneering studies of Percival M. Symonds and David M. Levy, along with more recent investigations summarized in reviews by Wesley C. Becker, Urie Bronfenbrenner, Bettye M. Caldwell, John A. Clausen, and Willard W. Hartup. In general, these researches point to the conclusion that a warm, constricting mother-child relationship maximizes dependency and produces a child who is readily socialized to adult standards. One can hardly improve on the original description provided by Symonds' own concise summary of the syndrome as he found it in America of the nineteen-thirties. He characterized children growing up in such a context as "obedient, orderly, submissive," and likely to "conform to the modes of the group in which they are reared. . . . This is a fair picture of the good child in our society." "The only trouble," he went on to say, "is that the men in our society are supposed to be independent, aggressive, forward, self-confident and strong."

THE EFFECTS OF AFFECTION AND ITS WITHDRAWAL

The later investigations were not only more sophisticated but made an important new contribution by identifying the disciplinary strategy involved in inducing conformity with adult standards. In summarizing these research findings, the present author described parents using this strategy in the following terms:

. . . they reason with the youngster, iso-

late him, appeal to guilt, show disappointment—in short, convey in a variety of ways, on the one hand the kind of behavior that is expected of the child; on the other, the realization that transgression means the interruption of a mutually valued relationship. . . .

The successful use of withdrawal of love as a disciplinary technique implies the prior existence of a gratifying relationship; the more love present in the first instance, the greater the threat implied in its withdrawal. . . . Our data indicates that it is a primarily mothers who tend to employ "love oriented" techniques of discipline. . . .

The foregoing analysis, derived from research done only with American children, would seem to apply rather well to patterns of child rearing in the Soviet family.

FATHER ABSENCE AND THE MOTHER-CENTERED FAMILY

The question may be raised as to how this particular pattern developed? How did it come about that the Soviet parents, especially mothers, are so affectionate with children and react to disobedience with withdrawal of love? Are these merely long-established cultural traits, passed down from one generation to the next, or are they promoted and maintained by certain social structural properties found in Russian society which, if they were altered, would modify the existing pattern?

Some light is shed on this issue by a growing body of research on the effects of father absence. Studies carried out both in the United States and Norway indicate that such absence not only affects the behavior of the child directly but also influences the mother in the direction of greater over-protectiveness. The effect of both of these tendencies is especially critical for boys. Children from father-absent homes, at least initially, are more submissive, dependent, effeminate, and susceptible to group influence, with the later course of development being determined by the character of the group in which the child finds himself. Thus in lower-class Negro families, where father absence is particularly common, the typically passive and dependent boy readily transfers his attachment to the gang, where, to earn and keep his place, he must demonstrate his toughness and aggressiveness.

Similar but not so extreme effects are likely to occur in homes in which the father is present but plays a markedly subordinate role. In a study of the relation between parental role structure and the child's behavior, Bronfenbrenner found that matriarchal families, in which primarily the mother held the power of decision, tended to produce children who "do not take initiative" and "look to others for direction and decision." At the same time, an asymmetrical family structure has somewhat different effects on the two sexes. Specifically:

Both responsibility and leadership are fostered by the relatively greater salience of the parent of the same sex. . . . Boys tended to be more responsible when the father rather than the mother is the principal disciplinarian; girls are more dependable when the mother is the major authority figure.

Further investigation qualified this finding in an important respect. It revealed that children of both sexes showing the highest degrees of leadership and dependability tended to come neither from matriarchal nor patriarchal families, nor from those in which the mother and father participated equally and similarly in the process of child rearing; rather, such youngsters were found in families where both parents took an active part but behaved rather differently, with some division between supportive and disciplinary roles.

What is the relevance of all these considerations to child rearing in the U.S.S.R.? First

of all, particularly during and after World War II, millions of Russian children were brought up in fatherless families; and, fifteen years after the war's end, there was still an excess of 20,000,000 women over men in the Soviet population. Nor is this a new phenomenon in Russian history, which records an inexorable series of devastating invasions, civil wars, famines, massive exiles, and shifts in population, all of which had the effect of separating families and removing large numbers of men from their homes. Beyond the direct effect which such paternal absence would have had on the wives and children of missing fathers, there is the likelihood of an indirect impact of imposing matriarchal patterns in families where the father was physically present. Such an effect has been strongly indicated as one of the heritages of slavery in the Negro family of today, and could well be operative in any society experiencing a history of massive, enforced family separation. In any event, despite the equalization of the sex ratio in the Soviet population over thirty-five years of age, which encompasses the present generation of parents of young children, the continuing primacy of the mother in child rearing is reflected both in objective circumstances (such as the common practice of the *Kommandirovka*: a work assignment in another locality without being accompanied by one's family) and in the popular literature on family upbringing, in which the mother is portrayed and addressed not only as the chief agent of child rearing but also as the principal maker of decisions affecting the child. (Witness the instruction, on pages 13-14, for "silent treatment" of the disobedient child, in which a lengthy passage addressed to the mother ends, almost as an afterthought, with a reminder that "about the same behavior" should be shown by the father.)

Perhaps even more significant for the Soviet child is the fact that the saliency of females in his environment increases markedly upon his entry into nursery school, and continues thereafter. Even though some male teachers are to be found, especially at the secondary school level, the excess of female over male personnel is even more pronounced than in the United States. Moreover, the elected leaders of the peer collective are also likely to be girls (in the thirty or more schools, camps, and Pioneer palaces visited, there was only one instance in which the highest officer was a boy). Finally, as dramatically illustrated by the example of the trial, after the primary grades it is girls who take the most active role in collective discipline, and boys who are most likely to be its target.

COLLECTIVE UPBRINGING IN SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGICAL PERSPECTIVE

These considerations bring us to our last and perhaps most difficult question: what are the psychological effects of collective upbringing? This question in turn may be examined from two points of view. First, what evidence do we have from Western research bearing on the consequences of child rearing in communal settings? Second, what is known about the characteristics of Soviet children who are products of this type of upbringing?

EVIDENCE FROM WESTERN RESEARCH

Since available data on the first of these questions has already been examined in some detail elsewhere, we shall deal with the issue here only in summary form. Western studies relevant to the effects of collective upbringing derive principally from two major contexts. The first of these is, of course, the family. We have already seen that the practice of withdrawing group approval employed as a disciplinary measure in Soviet children's collectives has much in common with the "love-oriented" techniques, which research on American families has shown to be especially potent in effecting "good behavior" and making children "conform more closely

to the modes of the group in which they are reared." This would suggest that analogous methods employed at a group level would have similar results. Moreover, the effectiveness of the collective in this regard would be enhanced by two distinctive features of the Soviet family already noted. The absence of a strong counterforce to the mother in the person of a frequently present and powerful father, coupled with the early diffusion of the nurturant role to persons outside the family should facilitate transition from the mother to the collective as a primary source of security and incontestable authority for the child.

A second body of research carrying implications for the effectiveness of collective upbringing deals with the power of the group in controlling the behavior of its members. Experiments on conformity behavior, notably the work on adult subjects by Solomon E. Asch, Morton Deutsch and Harold G. Gerard, and Stanley Milgram, and on children by Ruth Berenda, M. S. Neimark, and Muzaffer Sherif *et al.*, testify to the power of the majority in shaping and regulating the behavior of group members and forcing the deviant individual to conform. Of particular significance of the Soviet case is Deutsch and Gerard's ingenious extension of the classical work of Solomon Asch on group influences in perception. In the original experiment as conducted by Asch, the subject, along with six or eight others, is asked to identify the longer of two straight lines presented for all to see. At first, the task seems simple enough. The lines are easy to discriminate; the subject hears others make their judgments and then makes his own. In the beginning he is in agreement, but gradually he notices that the judgments offered by others do not correspond with his own. Actually the experiment is rigged, the other group members having been instructed to give incorrect responses on a predetermined schedule. The effect on the subjects is disturbing enough so that in a third of the cases they follow the false lead of the majority. In designing their own experiment, Deutsch and Gerard took note of the fact that in the earlier work the subjects were not actually members of a "group"; they were simply a collection of strangers assembled in one room to participate in an experiment. If a prior sense of group consciousness had been developed before the perceptual task, they argued, the distorting influence of social pressure would have been more pronounced. They then proceeded to test this hypothesis by running two series of experiments. The first simply replicated Asch's original conditions; the second introduced before the perceptual task a procedure designed to enhance feelings of group membership. The results were strongly confirmatory: the subjects in the "group" condition made twice as many errors (i.e., distortions) as the controls run under the standard conditions.

What was the procedure used to develop a feeling of group identity? Immediately before being asked to make perceptual judgments, the experimental subjects were instructed as follows:

This group is one of twenty similar groups who are participating in this experiment. We are going to give a reward to the five best groups—the five groups that make the fewest errors on the series of judgments that you are given. The reward will be a pair of tickets to a Broadway play of your own choosing for each member of the winning group. An error will be counted any time one of you makes an incorrect judgment. . . . The five groups that make the best scores will be rewarded.

In short, as their experimental treatment designed to enhance the Asch effect, Deutsch and Gerard employed "socialist competition." The only modification a Soviet upbringing could wish would be to have the winning

team make a group decision on which play to see and then attend the theater as a "victorious collective."

In summary, on the basis of Western research both on parent-child relations and on group process, one would expect Soviet methods of child rearing both in the family and in the children's collective to reinforce each other in producing a child who conforms to adult standards of "good conduct."

STUDIES OF SOVIET CHILDREN

To what extent are these expectations realized in the actual behavior of Soviet children? Our data on this question come from two sources: unstructured observations and impressions recorded in field notes; and systematic investigations carried out with comparable groups of children from the Soviet Union, the United States, and other countries.

The results of unstructured observations can be conveniently summarized by the following excerpt from an interim research report made at the International Congress of Psychology in 1963. Subsequent visits have served only to confirm the earlier description:

What impressed this observer, like others before him, about Soviet youngsters, especially those attending schools of the new type, was their "good behavior." In their external actions, they are well-mannered, attentive, and industrious. In informal conversations, they reveal a strong motivation to learn, a readiness to serve their society, and—in general—ironically enough for a culture committed to a materialistic philosophy, what can only be described as an idealistic attitude toward life. In keeping with this general orientation, relationships with parents, teachers, and upbringers are those of respectful but affectionate friendship. The discipline of the collective is accepted and regarded as justified, even when severe as judged by Western standards. On the basis not only of personal observations and reports from Soviet educators, but also from entries in the minutes of the Pioneer and Komsomol meetings which I had an opportunity to examine, it is apparent that instances of aggressiveness, violation of rules, or other antisocial behavior are genuinely rare.

The results of our systematic investigations point to similar conclusions. The most relevant data come from a series of experiments, some of them still in progress, carried out with children in a number of different countries including the U.S.S.R. Working with a sample of more than one hundred and fifty twelve-year-olds (six classrooms in three different schools) in each country, we placed the children in situations in which we could test their readiness to engage in morally disapproved behavior, such as cheating on a test, denying responsibility for property damage, etc. The situations were presented under three different experimental conditions, with ten "dilemmas" in each. Under the first, or *scientific* condition, the children were told that the research was being carried out by scientists under the sponsorship of a national scientific body (e.g., the National Science Foundation in the United States, the Academy of Sciences in the U.S.S.R.). They were informed that their responses would not be revealed to anyone whom they knew, such as parents, teachers, or fellow pupils. Even the scientists would be unaware of the behavior of particular individuals, since the data would be punched on cards, and analyzed by computers in terms of group averages. In the second, or *adult* condition, the children were asked to participate in another series, the results of which would be posted on a chart and shown to parents and teachers at a special PTA meeting. The last, or *peer* condition, was similar to the preceding. The children were asked whether they were interested in know-

ing how "kids" acted in situations like this. In response to the invariable "yes," we then offered to present still another series, with the understanding that the posted results would be shown only to the children themselves.

The results indicate that, under all three conditions, Soviet children are much less willing to engage in antisocial behavior than their age-mates in three Western countries (the United States, England, and West Germany). In addition, the effect of the peer group was quite different in the Soviet Union and the United States. When told that their classmates would know of their actions, American children were even more inclined to take part in misconduct. Soviet youngsters showed just the opposite tendency. In fact, their classmates were about as effective as parents and teachers in decreasing misbehavior.

In a second experiment, we compared the reactions of Russian children enrolled in three ordinary day schools (two classes in each) with responses of pupils in the same grade (the fifth, which means an average age of twelve) from three different *internats* or boarding schools (again two classes in each). As "schools of the new type," these institutions place even greater emphasis on collectivism and on the development of Communist morality. In keeping with this emphasis, the boarding school pupils were even more resistant to antisocial behavior than their age-mates in the regular schools, and showed an even smaller discrepancy in reaction to pressure from peers *versus* adults.

A third study sought to assess this special impact of collective discipline in schools of the new type while holding constant the factor of living away from home. Specifically, the responses of Soviet boarding school pupils (again about twelve years old) were compared with those of several hundred age-mates in children's homes in Switzerland, a nation in which the theory and practice of group upbringing have been well developed since the days of Johann Pestalozzi, but in the absence—and indeed in explicit rejection—of the collective approach. The experiment required each child to say what he would do if he learned that a classmate or friend had engaged in some form of misconduct. Twenty-one situations were presented ranging from minor misdeeds or annoying habits (e.g., littering, eating sloppily) to more serious offenses such as breaking rules, hurting other children, insulting teachers, damaging property, cheating on an important exam, or taking things belonging to others. In each situation the child could choose one of four courses of action:

Tell a grown-up so that he could put a stop to it.

Tell the other kids so that they could do something about it.

Talk to the child himself and tell him he should not do it.

Do nothing about it since it really is none of his business.

After the experiment had been conducted (but before examining the results), we had asked the upbringers in each country what responses they hoped the children had given. (The upbringers did not participate in the administration of the experiment, and were not told until afterward what it had involved.) Soviet educators were generally agreed that, at the age level in question (eleven to thirteen years), children should first take personal initiative in correcting the behavior of their friends and classmates, and then call on the collective only if this effort failed. Among Swiss staff members there was no clear consensus on the issue. The actual research results revealed a rather different pattern for children in the two countries. In the great majority of instances (75 per cent), the Soviet youngsters reacted by saying that they themselves would talk to the offender.

In contrast, only a third of the Swiss children gave this response. To the extent that there was a preferred response among the latter, it was to tell an adult (39 per cent). Only 11 per cent of Soviet children preferred this alternative. Russian youngsters were more willing than Swiss to invoke the help of other children in dealing with misconduct (12 per cent in comparison with 6 per cent), particularly if the offense involved hurting another child or discourtesy to a teacher. But an even sharper discrepancy was apparent with respect to the remaining option: "Do nothing, since it is none of my business." Whereas 20 per cent of Swiss children chose to look the other way, less than one per cent of Soviet pupils picked this alternative.

Taken together, the results of these three studies strongly indicate that collective upbringing does achieve some of its intended effects—at least at the school age level. Not only does the peer group in the U.S.S.R. act to support behavior consistent with the values of the adult society, but it also succeeds in inducing its members to take personal initiative and responsibility for developing and maintaining such behavior in others.

In the light of our earlier analysis, one other feature of the research results deserves comment. Of the various groups of boys and girls in the several countries in which we have worked (now numbering half a dozen), the Soviet girls show both the highest level of commitment to adult standards and the least individual variation within the classroom. In other words, our empirical findings confirm the impression that it is Soviet girls in particular who support the society's values, and—both as individuals and in their collectives—exert pressure on others to conform to standards of good behavior. Though Soviet boys are not so committed as the girls, their responses, under all experimental conditions, were considerably more "adult-oriented" than those of their Western counterparts.

In summary, considering both the observational and experimental data, it would seem that Soviet methods of upbringing, both within and outside the family, are accomplishing their desired objectives. The children appear to be obedient; they are also self-disciplined, at least at the level of the collective. But what about the individual? Is he capable of self-discipline when self-determination is required, particularly when the situation demands going it alone, perhaps in opposition to the group?

Some light is shed on this issue by a study conducted by Robert R. Rodgers, Bronfenbrenner, and Edward C. Devereux, Jr., on standards of social behavior among school children in four cultures: England, Switzerland, the Soviet Union and the United States. Again the subjects were sixth-graders, with those from Switzerland and the U.S.S.R. coming from boarding schools and children's homes. The results showed that Soviet youngsters placed stronger emphasis than any other group on overt propriety, such as being clean, orderly, and well-mannered, but gave less weight than the subjects from the other countries to telling the truth and seeking intellectual understanding.

This result is, of course, not incompatible with the other data we have reported highlighting the obedience of Russian children. Indeed, another way of describing our findings as a whole is to say that, from a cross-cultural perspective, Soviet children, in the process of growing up, are confronted with fewer divergent views both within and outside the family and, in consequence, conform more completely to a more homogeneous set of standards.

PORTENTS OF CHANGE

Consonant as such a conclusion is with our data—as well as with commonly held stereotypes of the U.S.S.R.—to accept the

foregoing statement as an appropriate conclusion is to do injustice both to Soviet society, and perhaps to our own. For Soviet society is changing, at least at the level of social institutions, if not of values. For example, with respect to families, the equalized sex ratio at ages below thirty-five means that father-absent homes are becoming far less frequent. And with regard to communal upbringing, Khrushchev's successors appear to be much less enthusiastic than he about the panacean powers of the schools of the new type. In sharp contrast to the frequent and fervid pronouncements about them a decade ago, the *internats* and schools of the prolonged day are scarcely mentioned in public statements by high Soviet officials; and there has apparently been a sharp decrease in new construction, particularly of the boarding schools. What accounts for the change in heart? Economic pressure is surely a factor, for these kinds of facilities are expensive both to build and to operate, but other considerations would seem to have played a role as well. Some of them were already apparent at the time the schools of the new type were introduced. Although the widespread expansion of institutional upbringing was enthusiastically welcomed by some Communist ideologues, there were also expressions of criticism and dissatisfaction both on the part of professionals and the general public. A case in point is provided by the strong reaction to an article published in the popular literary journal *Novy Mir* by a distinguished Soviet academician, economic planner, and "old Bolshevik," Stanislav Gustavovich Strumlin. His central conceptions are contained in the following excerpts:

"Under Soviet conditions it is especially noticeable how the lot of the woman worker is being lightened. She can work in one factory, her husband in another, both can eat in a communal dining facility while sending their children to nurseries, kindergartens and boarding schools. . . . Recognizing that communal forms of upbringing have an unquestionable superiority over all others, we are faced with the task in the immediate years ahead of expanding the network of such institutions at such a pace that within fifteen to twenty years they are available—from cradle to graduation—to the entire population of the country. Every Soviet citizen, upon leaving the maternity home, will be sent to a nursery; from there to a kindergarten maintained day and night; then to a boarding school from which he will enter independent life. . . .

" . . . The question arises: will not this kind of early separation of the child from his family be too painful an experience both for parents and for infants who are so dependent on maternal affection?

"This question may be answered as follows: the communal organization of upbringing in no sense requires full separation of the child from the parents . . . and surely no one will keep a mother from visiting her children when she is not working, from looking into the children's area, located in the same building in which she works, as often as it is permitted by the established schedule.

"The 'vitamins of love' are necessary for all children in equal measure . . . but the easiest way to satisfy this need is through the system of communal institutions of upbringing.

" . . . The former family is reduced to the married couple . . . and when these contracted families recognize that it is not sensible to expend so much work on maintaining an independent household just for two people, the family as an economic unit, having fused with other families and become incorporated into a larger economic collective, will dissolve within the context of the future social commune."

The article provoked so many critical letters from readers that the editors of *Novy Mir* turned to a prominent psychologist, V. N.

Kolbanovsky, to summarize the popular reaction and to express his own views on the issues raised. Obviously reflecting prevailing public sentiment, Professor Kolbanovsky challenged Strumlin's position on several counts. He began by questioning whether it was necessary "to deprive the family of that joy which is given by well-brought-up children."

"Already the Soviet work days are reduced to six or seven hours, and this is only the beginning. When one adds to this the fact that communal services are relieving the family of many household chores, it becomes clear that parents will be having more time to spend in bringing up their children. Moreover the family has certain unique qualifications for this job inhering in the affectional relationship between its members."

Finally, Kolbanovsky charged, "Children would be deprived indeed, if they had to survive solely on miserly 'vitamins of love' without being able to give anything back in return." He concluded by acknowledging that communal upbringing had its proper and important place in the Soviet way of life, "but this in no sense implies that the family is to be alienated from the process of rearing children. . . . the Party has never considered it possible to supplant the family by society."

Similar views were expressed by a number of prominent Soviet educators and social scientists including A. G. Kharchev, N. Solovey, and A. Levshin. A particularly strong case for the family was made in the writings of the sociologist Kharchev, who emphasized the unique, irreplaceable role of parental relationships in developing the emotional life of the child. In this connection he cited results of a Soviet study showing that children brought up exclusively in institutional settings, seemingly under the best of physical conditions, were at risk of being deprived of necessary "psychological stimulation."

"By virtue of its specificity, the non-repeatable nature of the influence of the family on the child constitutes an essential factor for normal child rearing. Children brought up without the participation of the family are at far greater risk of one-sided or retarded development than those who are members of family collectives."

At the same time, the popular press reflected both puzzlement and public concern. An example is provided by an article in *Pravda* written by a woman reporter. She described a visit to a boarding school in Moscow. Under a window she saw a young mother who, having missed the regular visiting hours, was hoping to catch a glimpse of her son or hear his voice. The correspondent found this incident disturbing:

"Once again my thoughts returned to that mother standing beneath the window of the boarding school. I cannot get her out of my mind. This is not a bad boarding school. But just the same, a mother's heart begins to yearn. Can we really reproach that heart for sentimentality? Of course not. A human being—especially a mother—is so constructed that she longs to warm her own child with her love and to be warmed herself by its side."

Nor was the reaction particular to mothers. Solovey in his *The Family in Soviet Society* quoted a factory worker as saying:

"We have a great need for boarding nurseries, but the fact that my son is becoming alienated from me is so painful that I can't even talk about it. I call him, 'Sasha, my son.' But he just runs away. No! I have to spend at least an hour or two each day with my son. Otherwise, it's impossible; otherwise, I can't stand it."

But in Soviet society (as in our own) neither the pronouncements of professional experts nor the complaints of parents can be viewed as major determinants of social change. Such change is more likely to be affected by objective factors of the type mentioned earlier: the equalizing of the sex

ratio in the population, the increase in leisure time made possible by shorter working hours, and, above all, the easing of the housing shortage. If our analysis is correct, all of these institutional changes should have the effect of enhancing the role of the family in the upbringing of the child and, in particular, strengthening the father as a counterweight to maternal overprotectiveness and "love-oriented" discipline. Unless Russian fathers are altogether different from those in America, Germany, and England, they will differ from their wives in greater use of direct methods of discipline (in contrast to "withdrawal of love") and in being more task-oriented in their relations with the child, approaches which tend to promote the development of achievement and independence.

But there are changes to be seen in the behavior of Russian mothers as well. On a number of occasions, the author had opportunity to observe the behavior of the new generation of young mothers with their children, and was struck by the contrast with the traditional pattern. The following excerpt from the field notes provides a case in point.

"The plane was leaving Tashkent for Alma-Ata in a few moments. As I stepped aboard, I saw an empty seat next to a young mother with her baby, and seized the opportunity. The child was about six months of age. I was struck by the way in which the mother held it—the infant's upper body away from her own. There was more of the unexpected to follow. As we got into conversation, the child began to fuss; the mother, without turning her head, plumped a chocolate into the baby's mouth and continued to talk about herself. She and her husband were students at the University in Tashkent, she said. She was a chemist, he a mathematician. The little girl kept fussing, but the mother did not speak to her or even pull her close. I had to suppress an impulse to take her up myself. The inhibition was strongly reinforced by what was happening. Every time the child whimpered, another chocolate had been popped into her mouth so that by now her face, arms, and dress were streaked with brown. Still the mother did nothing.

"I reached into my jacket pocket. On the plane to Moscow, I had helped myself generously from the box of 'wash-and-dries.' Taking one out of my pocket, I explained its purpose and offered it to my companion. 'Spasibo,' she said with a smile, and, undoing the wrapper and sniffing the fragrance, proceeded, with slow, measured strokes, to wipe her own brow.

"I learned later the purpose of her journey. In Tashkent where she and her husband lived, there were no places left in the public nurseries. The situation in Alma-Ata was far better, and she was flying there to enroll her baby. Some relatives were living there. Besides it was only a couple of hours by jet so that it would be easy to get up to see the baby on occasional weekends."

Clearly this is not a good mother as judged by the standards of Soviet upbringing. Equally clearly, she is an exception to the rule. But I observed others like her—not so extreme to be sure—among the rising generation of married students and young professionals. If this is indeed a trend, it would represent a manifestation in Soviet society, admittedly on a much smaller scale, of the same disruptive process we have seen operating massively on the American scene in which urbanization, increased physical and social mobility, and other institutional changes are seriously weakening the power of the family as a socializing agent.

But in the Soviet Union an effort has been made to compensate for such limitation through the widespread use of collective upbringing. Are there changes that can be observed or anticipated in this important Soviet sphere? Without question, the most

significant development has been the new emphasis in the work of Soviet educational experts and researchers on the relation between the collective and the individual. The most outspoken of these writers criticized Soviet educational practices for a one-sided interpretation of collective upbringing. The following excerpts from an influential paper by L. I. Novikova define the issue:

A substantial deficiency of our children's collective consists of the uniformity of the internal relations determining the life experiences of the child. Relations in school are most often limited to the sphere of task-oriented relations. It is precisely these which in the first instance are developed by teachers. These are relations of mutual dependence, mutual responsibility, mutual control, subordination and commanding, and intolerance to persons interfering with the common tasks. These are very important relations determining one of the essential aspects of the moral side of man. But one cannot include under them all of the varieties of human relationships. By developing primarily the task oriented aspects of human relationships in the children's collective and allowing other characteristics to develop as they may, we in the last analysis impoverish the personality of the child.

"Although the collective represents a means for moral education, it demands from each person a definite form of behavior corresponding to commonly accepted norms. Here are created not only the conditions essential for the harmonious development of personality, but there also arise social attitudes against those who do not wish to improve themselves. . . . But if every year we shall be obtaining more highly developed people but all of the same type, then this will be of little profit either to society or to personality. Socialist society is interested in original persons capable of revolution in the spheres of science, technology, and the organization of production. And the personality is interested in developing to the full those capacities with which it has been endowed by nature. And these capacities are by no means the same in all people. Thus we have an instance in which the interests of socialist society and personality completely coincide."

How did this one-sidedness come about? Novikova offers a historical interpretation:

"The function of the collective in relation to the individual in socialist society was expressed differently at different periods of socialist development. In the early years, in connection with the revolutionary reorganization of society, the upbringing functions of the collective were connected mainly with the development of revolutionary self-consciousness among its members, with the formation of the civic outlook. Having just mobilized all of its internal resources, the society could direct all the will and consciousness of its members on overcoming the difficulties connected with the war and the destruction of the economy. It was necessary to create those minimal material and spiritual conditions for all without which the individual is unable not only to develop but even to exist. It is natural that in that period the society was not able to provide adequate conditions for the many-sided development of each person.

"At the present time the solution of problems confronting the society depends in significant measure on the effectiveness of the process of forming personalities, personalities that are not only active socially and politically but also developed in all respects, not only ready to devote all their strength to the service of the Motherland, but also knowing how to find a position in society which permits the realization of all their individual potentialities, permitting them to realize with maximal effectiveness the individual abilities, talents, and gifts. If earlier we were confronted with the problem of creating that type of collective which could insure the

necessary conditions for the existence of all its members, then today we have to discover how to create the kind of collective which will insure the most full and many-sided development of each person."

It is significant that Novikova's article was published as "an aid for party instruction," and that the foregoing passages were cited with approval and elaborated upon in a definitive essay on "The Development of the Basic Ideas of Soviet Pedagogy" by F. F. Korolev, a leading Soviet educator and Director of the Institute on the Theory and History of Pedagogy. Korolev goes on to say that, in contrast to the one-sidedness of Soviet educational practice in the preceding period, "In the 1960's the problem of the collective and the individual is beginning to be resolved in a new way. Precisely during this period there has been a striking growth of investigations concerned with the analysis of this problem." And, indeed, during my most recent visits to Soviet research centers in 1967 and 1968, I was told repeatedly of the organization of projects and even entire laboratories devoted to this topic. These studies are still in progress. It will be a matter of great interest to learn of the results and, what is more important, their effect on actual practice. At least, as of 1968, the new emphasis on the importance of developing the individual personality had not yet been reflected in the concrete procedures recommended in manuals for teachers, upbringers, and youth-group workers.

Nevertheless, it is clear, as in other spheres of Soviet life, Soviet upbringing is showing signs of flexibility. In particular, both within and outside the family, there is a shift away from features which foster dependency and conformity, toward new configurations more conducive to the emergency of individuality and independence. To the extent that these changes reflect and reinforce developments in Soviet society at large, we may anticipate some reduction in Soviet life generally of the primacy of the collective and its powerful sanctions against deviance in word or action.

But reduction does not mean radical change. The basic patterns of Soviet upbringing, both within the family and in collective settings, are likely to endure for some time to come. Though the young Soviet mother may not be so affectionate and solicitous as her own mother and grandmother were, she still commonly responds to her child's disobedience with a hurt look and studied coldness. And, as we have seen, she may be even more eager than her parents to enroll her child in nursery so that she can resume her studies or her job, for there is every indication that the Soviet Union will continue to be a nation of working mothers. So long as this is the case, all-day nurseries, schools of the prolonged day, Pioneer palaces, camps, and other communal facilities for children will continue to be popular.

An ironic witness for this prediction is found in the same newspaperwoman who could not forget the mother waiting longingly beneath the window of her son's boarding school. The journalist sees a solution to the problem.

"And you know what I'm dreaming about? . . . A house. . . . In the house families are living. Next door or not far away there is a building in which a boarding school complex is situated. Children from nursery to senior high school age spend their entire day there, but in the evening, when their parents come home from work, they meet with their children. On those evenings when the parents are busy with civic obligations or go to the theater, the children remain in their boarding school. They stay there too when Mother goes to a hospital or travels somewhere in connection with her job. . . ."

"I know that this is the dream of many and many a mother. . . ."

"Perhaps, when we are more prosperous, when we build communism, we shall live exactly so!"

Yes, perhaps exactly so. In any event, whatever the future may hold, we have every reason to expect that Soviet society will continue to rely heavily on communal facilities for the care and education of children. And in all of these institutions, as well as in the regular schools, the well-proven techniques of collective upbringing, even if applied with greater tolerance for individual needs, will continue to be used.

All of this suggests that Soviet children of the future will continue to be more conforming than our own. But this also means that they will be less anti-adult, rebellious, aggressive, and delinquent. During our family sojourns in the U.S.S.R., we learned to our surprise and pleasure that the streets of Moscow and other Soviet cities were reasonably safe for women and children, by night as well as by day.

They say New York was that way once America, too, has been changing, and so have our ways of bringing up children. We turn next to an examination of current trends in child rearing in our own society.

THE UNMAKING OF THE AMERICAN CHILD— CONCLUSION

LOOKING BACKWARD

What explains this different course of social development in two large, highly industrialized countries? With respect to the U.S.S.R., we have already indicated a series of historical factors which fostered the development of strong and widely diffused dependency relations between children and adults. In addition, the primacy of the collective in claiming loyalty and submission across age and family lines has deep roots in Russian history.

The American pattern, too, has its historical antecedents. Perhaps in the first instance these derive from the fateful separation of church and state, which, as it freed the schools of religious control, also fragmented the process of education. The primary responsibility of schools became the teaching of subject matter. Character education, or what the Russians call *vospitainie*, was left to the family and the church.

The role of the church in moral education has withered to a pallid weekly session at Sunday school. And, as we have seen, the family, primarily because of changes in the larger social order beyond its control, is no longer in a position to exercise its responsibilities. As for the school—in which the child spends most of his time—it is debarred by tradition, lack of experience, and preoccupation with subject matter from concerning itself in any major way with the child's development as a person. Questions of conduct become of legitimate concern only if they "interfere with the lesson." The vacuum, moral and emotional, created by this state of affairs is then filled—by default—on the one hand by the television screen with its daily message of commercialism and violence, and on the other by the socially isolated, age-graded peer group, with its impulsive search for thrills and its limited capacities as a humanizing agent.

It is noteworthy that, of all the countries in which my colleagues and I are working, now numbering half a dozen both in West and East, the only one which exceeds the United States in the willingness of children to engage in antisocial behavior is the nation closest to us in our Anglo-Saxon traditions of individualism. That country is England, the home of the Mods and the Rockers, the Beatles, the Rolling Stones, and our principal competitor in tabloid sensationalism, juvenile delinquency, and violence. The difference between England and America in our results is not great, but it is statistically

reliable. England is also the only country in our sample which shows a level of parental involvement lower than our own, with both parents—and especially fathers—showing less affection, offering less companionship, and intervening less frequently in the lives of their children.

LOOKING FORWARD

In summary, it is our view that the phenomenon of segregation by age and its consequences for human behavior and development, pose problems of the greatest magnitude for the Western world in general and for American society in particular. As we read the evidence, both from our own research and that of others, we cannot escape the conclusion that, if the current trend persists, if the institutions of our society continue to remove parents, other adults, and older youth from active participation in the lives of children, and if the resulting vacuum is filled by the age-segregated peer group, we can anticipate increased alienation, indifference, antagonism, and violence on the part of the younger generation in all segments of our society—middle-class children as well as the disadvantaged. From this perspective, the emergence of hippyism appears as the least harmful manifestation of a process which sees its far more destructive and widespread expression in the sharp rise in rates of juvenile delinquency observed in recent years, with a substantial number of the offenders now coming from "the right side of the tracks," including some of "the best families in town."

Why should age segregation bring social disruption in its wake? The dynamics of the process are not difficult to see. However important genetic factors may be in the determination of human behavior, it is quite clear that such qualities as mutual trust, kindness, cooperation, and social responsibility cannot be insured through selective breeding; they are learned from other human beings who in some measure exhibit these qualities, value them, and strive to develop them in their children. It is a matter of social rather than biological inheritance. Or, as one of the author's teachers, Walter Fenno Dearborn, used to put it: "He's a chip off the old block—not because he was knocked off it, but because he knocked around with it." But in either case, transmission cannot take place without the active participation of the older generation. If children have contact only with their own age-mates, there is no possibility for learning culturally-established patterns of cooperation and mutual concern.

Moreover, evidence for a functional interdependence between conceptual development on the one hand, and moral and social development on the other, as demonstrated by Lee Charlotte Lee, suggests that children may be incapable of developing such patterns *de novo*, or of maintaining them in the absence of intervention by adults or already-socialized older youth. Thus the bands of orphaned youngsters who roamed the Soviet Union during the early nineteen-twenties, many of whom came from good families, became notorious for acts of selfishness, callousness, and violence, and it required the genius and uncommon perseverance of a Makarenko and his dedicated staff slowly to bring about patterns of mutual trust and cooperation among the children.

The necessity of responsible adult involvement in the work of children's collectives and the consequences of its absence continue to be stressed in the writings of present-day Soviet educators:

"The very concept of children's collective is to some degree qualified, since in the life and activity of any children's collective one always assumes the participation of adults. A collective which forms without adult involvement is not likely to endure. In those instances where it continues to exist for a prolonged period, then as a rule it gets into

a blind alley. The life experience of its leaders turns out to be inadequate to hold the collective to a right course even if the goal which the children themselves have set is a proper one."

But as is frequently the case, it is literature which provides us with the most revealing picture of psychological process and effect. In *Lord of the Flies*, William Golding describes the course of events among a group of pre-adolescent boys marooned on an island. Patterns of civilized human relationships, epitomized in the person of "Piggy," are as yet too shallowly rooted, and are soon destroyed by the quickly rising sadism of peer power. Piggy is brutally killed just before the adult rescuers arrive. Their first question: "Are there any adults—any grown-ups with you?"

The message of the allegorical ending is clear, and, in our view, dictated no less by literary insight than the independent data of behavioral science. If adults do not once again become involved in the lives of children, there is trouble ahead for American society. New patterns of life have developed in our culture. One result of these changes has been the reduced participation of adults in the socialization of children. Although, to date, this pattern has continued to gain acceptance, there is reason to believe that it can do harm to our children and to our society. We are therefore faced with the necessity of developing a new style of socialization, one that will correct the inadequacies of our contemporary pattern of living as it is affecting our children and provide them with the opportunities of humanizing experience of which they are now bereft.

In sum, it is not a question of whether or not there will be changes in the way in which we bring up our children, but rather what direction the changes will take. Shall we continue to drift, or shall we try to determine our course? If so, which approaches are both effective and feasible? What are the forces that shape human behavior and development, and how can they be utilized for constructive ends? In our concluding chapters we examine possible answers to these questions.

A BLACK VICE PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE: AN ANALYSIS

HON. LOUIS STOKES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 7, 1971

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, October 6, 1971, a statement by Washington-based Attorney Hobart Taylor, Jr., came to my attention. His remarks concern the recent announcement, by presidential aspirant Senator EDMUND S. MUSKIE, that America is not yet ready for a black vice presidential candidate. Attorney Taylor's statement is so cogent and so compassionate that I feel compelled to bring it to the attention of my colleagues.

Attorney Taylor is an outstanding black lawyer. He came to Washington from Detroit, Mich., in 1961. During 1961 and 1962, he served as special counsel to the President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity. In 1962, he worked as special assistant to the Vice President, and from that year, until 1965, he held the position of executive vice chairman of the President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity. Lawyer Taylor served as associate

counsel to the President in the years 1964 and 1965. From 1965 to 1968 he was the director of the Export-Import Bank.

In 1968, Hobart Taylor, Jr. became a partner in the law firm of Dawson, Quinn, Riddell, Taylor & Davis. He is currently serving as director of A. & P. Co., Standard Oil of Ohio, and the Westinghouse Electric Corp.

Attorney Taylor's analysis of the implications of Senator MUSKIE's comments is extremely perceptive. I have forwarded a copy of his comments to Senator MUSKIE and have urged the Senator to reconsider his position in light of Mr. Taylor's analysis, with which I agree.

Attorney Taylor's statement follows:

STATEMENT ISSUED BY HOBART TAYLOR, JR., Esq.

While traveling in Europe a few days ago, I learned that Senator Edmund Muskie told a political group in Los Angeles that should he attain the Democratic nomination for President in 1972, he would not consider a black American as a running mate because such a ticket would be "unelectable". I have further learned that he has since stated that he hoped that his bringing the matter up publicly might cause general consideration of the subject matter.

I have thought about these statements, I have followed the ensuing debate in the press, I have discussed them with prominent members of the Negro community, and I have come to the following conclusions:

(1) I disagree with Senator Muskie's views and I further feel that a candidate for the highest office in the land should not make such a statement for, wittingly or unwittingly, he has placed a ceiling on the aspirations of millions of his fellow countrymen, a ceiling which they and other Americans of good will have labored for more than 100 years to remove. I believe it is time to recognize that it is no longer stylish for black Americans to hold up their personal progress because others might not like it. I do not think that the nation is well served when the Senator issues a statement which dims the future of black Americans (and the hopes of a considerable number of whites) in order to ensure the success of what some might consider his own personal goals.

(2) Senator Muskie should consider the political facts of life that have been demonstrated. In the very state where he stood at the time of his remarks, the people of California have recently elected a black man to the very delicate post of Superintendent of Public Instruction by an overwhelming majority. From his own New England comes a black Senator elected from a state with a Negro population of 5%. There are countless other state and local officials who have been elected throughout the land by predominantly white electorates. I do not know why we are supposed to overlook this record of accomplishment, unless the Senator has factual data which would refute it and, to date, none has been advanced. I am also aware of the fact that there exists a rather substantial number of black Americans whose personal distinctions compare favorably with those of the Senator. Whether any of these persons is ready to be a candidate at the moment is one matter. But to say that all are disqualified on account of color strains the credulity and raises a question about the Senator's judgment and his sensitivity as to how Americans really feel.

(3) I am concerned about the effect of the Senator's remarks on the minority youth of America. For the last decade this country has devoted itself very strenuously to the elimination of the barriers which have adversely affected all types of opportunity for minority Americans, and we have asked them—and particularly the young—to put

aside any bitterness or frustration resulting from past treatment and prepare for a new day in which they can participate and compete as equals. And, despite the problems which plague us still, all over this land hundreds of thousands of young people are following this advice—as our college enrollment, our skilled and white collar employment statistics, attest. Now, the Senator places a condition upon our national commitment. He says it applies only if one does not aspire too far. He does not mention that had John Kennedy not disregarded such advice 15 years ago, the myth of Catholic ineligibility for the Presidency would not have been shattered, and he himself would not now be seriously considered as a candidate for President.

There is also public danger in the acceptance as correct of the views expressed by Senator Muskie. All men of experience know that political predictions create attitudes—that a statement of this kind by so highly placed a person as Senator Muskie is bound to lead great numbers to think that others are not ready to accept minority citizens in positions of high responsibility and, hence, that they too should hold that view. In short, this kind of prediction may express public opinion, but it also can form it. And experienced men also know that subsequent disclaimers and qualifications do not alter the original force of such a statement. In the code language of race such subsequent modifications are regarded as purely strategic.

Finally, the impact of such statements is not restricted to the Vice Presidency or to politics. The principle has a bearing on public opinion as to any high office—in private life as well as government. So the inhibiting effect of this kind of viewpoint stretches to those who would aspire to rise in corporations, in labor unions, and in other important institutions throughout the structure of American economic life.

Now, I have already pointed out that I have discussed this matter with a large number of prominent black Americans since my return to the country. I am now prepared to say that all of these people share my belief that Senator Muskie's views are totally unacceptable in a candidate who hopes to receive the vast majority of their vote. Here we draw an important distinction which has been generally ignored in the press. The fact is that one of the major political parties generally gets a much higher percentage of the black vote than the other. Hence, we expect those who receive the benefit to be prepared to bear some of the risk and burden of sustaining the legitimate aspirations of this segment of their support—even as they do for others. And so I must report that it appears that Senator Muskie can look forward to severe and sustained opposition to his nomination and, if need be, to his election, unless this group of Americans is satisfied that he has taken adequate steps to remedy the harm which has been done, and positive action to further the advance of American blacks to positions of the highest public authority on their merit.

I want to make it clear that none of us are charging the Senator with racism, and that we do applaud his exhibition of candor—a candor which we hope will be extended to all the issues of public moment in the coming election. Nor does this statement mean that anyone is presently announcing against Senator Muskie or for anyone else, but it should be understood that since Senator Muskie has raised this issue, we will be watching this situation attentively and will be prepared to take whatever action is necessary to demonstrate that the time is forever past in American politics when a candidate can nullify the legitimate aspirations and ambitions of his fellow Americans on the basis of color, and still receive their support at the polls.

**VA MEDICAL CONSTRUCTION IS
HALTED BY ADMINISTRATION**

HON. WM. JENNINGS BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 7, 1971

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, on Monday the House passed H.R. 6568, a bill I co-sponsored which would vest more authority in the Congress in constructing Veterans' Administration facilities.

This legislation is sorely needed, Mr. Speaker, in light of recent developments which indicate that the administration has disrupted the previously adopted long-range construction and modernization plan for VA medical facilities. A prime example of this disruption of orderly planning is the recent announcement by the administration that construction and modernization work at the Augusta, Ga., and Columbus, S.C., veterans' hospitals is being indefinitely postponed pending study of the President's health care proposals.

All veterans are tired of this on and off again policy. We are tired of waiting for long-promised and long-overdue action on the Columbia hospital. Mr. Speaker, the following statement and resolution by the South Carolina American Legion deals with the administration's announcement that construction is being postponed indefinitely:

STATEMENT

The American Legion is deeply concerned over reports we have received recently indicating that the proposed renovation of the Columbia V.A. Hospital facility has again been postponed.

In December 1960, almost eleven years ago, by mutual agreement among the Veterans Administration, the South Carolina Congressional Delegation and the various Veterans Organizations, the Veterans Administration agreed to a proposal that the Columbia V.A. Hospital would be renovated as soon as the new VA Hospital in Charleston was completed. The Charleston VA Hospital was completed and dedicated on May 13, 1966.

Since that time the VA has on numerous occasions reiterated its intentions to carry out its commitments to completely renovate the Columbia VA Hospital in accordance with the original agreement made in 1960, and, in July 1970 publicly announced in the office of the Senior Senator from South Carolina its plan to renovate the Columbia facility on the present site. This renovation was to be started "In the very near future", which The American Legion was given to understand would be within a year of the date of the announcement. Yet, as of now, no action has been initiated, including appointment of an architect to draw up plans.

The American Legion took this announcement at face value and has hopefully awaited implementation of the VA renovation plan. But again, we are told, the renovation is being postponed.

The American Legion deprecates this postponement. We believe eleven years is more than enough time for the Veterans Administration to initiate this project, which is sorely needed if the war veterans of South Carolina are to receive the medical care to which they are entitled and which is so badly needed. The American Legion believes the time has come for the Administrator of Veterans Affairs to take whatever steps are necessary to immediately begin implementation of the renovation plans. We are also requesting that the South Carolina Congressional Delegation take vigorous action in request-

ing that the VA fulfill its obligation to the veterans of South Carolina, and, if necessary, that an appeal be made directly to the President of the United States.

The American Legion is tired of waiting. We believe the renovation of the Columbia VA Hospital is not only needed, but is needed now. The VA has a long standing commitment—over 11 years—to the veterans of South Carolina. What is needed now is action by the VA in fulfilling its commitments to South Carolina.

RESOLUTION

Whereas, the Veterans Administration is charged by our government to administer laws and regulations for veteran affairs, which includes veterans hospitalization.

Whereas, in December 1960, by mutual agreement of the Veterans Administration with the South Carolina Congressional Delegation and various Veterans organizations, the Veterans Administration did agree to the modernization of the Columbia Facility upon completion of the new Charleston Facility of 500 beds.

Whereas, the Charleston Hospital Facility was built and was dedicated on May 13, 1966.

And Whereas, in 1966 and 1967, and on other dates, the Veterans Administration reaffirmed its intentions that modernization would be forthcoming for the Columbia Facility as per agreement in 1960.

Whereas, on July 9, 1970, the Veterans Administration, in the office of the Senior Senator of South Carolina, did publicly announce its plan of renovation of the Columbia Facility on the present site and that such construction of Nineteen Million Dollars would be started "In the very near future", which was later clarified in verbal conversation to mean within a year.

And whereas, this announcement was gratefully hailed by The American Legion of South Carolina in public statement, acknowledged, and accepted at face value, as the beginning of the fulfillment of an agreement and an inherent responsibility of the Veterans Administration to the veterans of South Carolina.

And Whereas, The American Legion, Department of South Carolina, conscious of its responsibility, is shocked and extremely disappointed to note that announced renovations have not started at the Columbia Facility, and to further observe that an architect for detailed drawings has neither been selected nor has been announced for this project.

Now, therefore, be it resolved by the Executive Committee of the Department of South Carolina, The American Legion, on this twentieth day of September, 1971, that this failure of the Veterans Administration to carry out its announced renovations of the Columbia Facility be brought to the immediate attention of the Administrator of the Veterans Administration and to the South Carolina Congressional Delegation.

Be it further resolved that we respectfully request members of the South Carolina Congressional Delegation to vigorously request action from the Veterans Administration, or, if it is deemed advisable, to appeal directly to the President of the United States.

Be it finally resolved that a copy of this resolution be released to the news media.

**EULOGY TO JUSTICE HUGO L.
BLACK**

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 4, 1971

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join my colleagues in honoring today the memory of one of Amer-

ica's legal giants. His service on the U.S. Supreme Court, the third longest in history, is remarkable for its outstanding quality. Americans will long remember and enjoy the broad social changes which were wrought by his hand in some of the Court's most difficult cases. If there was any inconsistency in his life, it was the fact that his southern background did not in any way hinder his liberal philosophy. He always regarded the matter of human rights as being paramount in a judicial decision.

The late Justice Hugo L. Black was an ardent defender of civil liberties and civil rights. He championed causes that would protect freedom of religion, freedom of speech, and freedom of the press. It is to his eternal credit as a jurist that some of his early dissenting opinions later became the law of the land.

Perhaps the one habit of Justice Black that might well be emulated by Americans, jurists, lawmakers, and school children alike, is that he always carried in his pocket and frequently referred to a copy of the U.S. Constitution. I am convinced that as long as there are Americans who are willing to continue in the tradition of the Black habit, this Nation will continue to be strong in the principles which make up its foundation.

There are three things in the life of Justice Black that I shall remember above all else: First, his humble beginning; second, his first law client; and third, his opinion invalidating martial law as it existed in Hawaii during World War II. Considered together, these three things, I believe, show the greatness of the man.

Justice Black himself referred to his humble beginning in an unprecedented television interview granted CBS in December 1968. He said on that occasion:

It is a long journey from a frontier farmhouse in the hills of Clay County, Alabama, to the United States Supreme Court. But this nation, created by our Constitution, offers countless examples just like mine.

With those words Justice Black offered hope and promise to countless American youth of today to rise above their present humble surroundings to heights that are attainable to persons such as they only in a country such as ours.

Prophetic perhaps of what was to follow in later years, young Attorney Black's first law client reportedly was a Negro convict who had been held 15 days overtime as a slave. In behalf of his client Mr. Black filed a suit for damages and won his first verdict. This case established a precedent, as it were, for Justice Black in later years never forgot the little man, and never forgot to speak clearly and forcefully in his behalf.

The third noteworthy thing in the life of this distinguished American whose outstanding record in Congress was eclipsed by his later career on the High Court, was his opinion in the case of *Duncan v. Kahanamoku*, 327 U.S. 304 (1946). Justice Black wrote in that case what is generally regarded as the leading opinion of the 20th century on the limitations of martial law within American territory. He brought to bear on a difficult problem of the times his characteristic precision of reasoning and his deep understanding of the human as-

pects of the issues, both against the omnipresent background of the U.S. Constitution. The result was the invalidation of martial law as it existed in Hawaii during World War II.

Mr. Speaker, I join the many who are saddened by the passing of this great American who, as in the words of Chief Justice Warren E. Burger, "will be sorely missed, not only on the Court, but in American life."

I extend to Mrs. Black, the children of the late Justice Black, and the other members of his family my deepest sympathy in this period of sadness.

UNIVERSITY YEAR FOR ACTION

HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 7, 1971

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the "University Year for ACTION" program is one which gives America's young people a real chance to do something for the benefit of this Nation.

It is all too often the case that youths want to do something, yet they feel that they just are not provided the chance. Hence, they become dissipated and disillusioned and question a system that they feel stifles their idealism.

The administration's development of the ACTION agency is an affirmative step toward attaining the goal of involvement within the system for the good of the Nation.

Joseph Blatchford, director of ACTION, has written an article, which is being sent to student newspapers throughout the United States, explaining the ACTION program and urging young people to participate in it. At this point, Mr. Speaker, I submit the article for the information of my colleagues:

UNIVERSITY YEAR FOR ACTION

(By Joseph H. Blatchford)

"University Year for ACTION" is the government's latest—and potentially broadest—response to the hundreds of thousands of young people now ready and eager to make their lives count for something.

This fall, approximately 500 students from 11 universities and colleges will enroll in school and then, without reporting for classes, set to work on the problems of poverty in nearby communities. How many more do so next year is up to the students, faculties, and administrators of our other colleges and universities.

We believe many more should. For, by joining "University Year for ACTION," universities can loosen their embrace on their students, tear down the walls that keep the students in and the greater world out, and break the isolation which has estranged so many campuses from the broader community in recent years.

"University Year for ACTION," will enable medical students from the University of Nebraska to deliver health services to migrant laborers, business majors from Pepperdine College to help black owned and operated businesses succeed in Watts, and education students from the University of Colorado to help Indians in South Dakota develop their own unique educational system.

And while doing all this, students will

not be delaying their own careers, but will be enriching them with practical experience. Full academic credit up to 30 hours will be awarded for a full year's voluntary service.

Student volunteers will receive a modest subsistence allowance, varying with community living costs. The average monthly allowance will be \$185. The volunteers also receive paid medical insurance.

But for many students, particularly married students with families or students who have no financial resources, participation will require a significant personal financial sacrifice.

Volunteers work full time and are prohibited from securing part-time or summer employment. To mitigate the financial hardship for students who otherwise would receive scholarship aid or who rely on part time and summer employment to finance their education, ACTION will set aside \$50 a month in escrow to be paid to these volunteers on completion of 12 months service in the program.

Any student, undergraduate or graduate, enrolled in a participating university is eligible for the program. The university itself will seek out work assignments in poverty areas, looking to the poverty organizations and low-income people themselves to define the areas where assistance is needed.

"University Year for ACTION" is a partial fulfillment of a pledge President Nixon made in January to students at the University of Nebraska. He called for an alliance of generations—of rich and poor, black and white, youth and aged—which would blend the experience of one with the commitment of the other.

"University Year for ACTION" is a major attempt to forge that alliance. But beyond "University Year for ACTION" are other initiatives which must be considered if we are to provide young people with the equipment to make our world a more fit place in which to live.

We must start now to expand the capability of our schools to train young people for community service separate from their full-time careers. With the advent of the four-day week, the extended vacation and the secure retirement, citizens are in a position to seek ways to put their new-found leisure time to better use.

Idle hours are welcome as respite from the cares of the workday, but as the time allotted to leisure grows longer, many Americans will have the desire to fill those hours with meaningful service. If our schools have prepared them for a second career in service, our Nation's untapped talent could then be unleashed.

We are in need of men and women to provide supplemental health delivery services, to work in parole and probation work, to build parks, monitor air and water, plant trees . . . even to get the trash off the streets.

Because many of these problem areas require specialized training, our schools must take the initiative in structuring classwork to provide for part-time service after graduation. And inevitably, this must begin with our young people, for they are in our colleges and high schools now.

Much has been made of the "generation gap" which supposedly exists between those under and those over age 30. Pessimists would have us believe that this gap is unbridgeable, a manifestation of the divisive factors which rend our society today.

But the young of any generation have always sought to identify with the most noble aspirations of their society. What youth today is questioning is the credibility of values which lead to the pollution of our environment, the imprisonment of our poor in ghettos and the perpetuation of the cycle of poverty.

The solutions to these problems are being sought in Washington, on campuses and in local communities all over America. But more

must be done to involve the young in these solutions. "University Year for ACTION" is an important step in encouraging that involvement.

LEADERSHIP?

HON. TIM LEE CARTER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 7, 1971

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, in the past 20 years, far-reaching changes have occurred throughout our land. In many cases, the virtues which have been the basis of true accomplishment in our great country have been forgotten. Our country is on the verge of losing its place in the leadership of nations. Whether we retain this leadership or not may be of little moment. What is necessary to the health and strength of our Nation is our return to the true ideals which made our country great.

I include in the RECORD a copy of the Ten Commandments, a copy of the "Virtues" by Franklin, and a copy of the "Cannots" by Lincoln:

THE COMMANDMENTS OF MOSES

Thou shalt have no other gods before me. Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image.

Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain.

Remember the Sabbath Day, to keep it holy.

Honor thy father and thy mother.

Thou shalt not kill.

Thou shalt not commit adultery.

Thou shalt not steal.

Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbor.

Thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's house, thy neighbor's wife, his servant, nor his ox, nor anything that is thy neighbor's.

THE "VIRTUES" BY FRANKLIN

Temperance: Eat not to dullness. Drink not to elevation.

Silence: Speak not but what may benefit others or yourself.

Order: Let all your things have their place. Let each part of your business have its time.

Resolution: Resolve to perform what you ought. Perform without fail what you resolve.

Frugality: Make no expense but to do good to others or yourself.

Industry: Lose no time. Be always employed in something useful.

Sincerity: Use no hurtful deceit. Think innocently and justly; if you speak, speak accordingly.

Justice: Wrong none by doing injuries or omitting the benefits that are your duty.

Moderation: Avoid extremes. Forbear representing injuries so much as you think they deserve.

Cleanliness: Tolerate no uncleanness in body, clothes, or habitation.

Tranquillity: Be not disturbed at trifles or at accidents common or unavoidable.

Chastity: Rarely use venery but for health or offspring—never to dullness, weakness, or the injury of your own or another's peace or reputation.

Humility: Imitate Jesus and Socrates.

THE "CANNOTS" BY LINCOLN

You cannot bring about prosperity by discouraging thrift.

You cannot help small men by tearing down big men.

You cannot strengthen the weak by weakening the strong.

You cannot lift the wage earner by pulling down the wage payer.

You cannot help the poor man by destroying the rich.

You cannot keep out of trouble by spending more than your income.

You cannot further the brotherhood of man by inciting class hatred.

You cannot establish security on borrowed money.

You cannot build character and courage by taking away man's initiative and independence.

You cannot help men permanently by doing for them what they could and should do for themselves.

CANCER: NO. 2 KILLER

HON. JAMES C. CORMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 7, 1971

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, cancer is perhaps the most feared of all diseases. With good reason. It is the Nation's No. 2 killer and is responsible for about one out of every six deaths. No wonder, then, that there is an urgency about the need to obliterate this dread disease.

I do not sit on the committee now conducting hearings on the various legislative proposals on the conquest of cancer. But I was among those who, early in 1970, shared the unanimous sense of the Congress when it passed Concurrent Resolution 675 that—

The conquest of cancer should be made a national crusade and that the Congress should appropriate the necessary funds so that citizens of this land and all other lands might be delivered from the greatest medical scourge in history.

There is considerable concern and confusion about the best means legislatively of attaining this national goal. In light of this, I was pleased to come across what I believe is an illuminating analysis of differing House and Senate bills on this issue. The analysis was prepared by the citizens committee for conquest of cancer in consultation with a number of members of the National Panel of Consultants on Conquest of Cancer.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the analysis to the attention of my colleagues with the hope that it will help to guide them in the direction the House should go in meeting the spirit of Concurrent Resolution 675. The analysis follows:

ANALYSIS OF DIFFERING HOUSE AND SENATE BILLS ON THE CONQUEST OF CANCER

(Comparison of S. 1828, Dominick and Kennedy, and H.R. 10681, Rogers, et al.)

1. Early in 1970, the Senate appointed a panel to develop a comprehensive report on cancer and to formulate recommendations for a program making the conquest of cancer a major national goal. Several months after the National Panel of Consultants on the Conquest of Cancer was set up, the House of Representatives joined the Senate in passing concurrent Resolution 675 expressing the unanimous sense of the Congress that "the conquest of cancer should be made a national crusade and that the Congress should

appropriate the necessary funds so that citizens of this land and all other lands might be delivered from the greatest medical scourge in history."

The Cancer Panel heard close to 300 witnesses. It made an in-depth study, not only of the present scientific status of cancer research, but of the existing administration of the cancer program. The Panel was particularly influenced by a General Accounting Office study of the administration of the National Cancer Institute which documented the point that, even with a budget of \$180 million, the National Cancer Institute took anywhere from seven to nine months for review and approval of contracts and grants. The GAO study concluded that "the present system of administration and funding National Cancer Institute research has resulted in delays in the approval and funding of contracts and grants."

On the basis of the massive information it accumulated, the Cancer Panel recommended to the Senate in December, 1970 the establishment of an independent National Cancer Authority similar administratively to the AEC and the TVA. The President would appoint the Director and a Deputy Director of the new Authority, and the Director would be empowered to submit his annual budget request directly to the President. The Panel Report made clear that the National Cancer Institute would become the foundation stone of the new Authority; it would continue to be located on the National Institutes of Health campus in Bethesda.

The National Cancer Authority Bill (S. 34) was sponsored by more than half the Members of the Senate, and it was generally assumed that it would be passed early in the 1971 session. However, just before the markup in the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee the Administration, through Senator Dominick, introduced a new bill (S. 1828). It differed in only one important respect from S. 34. It provided that the new Cancer Authority would remain within the National Institutes of Health but would still have direct budget access to the President. S. 1828 spelled out the following ways in which the newly named Conquest of Cancer Agency would remain an integral part of NIH:

1. Use of present laboratories and offices.
2. Use of NIH computer facilities.
3. Use of NIH clinical facilities.
4. Use of NIH study sections as required.
5. Continuing attendance by officers of the Cancer Institute at all meetings of Institutes—over 20 meetings per month.
6. Continuation and expansion of collaborative projects with other Institutes.

Furthermore, to insure that the Director of N.I.H. has complete knowledge and some voice in the operation, he is made an ex-officio member of the Cancer Advisory Council. But he no longer has absolute power over the Cancer Institute.

Also, the Secretary of H.E.W. and the Director of the Office of Science and Technology are made ex-officio members of the Cancer Advisory Council.

S. 1828 was regarded as an excellent, workable compromise between the Cancer Panel recommendations and those of the President; it passed the Senate by the overwhelming vote of 79 to 1. The legislation was enthusiastically endorsed by:

- (1) The National Panel of Consultants on the Conquest of Cancer;
- (2) The American Cancer Society;
- (3) The Leukemia Society;
- (4) The National Association of Cancer Institute Directors;
- (5) The vast majority of cancer researchers;
- (6) The great majority of the American people (they had sent more than one mil-

lion letters and wires to their Senators urging passage of the Bill);

(7) The United States Senate;

(8) The vast majority of the House of Representatives (as evidenced in the passage of the Gallagher and Rooney Cancer Resolutions and in the sponsorship by 150 Members of the Staggers-Pepper Bill of February 1971 creating a National Cancer Authority);

(9) The President of the United States (in both his State of the Union Message and his Special Health Message in 1971);

(10) The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare;

(11) The Director of the National Institutes of Health, who testified strongly for the principles of S. 1828 before both Senate and House committees.

Opposition to S. 1828 comes almost entirely from medical school deans and medical organizations who are not experts in the cancer field and who feel threatened by any increase in cancer expenditures, supposedly at the expense of their particular medical areas.

A study of the history of the National Institutes of Health would show the exact converse to be true. As every new Institute was established, many of the bureaucrats and Establishment types cried out that it would cut into their existing monies. But this did not happen. The new Institutes merely added *visibility* to targeted attacks on specific diseases and all of them prospered as both Congress and the American people, through their voluntary health organizations, increased their total contributions to medical research.

2. *The Rogers Bill.*—On September 12, 1971 Representative Paul Rogers and some of his colleagues on the Public Health and Environment Subcommittee introduced H.R. 10681. It is a further attempt to allay the unreasoning fears of the scientific community. (In fact, the Association of American Medical Colleges participated to some degree in the drafting of the legislation.) It is supposedly a compromise, but it actually emasculates the central thrust of both the Cancer Panel Report and of the President's recommendations. It turns a national crusade into a very confusing jurisdictional jungle.

Under H.R. 10681, the Director of the National Cancer Institute assumes an additional title as Associate Director of the National Institutes of Health. Beyond having this additional title, which has very little meaning, the status quo is still preserved by keeping him under the N.I.H. Deputy Director for Scientific Affairs, both the Deputy Director and the Director of N.I.H., and a whole additional layer of bureaucrats in H.E.W.

The NCI Director, according to the Rogers Bill, has authority "to prepare and submit directly to the President for review and transmittal to the Congress an annual budget estimate for the National Cancer Attack Program with the comments of but without change by the Secretary of H.E.W., the Director of the National Institutes of Health, and the National Cancer Advisory Council."

This is a strange type of administration. Since the Director of the National Cancer Institute is only an Associate Director of N.I.H. he obviously has a number of bosses, including the Deputy Director for Science, the Deputy Director, and the N.I.H. Director. These people will still call the shots on personnel and policy, so how independent is the NCI Director in submitting a budget? Since he can't hire anybody without the approval of the top officials in N.I.H., how can he draw up a meaningful budget?

Control of personnel is a very revealing example of a sharp difference between the Senate and House bills. In S. 1828, the Director of the Conquest of Cancer Agency has

full and absolute power to appoint no more than 50 scientific, professional and administrative personnel to the agency without regard to certain Civil Service limitations. In the Rogers Bill the Director of the National Institutes of Health appoints these 50 people, who are critical to the administration of an expanded effort against cancer. However, in the Rogers Bill, these super-grade people can be assigned to any of the Institutes. How many for the National Cancer Institute? It doesn't say. Maybe 20—maybe 10?

One of the key recommendations of the Cancer Panel is the establishment of a network of cancer research and treatment centers in various parts of the country. Under Section 407(d) of the Senate Bill, the Director of the Conquest of Cancer Agency is given full authority to "strengthen existing cancer centers and establish new cancer centers as needed . . ."

In the Rogers Bill, Paragraph 3 of Section 455 gives the Director of the National Institutes of Health the power to "acquire, construct, improve, repair, operate and maintain cancer, heart disease and stroke centers . . . as the Director deems necessary." There is really nothing new in this language; the N.I.H. Director has this power now.

H.R. 10681 is supposed to be a bill about cancer, and to be based to some degree upon the recommendations of the National Panel of Consultants on the Conquest of Cancer. However, it also makes the Directors of the Heart and Lung and Neurological Diseases and Stroke Institutes associate directors of the National Institutes of Health—equal in the pecking order to the National Cancer Institute Director. Apparently, the Heart and Neurology Directors don't have the authority to submit their budgets directly to the President, although both are appointed by him. In this can of worms, it is very difficult to discern who is more equal than the others.

3. *Criticisms of Senate Bill.*—The critics of S. 1828 come almost entirely from the existing medical Establishment. They are, for the most part, the ones who are the beneficiaries of N.I.H. grants; they don't want the system changed.

These critics seem incredibly unaware of the vast changes which have occurred in the National Institutes of Health since the National Cancer Institute was established back in 1937. In the decade after World War II, the Congress established a number of new Institutes, elevated some divisions of N.I.H. to Institute status, and engaged generally in a constant process of restructuring the N.I.H. to meet changing needs and expanding scientific knowledge. As recently as 1968, the Congress transformed the existing Neurological Diseases and Blindness Institute into one for Neurological Diseases and Stroke, removed the eye programs from the Institute and created a new Eye Institute. The then Director of N.I.H. fought the change fiercely. Many neurologists proclaimed Doomsday for research on blindness. But the fact is that the new Eye Institute in the past three years has done a remarkable job in gaining increased visibility and expanded Congressional support for a new crusade against blindness.

The removal of the National Institutes of Mental Health from the N.I.H. in 1966 stirred up much more of a fuss than the present rather moderate controversy over the cancer program. From its inception, the National Institutes of Mental Health put its emphasis upon clinical research, training and treatment programs which would benefit patients. Basic research was pursued, but it was secondary to programs designed to reduce the number of patients in our state mental hospitals.

This clinical emphasis involved the NIMH in constant conflict with the then Director of the N.I.H., Dr. James Shannon. When the Congress passed legislation authorizing Fed-

eral appropriations for the construction and operation of mental health centers, Dr. Shannon made his objections public, stating that "it involves the National Institute of Mental Health too much in services to patients. It should be a research Institute."

After several years of public airing of the dispute, the Director of the National Institute of Mental Health convinced the Secretary of H.E.W. that he needed independent status and visibility in order to respond to popular and Congressional demands for increased action in the fields of community mental health, alcoholism, drug addiction, etc.

At the time of its separation from N.I.H., there were dire predictions that the N.I.H. would collapse. However, the N.I.H. still prospers. But the National Institute of Mental Health has done even better. In the five years since 1966, its budget has gone up from \$232 million to \$612 million, and it even has a new National Institute of Alcoholism under its wing.

The Regional Medical Program in Heart Diseases, Cancer and Stroke was originally placed in the National Institutes of Health in 1965. Dr. Shannon found it too clinically oriented, and he constantly criticized it. However, several years later, when the Secretary of H.E.W. moved it out of the N.I.H., Dr. Shannon complained that another attempt was being made to destroy the N.I.H.

The story of the health manpower effort is another example of constant change, and it is surprising that the medical school deans who now oppose a new Cancer Authority did not protest when massive changes were made in the administration of the Health Manpower Program in H.E.W. After rattling around in a number of different places, the health manpower programs were finally lodged in the National Institutes of Health. Of course, this makes the deans protectors of the status quo—after all, most of their money now comes from N.I.H.

It can safely be said that most organizational changes enumerated here—and many others too numerous to detail—have given the major diseases the specific visibility and public identification they needed to achieve strong fiscal support. As recently as 1948, the National Institutes of Health was composed of the National Cancer Institute and a series of small divisions which had jurisdiction over many killing and crippling diseases. The subsequent establishment of the Heart, Neurology and other Institutes could be equally described by critics as efforts to loosen up tight central control by the N.I.H. In a sense, they were; each new Institute acquired its own degree of independence and its own legion of supporters.

In the light of all of these changes, it is not reasonable to contend that an administrative structure created in 1937 for the National Cancer Institute when it had a \$500,000 budget is hardly adequate to run the billion dollar attack envisioned by the President and the Cancer Panel by 1976.

4. *Criticism of Rogers Bill.*—It is fair to state that the Rogers Bill does not really address itself to a dynamic program for making the conquest of cancer a national goal. With few minor changes, it retains the status quo. It is really a series of contradictions. For example, the NCI Director has "direct" budget access to the President, but he is fully under the control of the N.I.H. Director and his subordinates. He doesn't have the power to appoint the 50 key scientific, professional and administrative personnel he needs to run an effective program and although his authority to establish new cancer centers is restated (he already has it), the Director of the N.I.H. has the real power under Paragraph 3 of Section 455 to construct and operate cancer, heart diseases and stroke centers "as the Director deems necessary."

The Rogers Bill is even more puzzling because it encompasses heart disease and neurology in what is supposed to be a cancer bill. The Cancer Panel did not conduct studies of these diseases and how their programs should be administered. We all would agree that they are very important, but by the same token they are deserving of independent study and analysis.

The Senate Bill is a direct response to an exhaustive study of one disease—cancer. The Senate, therefore, resisted all efforts to piggy-back other diseases on the bill, or to remove the National Institutes of Health from the Department of Health, Education and Welfare. These are matters which must be studied in greater detail.

The issue is a very simple one. The Senate Bill attempts to deal forthrightly with the development of a new administrative structure which will make it possible to run a billion dollar program against cancer. The Rogers Bill makes only a small attempt in this direction. If the Cancer Panel's recommendations are adopted, the budget of the National Cancer Institute will be 50 percent or more of the total N.I.H. budget by 1976. It would seem obvious that it's impossible to squeeze an effort of this dimension into the existing N.I.H. layers of bureaucracy.

LEWIS J. JOHNSON

HON. BILL ALEXANDER

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 7, 1971

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, in a month one of this Nation's truly great Americans will be marking his 63d birthday anniversary. This man, Lewis J. Johnson, more familiarly known to hundreds of people as "Red" Johnson, on that day as with most other days will no doubt be giving some thought to an on-going project or a new idea for helping Arkansawyers build a better life for themselves.

John Locke might well have been anticipating Red Johnson when he wrote in "An Essay Concerning Human Understanding":

I have always thought the actions of men the best interpreters of their thoughts.

Mr. Johnson's unselfish deeds in behalf of his fellow men have frequently lent new meaning to their lives. Because I believe my colleagues would find inspiration in it, I would like to share an account of this fine man's activities. The story appeared recently in the Arkansas Gazette.

The Arkansas Gazette story follows:

DESERVING TRIBUTE TO RED JOHNSON

Reader—I share one honor with Lewis J. (Red) Johnson. He and I, along with nine other intrepid folks, rode the inaugural American Airlines non-stop flight from Little Rock to Washington. On second thought, maybe it is two honors since this was also the last (for the time being at least) such flight. It happened last January, the time the big fog descended on Adams Field. We were supposed to leave at 12:30 p.m. but when departure time came we discovered that the 6:20 a.m. flight to Washington hadn't left yet so there was some slight confusion around the airport. About 1:30 p.m. Red came and got me. He said American was

going to send one plane on to Washington without the usual stops at Memphis and Nashville so we got aboard. The way it worked out Red and I arrived at National Airport in the bright sunshine an hour ahead of schedule.

Coming in ahead of schedule is a common occurrence in the life of this affable gentleman who was honored yesterday here at Reader by a host of people who have felt his magic touch. Some of them he has known since childhood because the Johnson family farm is only about a mile from this little Nevada County railroad junction. Others who were present have been enriched because somewhere along life's pathway they have come in contact with this hail fellow well met who will be 63 come next November 7. Red Johnson could charm a cobra out of a 10-foot jardiniere without a flute.

What happened here yesterday was the dedication of the Lewis J. Johnson Park, a community park built by Arkansas Green Thumb workers. Green Thumb, in case you don't already know, is a federal program designed to provide extra work for low income rural elderly. It is sponsored by the National Farmers Union. Red Johnson is president of the Arkansas Farmers Union and this not so startling revelation allows us to get into the meat of the matter. But first a few vital statistics are needed.

THE EARLY YEARS

On that flight to Washington last January, Red was telling me about his childhood on a hilly farm but I had a little trouble separating the wheat from the chaff. When Red gets to reminiscing, you have to watch for the twinkle in his eyes. This time he was telling about his father and mother, Tom and Maudie Johnson, and the transition to a tale about the family dog was smooth as sirup. I missed the twinkle. He said this dog would start chasing a rabbit in the morning, chase the bunny until noon, mark his place in the woods, come home for lunch and then go back to chasing the rabbit again without missing a sniff.

Red attended country school and then went to high school at Prescott where he was a star in every sport then played. At the University of Arkansas he studied agricultural economics, worked for his meals in the kitchen of a fraternity house and found time to letter in football in 1931, 1932 and 1933. In 1933 he was the team captain but sat out most of the season with a bad knee. This was the first year that Arkansas ever beat Texas and the Razorbacks had the best record in the Southwest Conference. However, the Conference officials refused to award them the championship because of a few minutes of action by an ineligible player. Red gained further distinction by becoming the first player to undergo a knee operation that was paid for by the University. In this department his name now heads a distinguished list.

After he graduated from the University, Red returned to Nevada County and married his childhood sweetheart, Miss Elizabeth Neal of Prescott. He is now the patriarch of a family that consists of a daughter, Mrs. Richard Coffman, a school teacher in the Little Rock Public Schools; Lewis J. Johnson Jr., a regional director for National Green Thumb, and John Thomas Johnson, an architect at Kansas City. There are five grandchildren.

YEARS OF PUBLIC SERVICE

In an era that saw the agricultural economy of the United States bend radically away from the small farm, Red Johnson realized the acute need for someone to champion the cause of this important minority. He knows from first-hand experience the trials and tribulations of the man who tries to eke out a living from 40 acres. After a hardening process as a roustabout in the oil fields of

the Southwest and five years with a wholesale grocery firm, he was employed by the Farm Security Administration which later became the Farmers Home Administration. A member of the Farmers Union from his youth, he became a director of the group in 1948, its public relations director in 1952, vice president in 1955 and president in 1960.

In April of 1957 Lewis James Johnson Sr. took over as secretary-manager of the Farmers Union Mutual Insurance Company. Since that time the Company has tripled its assets. However, it is the list of voluntary accomplishments that makes this man a living legend.

He has served ably on the State Advisory Committee on Trade and Vocational Schools and he was one of the original members of the Arkansas Water Conservation Commission, a group that made an exhaustive study of the state's water needs long before interest in clean water became a status symbol. He served a term on the Arkansas Water Pollution Commission during the period that the Ouachita River was rescued from oblivion. He was a member of the Arkansas Highway Users Conference.

Red Johnson walked many a lonely mile on the hard floors of Washington's Capitol Hill complex to bring the Neighborhood Youth Corps to Arkansas and 34,000 boys and girls from low-income families benefited from his efforts. In the first year of this program, Arkansas got more money than any state in the Union.

Green Thumb has allowed hundreds of elderly Arkansans to enjoy security and satisfaction in the autumn of their lives. The On-the-Job Training program, another program that helped care for 2,000 elderly Arkansans that couldn't fend for themselves, and a program to retrain displaced farm workers at AM and N College are Johnson-produced assets to Arkansas. No one knows how many miles this man traveled as a member of President Johnson's Commission on Rural Poverty.

The Lewis J. Johnson Formula is simple. He reverses the usual process. He gets things done and then talks about them later. The hiking trail across the Ouachitas is a case in point. One day last November Red and I were sitting in the lounge at Kennedy Airport in New York. I mentioned how nice it would be if efforts to build a hiking trail in the Ouachitas could be realized. "When do you want to start?" Red asked. Before I had a chance to answer he said: "Would next Monday be soon enough?" This was Friday, November 7, 1970. On November 23, 1970, work on the trail was begun and, as of today, about 80 miles of the 150 miles is completed. Until this moment, there hasn't been a single committee meeting. That's the way Red Johnson works.

LIEUTENANT SKINNER

HON. CHARLES H. GRIFFIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 7, 1971

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, I want to pay tribute to an outstanding young Jackson, Miss., police detective, Lt. William L. Skinner, who lost his life in pursuit of his duty.

Lieutenant Skinner joined the Jackson Police Department in 1960 and was soon marked as a man of distinct leadership potential and dedicated to crime prevention. He was a highly respected officer and enjoyed widespread friendship

among his colleagues and the general public.

The first real recognition of his leadership ability and dedication came in 1966 when Lieutenant Skinner and one other officer were named to establish and place into operation a new department—the narcotics and vice department.

Only recently Lieutenant Skinner was given the new and larger responsibility of heading the intelligence division of the Jackson Police Department.

On the morning of August 18, 1971, a number of FBI agents and Jackson policemen, including Lieutenant Skinner, possessing proper warrants, went to a house in Jackson then occupied and used by the Republic of New Africa as its headquarters. They went in search of a Detroit man wanted on a murder charge and three other men wanted on lesser charges.

The occupants of the house were ordered to come out by the officers. They were answered by a fusillade of gunfire, lasting some 20 minutes, which brought death to Lieutenant Skinner and severe injury to fellow policeman Billy Crowell and FBI agent William Stringer.

Lieutenant Skinner did not die immediately but, suffering a severe head wound, lingered for 21 unconscious hours before succumbing on Thursday, August 19th.

Mr. Speaker, Lieutenant Skinner's death is a tragic and senseless slaying. It has brought grief and despair to the citizens of Jackson, has deprived the city's police department of a bright young potential leader and, most importantly, has deprived his wife and children of a husband's and father's love, affection, guidance and protection.

Lieutenant Skinner's sacrifice was not in vain, however. His outstanding record with the Jackson Police Department and his dedication to duty will serve as a sterling example of the proper and necessary role of law enforcement. We, in America, are being constantly reminded, through ever increasing criminal activity, that the face of our society may be not much more than a thin veneer. Along with the honest, law abiding citizens of this Nation, men such as Lieutenant Skinner are the ones who deserve the real credit for holding it in place.

Mr. Speaker, the citizens of Jackson have established a memorial fund and, urging everyone to contribute to this worthy effort, I include an explanatory article from the August 20, 1971, Clarion-Ledger of Jackson, Miss., at this point:

SKINNER FUND IS ESTABLISHED

The "Louis Skinner Memorial Fund" has been established to assist the slain city detective's survivors—a wife and three children.

Det. Lt. Skinner died Thursday from a head wound received while attempting to serve arrest warrants on a black militant group's "Republic of New Africa" headquarters in Jackson. An intelligence officer, Skinner was a 10-year veteran on the police force.

Contributions should be sent to George Donavan at First National Bank, or W. P. McMullan Jr. at Deposit Guaranty National Bank, both in Jackson.

SCHOOL PRAYER

HON. WM. JENNINGS BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 7, 1971

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of my colleagues and to the people of our country the following editorial from the Anderson Independent, October 3, one of the South's leading newspapers:

SCHOOL PRAYER AMENDMENT: CHURCHES RIGHT IN WARNING AGAINST DANGER

Two hundred eighteen representatives, just the needed number, have appended their signatures to a discharge petition to pry the school prayer amendment out of committee and onto the House floor, and it may be that all of them have good intentions in so doing.

But you know what road is paved with those. We submit that the intentions of the 38 national religious leaders who signed a statement in opposition to the proposed constitutional amendment are just as good and their understanding of American traditions better.

The religious leaders include representatives of the Southern Baptist Convention and several other Baptist groups, the United Presbyterian Church, the National Council of Churches of Christ, the Episcopal Church, the United Methodist Church, the United Church of Christ, the Church of the Brethren, the Lutheran Church, the Synagogue Council of America and the American Jewish Congress.

Affirming "the right of school children or any other segment of the population to engage voluntarily in their own prayers without government authorization or supervision," the religious leaders point out that "this right is adequately protected by the First Amendment as it now stands."

So the school prayer amendment is, in the first place, quite unnecessary.

But in the second place, it is fraught with danger. For the evil at which the U.S. Supreme Court struck when it forbade officially authorized or supervised prayers and religious observances in the public schools was precisely the evil which our ancestors sought to escape from in Europe.

It is the kind of evil which produced centuries of religious persecution—government intrusion into the sphere of religion, which is and ought to be a private affair between the individual and the God he worships or does not, as he chooses.

What IS the "interdenominational prayer" which the proposed amendment would permit? As the religious leaders pointed out, they themselves can achieve no consensus on a definition. How, then, can politicians or school board members expect to?

And why should they? Why should prayer be cheapened by using it as a device to quiet unruly children?

The basic issue, though, was stated in simple terms by Sen. Sam Ervin almost exactly five years ago when the Senate rejected a similar amendment.

"Political freedom," the North Carolina Democrat declared, "cannot exist in any land where religion controls the state, and religious freedom cannot exist in any land where the state controls religion."

This the men who wrote the Bill of Rights knew full well, and we do not think their latter-day would-be successors are likely to improve upon their handiwork.

DRUG ABUSE PREVENTION WEEK

HON. LAWRENCE J. HOGAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 7, 1971

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, this week has been declared Drug Abuse Prevention Week in an effort to focus the Nation's attention on the drug menace. Because of my concern over this problem, I have prepared a drug abuse newsletter which I mailed to my constituents this week. I include the newsletter in the RECORD at this point:

HOGAN APPOINTED TO DRUG ABUSE TASK FORCE

In May I was appointed by the Republican leadership in the House of Representatives to serve on a 15-member Republican Task Force on Drug Abuse.

The Drug Abuse Task Force is one of several Task Forces being organized by the House Republican Research Committee. The committee is part of the House Republican Conference and serves Republican Members of Congress by providing research services and by organizing Task Forces to undertake long-range studies of important issues.

I am pleased to have this opportunity to become more deeply involved in the fight against drug abuse. Everyone believes that drug addiction can only happen to the "other guy" in another family. But this is the first fallacy which must be unlearned.

HOGAN FIGHTS DRUG EPIDEMIC

Drug addiction is reaching epidemic proportions in this country, and it should be treated as the health plague which it literally is. It is a disease which has enslaved between 250,000 and 500,000 people in this country.

Heroin addiction is the greatest single cause of deaths among young people between the ages of 15 and 35.

The horrible fact is that the disease is spreading. The Washington Metropolitan area is now faced with an increasingly serious addiction problem.

Moreover, there is a direct correlation between drug addiction and crime. An addict may need from \$50 to \$150 a day to buy heroin to support his habit. In the District of Columbia, 60 percent of the funds used to support addiction are obtained through burglary, robbery and larceny; 15 percent through prostitution; and 10 percent from other illegal activities.

In addition, addicts must steal goods worth five times the cost of their habit. So, an addict with a \$50 a day habit would have to steal over \$90,000 worth of goods per year to maintain his habit.

In addition to the loss of lives and the huge economic costs due to addiction, there are mammoth social costs. The entire criminal justice system (police, courts and correction institutions) has an enormous burden placed on it. Families are destroyed, young lives are ruined and large segments of our society lives in the fear of becoming the victims of addiction-related crime.

I, along with other members of Congress, recently introduced a broad-based bill which I believe would be a major contribution to the nation's battle against drug addiction.

This legislation would provide for \$120 million to train doctors and other health personnel in the treatment and rehabilitation of drug users. Also, under the provisions of this bill over \$370 million would be used in a five-year research program designed to find a non-addictive drug which could be substituted for heroin and a vaccine to prevent drug addiction.

One of the major components of this legislation is involuntary commitment and forced treatment for any individual whom a court hearing determines is an addict. The Narcotic Addict Rehabilitation Act would be amended to allow a relative, law enforcement officer or health official who believes a person is an addict to report such a belief to the U.S. Attorney in a sworn affidavit. It would then be the responsibility of the Attorney, if he felt there was reasonable cause, to petition the court and ask that the alleged addict undergo 72 hours of physical and psychiatric testing. If the examination results indicated that the person was an addict, he could then be committed to a medical institution for treatment and rehabilitation.

Programs of involuntary treatment have had noteworthy success in California and New York. This concept offers great hope for a nationwide drive against the illegal drug epidemic. The only way to protect ourselves, our homes and our children is to get drug addicts off the streets and provide them with treatment that will help them conquer the curse of drug addiction and prevent them from infecting others with addiction.

Involuntary commitment and forced treatment are, in effect, a quarantine of people who are sick and who infect others with this sickness wherever they go. The government has the right and the obligation to quarantine a person with tuberculosis or to take someone who is insane out of society.

That is what we are proposing to do with this legislation—take heroin addicts, who are sick people, out of society and help them get well for their sake and for society's sake.

The Supreme Court has already ruled that involuntary treatment for drug addiction is constitutional because it is designed to protect the public health and welfare. Constitutional safeguards have been written into this proposal to insure that there would be no abridgement of personal rights. Among them are a guarantee of all the procedural rights to due process, including the right to a trial by jury, right to counsel and a right to a speedy hearing.

I have also introduced separate legislation which would call for mandatory jail sentences for non-addict pushers with no possibility of parole. These provisions were already in effect until the passage of the Controlled Substances Act. They were then omitted in order to prevent excessive penalties for the addict pusher. However, in my opinion, harsher penalties are still needed for the non-addict pusher—an individual who profits from addicting young people and does not even have the excuse of addiction and the need to support his habit for selling heroin.

PRINCE GEORGES COUNTY TO HAVE OUT-PATIENT DRUG REHABILITATION CENTER

In June I announced that the Maryland Governor's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice was the recipient of a \$144,593 grant from the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration.

These funds will be used by the Drug Rehabilitation Program in Prince George's County to treat drug addicts through an out-patient rehabilitation center.

The main thrust of this program will be to offer supportive services such as vocational counseling and guidance, as well as therapy to the drug user.

The rehabilitation center will be open from 8:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m. with an ultimate goal of treating 400 patients a week. These individuals will be referred by social and law enforcement agencies. The clinic has now been fully staffed and the location of the site will soon be announced.

By the issuance of identification cards and

the close coordination and cooperation of the various Washington Metropolitan agencies, it is hoped that the addict will be prevented from taking advantage of this program through registering at several clinics.

DRUG ABUSE IN MILITARY

Recent investigations indicate that the drug abuse menace is spreading rapidly, not only in our American communities, but especially among our American men in Southeast Asia. One Congressional study indicates that the American soldier in Vietnam is now in more danger of becoming a heroin addict than a combat casualty.

Along with my colleagues on the Republican Congressional Drug Abuse Task Force, in June, I introduced in Congress a legislative package to combat comprehensively drug abuse in the military.

I believe that these bills represent a realistic and viable solution to this staggering problem which is confronting our armed services. This legislative package builds upon present drug treatment and rehabilitation programs run by the military, the Veterans' Administration, the National Institute of Mental Health and other federal and state agencies and expands them in areas where each has the responsibility and the capability for providing additional needed assistance.

The most important bill in this legislative package is "The Military Rehabilitation Drug Act of 1971." Briefly, this bill includes provisions to cover the following areas of concern: identification of drug users by urinalysis; short term treatment in the military; centralized decisionmaking and coordination of facilities; and the referral of addicts or their dependents to civilian agencies. Also included is a service-wide amnesty program

to provide immunity from prosecution under the Uniform Code of Military Justice.

This legislative package also includes the establishment of a drug rehabilitation program in the Veterans' Administration; amendment of the Uniform Code of Military Justice to make the penalties for use or possession comparable to those under the 1970 Drug Abuse Prevention and Control Act, which I supported last year; and amendment of the Narcotic Addict Rehabilitation Act to expand civilian treatment and rehabilitation programs.

It has been estimated that approximately 250,000 young people are already addicted to heroin in the United States, with an additional 30,000-40,000 servicemen addicted in Southeast Asia. This represents approximately 10-15% of our military personnel in that area. These shocking statistics make it obvious that the problem has reached magnitudinous proportions and that something must be done. I believe this legislative package which I have co-sponsored is the only realistic approach to a solution of the drug problem confronting our military establishment.

I am pleased to report that the House unanimously passed legislation similar to that proposed by the Task Force with respect to the establishment of a drug rehabilitation program in the Veterans' Administration. This more comprehensive bill now awaits Senate action.

HOGAN SPONSORS DRUG TRAFFIC CONTROL BILL

I have sponsored legislation designed to cut off funds to those countries failing to exercise adequate control over the illegal flow of drugs into this country.

Under the provisions of this bill the Comptroller General would have the authority to

stop economic assistance, after making an annual study and determining which countries were not taking appropriate steps to curb their illegal narcotics traffic into the United States.

On August 3, 1971, the House passed the Foreign Assistance authorization bill which included provisions similar to those in my bill. Presently, this authorization measure is pending before the Senate.

I am hopeful that the threat of withdrawing economic assistance will provide an impetus for control and cause those countries where opium is grown to curtail the illegal exportation of drugs into this country.

DRUG ABUSE CHART

Experimentation with drugs among our youth is becoming more and more widespread, but many parents, through ignorance, do not recognize the signs of drug use in their own children. Please study this chart of the most commonly used drugs, the physical symptoms which usually accompany them, clues to aid in their detection, and the actual destruction they can and often do cause.

Please take note of these danger signals, since it is possible to save a user of narcotics from a life of horror if detection is early.

If you have a problem or if I can be of service to you or your family in any way, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Please write: Congressman Larry Hogan, Iverson Mall, Suite 120, 3847 Branch Avenue, Hillcrest Heights, Maryland 20031.

I cannot stress enough how important it is that you write to me, rather than call. A letter receives much faster service because a phone call must be reduced to writing before action can be taken.

Drug used	Physical symptoms	Look for—	Dangers
Glue sniffing	Violence, drunk appearance, dreamy or blank expression.	Tubes of glue, glue smears, large paper bags or handkerchiefs.	Lung/brain/liver damage, death through suffocation or choking, anemia.
Heroin (H. Horse, Scat, Junk, Snow, Stuff, Harry, Joy powder).	Stupor/drowsiness, needle marks on body, watery eyes, loss of appetite, blood stain on shirt sleeve, running nose.	Needle or hypodermic syringe, cotton, tourniquet—string, rope, belt, burnt bottle, caps or spoons, glassine envelopes.	Death from overdose, mental deterioration, destruction of brain and liver.
Morphine (White stuff, Miss Emma, M., Dreamer) Codeine (Schoolboy). Cough medicine containing codeine and opium	Drunk appearance, lack of coordination, confusion, excessive itching.	Empty bottles of cough medicine	Causes addiction.
Marijuana (Pot, Grass, Locoweed, Mary Jane, Hashish, Tea, Gage, Reefers).	Sleepiness, wandering mind, enlarged eye pupils, lack of coordination, craving for sweets, increased appetite.	Strong odor of burnt leaves, small seeds in pocket lining, cigarette paper, discolored fingers.	Inducement to take stronger narcotics.
LSD (Acid, Sugar, Big D, Cubes, Trips). DMT (Businessman's High). STP.	Severe hallucinations, feelings of detachment, incoherent speech, cold hands and feet, vomiting, laughing, and crying.	Cube sugar with discoloration in center, strong body odor, small tube of liquid.	Suicidal tendencies, unpredictable behavior, chronic exposure causes brain damage.
Amphetamines (Bennies, Dexies, Co-Pilots, Wake-Ups, Lid Poppers, Hears, Pep Pills).	Aggressive behavior, giggling, silliness, rapid speech, confused thinking, no appetite, extreme fatigue, dry mouth, shakiness.	Jar of pills of varying colors, chain smoking	Death from overdose, hallucinations.
Barbiturates (Barbs, Blue Devils, Candy, Yellow Jackets, Phennies, Peanuts, Blue Heavens, Goof Balls, Downs).	Drowsiness, stupor, dullness, slurred speech, drunk appearance, vomiting.	Pills of varying colors	Death from overdose, unconscious.

HOTLINES

Area youth faced with drug problems now have several Hotline numbers to call for counseling and the opportunity to "rap" with someone who understands. This type of telephone service is the outgrowth of mounting community concern over youth's inability to communicate through normal channels. If you're desperately seeking help or if you just need someone to listen, please call: 864-7271 (Prince George's County Hotline), 498-4200 (HEAD, Laurel), 776-6811 (HELP, Laurel), 454-4357 (University of Maryland), 262-2433 (Bowie), 322-1788 (Cheverly Lighthouse).

DRUG PAMPHLETS

The following pamphlets on various aspects of drug abuse may be obtained from Congressman Larry Hogan's District Office:

(1) The Question-and-Answer Series from HEW: LSD, Stimulants, Narcotics, Sedatives, The Up and Down Drugs, Marijuana.

(2) "Don't Guess About Drugs When You Can Have the Facts"—National Institute of Mental Health—bibliography of available information on drug abuse and where to get it.

HERMAN BADILLO—AN EMERGING LEADER

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 7, 1971

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, in the brief period since his election to this body last fall, HERMAN BADILLO, Representative from New York's 21st Congressional District, has proven himself a leader of quality. As a worker, he is tireless. As a legislator, he is more than responsive. And as a leader of 10 million Spanish-speaking Americans, he is a compassionate and dedicated spokesman.

I have had the good fortune to get to know Mr. BADILLO, and am pleased to call him friend as well as colleague. He possesses that unique combination of political experience and grass roots up-

bringing which makes him a peoples' leader. Mr. BADILLO knows that minority groups must work together, as a recent article in Jet magazine observes:

COALITION: PUERTO RICAN LAWMAKER BACKS MEMBERS OF BLACK CAUCUS IN U.S. CONGRESS

(By Theresa Booker)

For ten million Spanish-speaking Americans, Rep. Herman Badillo (D., N. Y.) is as much a hero as Black Caucus Chairman Rep. Charles C. Diggs, Jr. (D., Mich.) is for 25 million Blacks. Badillo was the first non-Black to go on record supporting the Congressional Black Caucus. The former Bronx borough president, who wanted his views known on Capitol Hill, published a statement in the *Congressional Record*, praising the Caucus as having the potential to create and obtain passage of meaningful legislation to improve conditions for Black Americans.

In an interview, the tall, handsome Puerto Rican lawmaker spoke of the need for a continuing political alliance between minority groups, including Spanish-speaking Ameri-

cans, Blacks, the poor and the young. "Such an alliance would help bring about needed change in the structure of American politics," said Rep. Badillo.

His political career, which has included positions such as commissioner of relocation and Bronx borough president, was capped by his election last year as a congressman from New York. One of the main solutions he offers to the problem of continued migration into the cities is the improvement of areas from which these people migrate. For Blacks, it is the South and for Puerto Ricans, Puerto Rico. He feels that improvements in living conditions in these areas would reduce migrations that have overcrowded the cities.

Born in Caguas, Puerto Rico, Aug. 21, 1929, the lawmaker's family was among the first Protestant settlers in Puerto Rico and his ancestors reportedly brought the first Bible to Puerto Rico. His father, Francisco, was a teacher and was compiling a Spanish-English Bible when he died in 1930 at age 25. Both of Badillo's parents helped the poor during the Depression which hit Puerto Rico harder than the U.S. Both of them died of tuberculosis within four years of each other.

Orphaned when he was five years old, Badillo lived with relatives in Puerto Rico until he was 11, when he came to the U.S. He lived in Chicago, California and New York with relatives. Despite his nomadic youth, Badillo refused to give up his drive for an education. He worked his way through City College of New York and the Brooklyn Law School with high honors.

After forming a law firm in New York City, he began his long road home in politics. As a lawmaker, Rep. Badillo supports the following bills now before Congress: manpower training programs, public service employment, federal subsidizing of low and middle income housing and health bills.

On the subject of the Vietnam war, the congressman responded, "The Vietnam war has diverted thousands of millions of dollars away from the cities and the poor. The tragedy of the war lies in its congressional priority over existing urban problems."

Today in Washington, Rep. Badillo, the pride of Spanish-speaking voters, is the first man to subscribe to the worthy goals of the Congressional Black Caucus.

C-5A LOSES ENGINE

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 7, 1971

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, my dear colleagues, on December 15, 1969, I took this floor in opposition to funding for the C-5A giant transport.

When I took the floor that day, in defense of my position, I cited 25 major structural flaws in the plane, including several defects in the wing alone.

In regard to problems with the engine, I said:

Failures have been experienced with the engine mounts. Therefore, restrictions have been imposed on engine throttle limits and the plane cannot take off from unimproved runways.

My friends, I regret to say that I failed to mention that the engine could fall off the plane. I am sure, had I said that, the ceilings of this venerable Chamber would have shaken with laughs on MOORHEAD.

On September 29, of this year, as one

of the C-5's was preparing for takeoff, the engine fell off.

With their usual candor and respect for Congress, the Department of Defense said nothing of this incident until some aggressive reporters got wind of the story and forced an explanation from the Air Force.

I hate to say I told you so. But, I told you so.

Long ago I stopped accepting the word of the military as gospel as far as defense needs are concerned.

And their lack of respect for Congress and the Nation, as evidenced by their silence, only adds to the list of incidents of Government suppression of information.

Let us use this occasion, since there were no injuries except to Air Force pride, as a lesson.

The President scolds the Congress for being spendeasies while he cuts down milk programs and threatens wage increases for Federal employees.

There are areas in our Federal budget far more ripe for the professed frugality of the administration and the majority are in the DOD budget requests.

I would like to enclose the article which appeared in the Washington Post today on the C-5 losing its engine:

C-5's GROUNDED AFTER ENGINE FALLS OFF

(By Michael Getler)

The Air Force has grounded seven huge four-engine C-5A jet transports after an engine fell off one of the planes as it was getting ready for take-off.

The incident took place Sept. 29 at Altus AFB, Okla., but was made public only yesterday after press inquiries to the service.

The Air Force says an investigation into the mishap is not completed, but preliminary indications are that the failure was due to a structural problem in the pylons that hold each of the big jet's engines to the wing.

The plane had taxied to the end of the runway before take-off and the engine fell off as the pilot applied full power in a final check.

The plane involved in the incident is one of six C-5As used for training, and has accumulated 1,300 flying hours and more than 3,000 landings thus far. That is far more than most of the planes in the C-5A fleet of 41 operational planes. The Air Force says it has grounded seven planes that have accumulated as many hours as a safety precaution until new pylons can be installed.

The pylons previously had been identified as a potential problem spot by Air Force investigators looking into the trouble-plagued aircraft. Eventually, all of the C-5A fleet will be fitted with new pylons. The 41 planes in service represent half of the 81 currently planned. They cost an estimated \$56 million each.

The latest incident will do nothing to improve the plane's image which has been tarnished by both high cost overruns and continuing structural problems involving extensive and expensive new test programs. Until the structural problems are solved, the C-5As continue to operate under restrictions limiting the planes to 80 per cent of their intended load capacity.

Until last month, the Air Force had thought most of its problems were solved. Then, on Sept. 14, just two weeks before the latest engine incident, another wing crack was detected during static testing at Lockheed's C-5A plant in Marietta, Ga. The wing cracked at 130 per cent of its designed load rather than at the 150 per cent which the Air Force had set as its safety goal.

DO WE WANT ANOTHER BIBLE WAR?

HON. ROBERT F. DRINAN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 7, 1971

Mr. DRINAN. Mr. Speaker, over the years the periodic reports to his constituents of my distinguished colleague from Arizona, Congressman UDALL, have achieved a justified fame. They are widely circulated and carefully read by Members of Congress and others.

On May 22, 1964, Congressman UDALL chose as the subject of his report the Becker amendment—a proposal designed to alter the Bill of Rights for the first time in American history in order to sanction nonsectarian prayer in public schools. Because the issues discussed in this report are once again before the Congress, I take this occasion to bring Congressman UDALL's analysis to the attention of my colleagues:

DO WE WANT ANOTHER BIBLE WAR?

A hundred years ago Protestant Christians and Catholic Christians fought each other in the courts—and in the streets—over the right of the State to compel Catholic school children to listen to readings from the King James Version of the Bible. In Massachusetts, Indiana, Iowa, Illinois, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Wisconsin and other states the use of public schools for religious instruction, usually described as "nonsectarian", was a bitter and divisive issue. In Maine a Jesuit priest was tarred and feathered. In Cincinnati the contending groups waged what came to be known as the "Cincinnati Bible War." There are those today who think we are headed for another such "Bible War." I hope they're wrong. These old passions have been inflamed anew by two recent decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court:

In *Engel v. Vitale*, decided in June, 1962, the Supreme Court held that a State may not compose and prescribe a form of prayer to be recited daily in its public schools, even though students may be excused if their parents object. The Court held that this was a violation of the First Amendment, which says: "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof..." The prayer in question had been composed by the New York State Board of Regents and ordered recited in all public schools. The case was brought by parents who objected to this practice.

In *Abington School District v. Schempp*, decided in June, 1963, the Court held that the First Amendment forbids a State to require the Bible to be read and the Lord's Prayer to be recited each day in the public schools. The case was brought by parents of school children in Pennsylvania, where State law required that 10 Bible verses be read, without comment, in all school classrooms daily. Combined with this case was that of a Baltimore school boy and his mother, who objected to a local school board rule requiring Bible readings or recitation of the Lord's Prayer each day. In each case there was provision for children to be excused during these exercises if their parents objected.

On both occasions the Court spoke loud and clear with just one dissenting opinion. Speaking recently of these decisions, Arizona's Walter Craig, president of the American Bar Association, said they were "clearly predictable from prior opinion of the Court, and no other decision would have been consistent with the dictates of the First

Amendment." Nevertheless, charges were made that the Court had "expelled God from school", and many conscientious citizens took the decisions as indication that the court was hostile to religion. "They went and put the Negroes in our schools," one Southern congressman said, "and now they've taken God out."

Out of this controversy has come a movement to amend the Constitution to permit such State-ordered exercises. Of about 160 resolutions introduced in Congress, nearly half contain the language of the "Becker Amendment," first introduced by Rep. Frank J. Becker of New York. Here is what the Becker Amendment says:

"Nothing in this Constitution shall be deemed to prohibit the offering, reading from, or listening to prayers or biblical Scriptures, if participation therein is on a voluntary basis, in any governmental or public school institution, or place.

"Nothing in this Constitution shall be deemed to prohibit making reference to belief in, reliance upon, or invoking the aid of God or a Supreme Being in any governmental or public document, proceeding, activity, ceremony, school, institution, or place, or upon any coinage, currency, or obligation of the United States.

"Nothing in this article shall constitute an establishment of religion."

This Amendment, along with the other pending resolutions, is now the subject of lengthy hearings by the Judiciary Committee. Before it can become law it must (1) be reported favorably by the Committee, (2) pass the House of Representatives with a two-thirds majority, (3) pass the Senate by the same margin, and (4) be ratified by three-fourths of the States. If ratified, it would become the 25th Amendment to the Constitution.

Because certain church groups and other organizations have taken an intense interest in this proposal, I have been swamped by mail on the subject in recent weeks. In fact, the flow has exceeded that on any other issue arising in the last two years. The time has come for a discussion of the problem.

RELIGION IN AMERICA—A TRADITION WORTH PRESERVING

In some countries of Europe you can't get milk deliveries if your religion is different from the majority prevailing in your area. In spite of our many troubles, we are fortunate that religious rivalry has not reached that point in this country.

We should recall that it was for religious freedom that many of our first settlers came to America. Government-prescribed prayer, as authorized by Parliament in the Book of Common Prayer, was the *very issue* which prompted the Pilgrims to establish their colony in Massachusetts. Ironically some of the very groups which had opposed the established church in England proceeded to establish their own churches in the colonies and to write their own official prayers into law. In fact, by 1776 there were established churches in eight and possibly 10 of the colonies.

Because of this sad history James Madison included a "freedom of religion" amendment in his proposed Bill of Rights, introduced in the First Congress in 1789. After undergoing several revisions the amendment was ratified and made part of the Constitution in 1791. I believe it has contributed greatly to the atmosphere of religious tolerance which distinguishes this country from many other nations of the world. It has not deprived our country of religion but has drawn a rather distinct line between Church and State. I would hate to see any change in that pattern. As Madison said:

"It is proper to take alarm at the first experiment of our liberties. . . . Who does not see that the same authority which can establish Christianity, in exclusion of all other

Religions, may establish with the same ease any particular sect of Christians, in exclusion of all other Sects?"

THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS—HISTORIC BATTLEGROUND

In our early history there were few public schools as we know them today. Most schools were operated by the churches. As tax funds came to be used for public education many of the religious aspects of the old schools continued. In time this led to bitter controversy, especially as Catholics immigrated into formerly Protestant areas. In one celebrated case an 11-year-old Catholic boy in Boston was whipped with a stick for 30 minutes before consenting to recite the Protestant version of the Ten Commandments. In the Cincinnati controversy Catholics were angrily accused of "atheism" because they objected to the same "voluntary" Bible-reading rule being debated today. Out of these encounters came various conflicting court decisions, none of them reaching the U. S. Supreme Court. However, since 1940 the high court has taken jurisdiction in a number of such cases, ruling that the 14th Amendment extends the provisions of the First Amendment to acts of state and local governments. What the 14th Amendment says, in part, is this:

"No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States . . . nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws."

As long ago as 1872 the Supreme Court of Ohio held that, "United with government, religion never rises above the merest superstition; united with religion, government never rises above the merest despotism; and all history shows that the more widely and completely they are separated, the better it is for both." Nevertheless, many of my correspondents apparently believe that until the recent decisions were handed down prayers and Bible-reading were the universal practice in public schools. The truth is that the Constitution or courts in 10 states had long forbidden such exercises.

It may surprise my readers to know that Arizona is one of these states. (I will return to this later.) The other nine states are Illinois, Nebraska, Ohio, South Dakota, Washington, Wisconsin, California, and Nevada. Fifteen other states have forbidden prayers and Bible reading by statute. And another 10 states generally look with disfavor on such practices.

WHAT THE SUPREME COURT DID NOT SAY

So many words have been spoken that I think it would be well to point out what the Supreme Court did not say:

The Court did not take "In God We Trust" off our currency. It did not take "under God" out of the Pledge of Allegiance. It did not remove chaplains from the Armed Services. It did not prohibit use of the Bible as part of courses in comparative religion or literature. It did not forbid occasional prayers or Bible-reading by teachers and pupils on a voluntary, non-official basis. And obviously it did not outlaw silent prayers or acts of devotion by anyone at any time or place, public or private.

As a lawyer I do not believe any such decisions will follow. As a Congressman I would oppose them if they were rendered. The issues now before us are entirely separate.

THE CURRENT DISPUTE

The current debate has turned more on emotion than fact. Speakers on both sides have made too much of the "extremists" on the other side. To be sure, there are some notorious racists and Supreme Court-haters (for example, Gerald L. K. Smith and the John Birch Society) campaigning for the Amendment. However, many prominent church leaders and church groups also favor the Amendment. To be sure, there are militant atheists, who frown on every reference

to religion, opposing the Amendment. But the great majority of the nation's church organizations also oppose it. Here are a few typical views:

Rep. Frank J. Becker, R-New York: "Many people subscribe to no religion. Without school services millions of children would be deprived of knowing there is a God."

Rabbi Maurice N. Eisendrath, President, Union of American Hebrew Congregations: "The worst thing that could happen to the churches and synagogues would be to undermine their sacred role and their integrity by developing in the public schools an American public school religion which would consist of a set of meaningless, watered-down, nonsectarian platitudes. As Santayana said, religion in general is nothing."

Rep. Charles McC. Mathias, R-Maryland: "I think it is improper for a bunch of politicians to write a prayer and make children read it."

Gov. George C. Wallace, Alabama: "It (the Supreme Court) is a part of the deliberate design to subordinate the American people, their faith, their customs and their religious traditions to a godless state."

Baptist Joint Committee on Public Affairs: "When one thinks of prayer as sincere outreach of a human soul to the Creator, 'required prayer' becomes an absurdity."

Rt. Rev. Arthur C. Lichtenberger, Presiding Bishop of the Episcopal Church: "We are indeed a 'religious people,' but our varied beliefs are embodied in institutions which are not governmental and are not dependent on majority votes."

Evangelist Billy Graham: "The Ten Commandments could be read and said every day in our schools. Protestants, Catholics and Jews all agree on the Ten Commandments."

Executive Council, Lutheran Church in America: "If the 'Lord's Prayer' were to be recited in schoolrooms only for the sake of the moral and ethical atmosphere it creates, it would be worth nothing to the practicing Christian."

America, Catholic weekly: "The weightier reason for questioning the wisdom of this move is that, if it should succeed, it would only shake the faith of the American people in the firmness of our most basic civil liberty, freedom of religion."

American Baptist Convention (resolution): ". . . we reaffirm our historic Baptist belief that . . . prayers and religious practices should not be prescribed by law or by a teacher or public school official."

National Council of Churches: "Neither the church nor the state should use the public school to compel acceptance of any creed or conformity to any specific religious practice."

Obviously, the strong divergence of opinion, and the impact that such an Amendment might have on the Bill of Rights as it stands today, indicate the need for full and adequate debate and the most careful kind of study. Recently there was an effort through a device known as the Discharge Petition to bring this Amendment to the House floor without any committee study. I opposed this as extremely unwise and a grave risk to the Constitution.

ISSUES THAT NEED TO BE EXPLORED

There are a great many grave questions which need sober reflection before this country plunges into revision of the Bill of Rights. Here are some of them:

The First Amendment not only prohibits "establishment" of religion, but it protects the "free exercise" of religion. What happens if we now decide that "establishment" does not include publicly-ordered prayers and Bible reading? Opponents fear our rights under the "free exercise" clause will be impaired. Would this permit some future Gestapo to break up prayer meetings of unpopular church groups?

What scriptures would be "official"? The Catholic (Douay) Bible contains 14 Old Tes-

tament books not recognized by most Protestants and Jews. Should Protestant children be required to read passages from these books? Should Catholic and Orthodox children be required to read a version of the Bible not approved by their churches?

The Becker Amendment says, "Nothing in this article shall constitute an establishment of religion." Commenting on this the magazine *Christian Century* said, "In Sections 1 and 2 the proposal would destroy the First Amendment's guarantees of religious liberty and then in section 3 deny that it has done so. If adopted, the Becker amendment will imperil religious freedom in the name of religious freedom."

How can a prayer or scriptural passage be "non-sectarian" with respect to all the religions people practice? And if it is watered down enough to satisfy all religions, of what value is it?

As many church leaders have pointed out, it is absurd to suggest that a young child is free to leave the room when "voluntary" religious exercises are held. The desire to conform is exceedingly great in children; few want to be "odd balls."

If you're Protestant, how would you feel if your child recited the "Hail Mary" in school? If you're Catholic, how would you like your child reciting the prayer of Martin Luther? What happens in predominantly Mormon communities of Arizona if the school board prescribes reading from the Book of Mormon?

What agency of government will prescribe prayers and Bible passages? What language in this Amendment would stop the federal government from doing so?

I am not one who thinks the coming generation is hopelessly lost. The education and training of our youth rests on a three-legged stool: *school, home, and church*. Each leg must carry a share of the load. Has there not been too much of a tendency to shove onto already burdened teachers non-academic training in manners, sex education, health and personal care—duties which belong elsewhere?

Must we really, as Congressman Becker implies, protect America's children from the godlessness of their parents?

ARIZONA NOT AFFECTED

Now here's the big fact overlooked by nearly all of my correspondents on this issue. The Supreme Court has not "taken the Bible from Arizona schools" because daily recitation of Bible passages and regular school prayers have never been there. When the Arizona Constitution was adopted in 1912, Article II declared: "... No public money ... shall be appropriated for or applied to any religious worship, exercise, or instruction, or to the support of any religious establishment." The First Arizona Legislature then passed this law, which is still on the books:

"A teacher who uses ... denominational books or teaches any sectarian doctrine or conducts any religious exercises in school is guilty of unprofessional conduct and his certificate shall be revoked."

Thus the Supreme Court ruling has made no change in Arizona school practices, and the same is true of 24 other states with similar provisions. But passage of the Becker Amendment might invalidate existing Arizona laws and introduce a new element of interfaith friction in our communities. I'm proud of Arizona's schools, and I'd be reluctant to experiment with a successful pattern of 52 years' standing. I see no evidence that Arizona school children are less religious or moral than those in Alabama or Kansas, and I certainly don't regard Arizona (to use Gov. Wallace's expression) as a "godless state."

CONCLUSION

It is strange that many of the people writing in behalf of Mr. Becker's amendment have written on other occasions to denounce government interference with people's pri-

vate affairs and individual freedoms. Yet they seem to believe that home and church can no longer be depended on, and that government must save religion by compulsory instruction.

America is a religious nation. Much of our strength rests on that fact. The First Amendment is at the very heart of our liberties and has successfully guaranteed our religious freedom for 170 years. I'm not ready to tinker with this or any other part of our Bill of Rights.

I intend to listen to all arguments, pro and con, but I am inclined to agree with the Baptist Joint Committee on Public Affairs when it said:

"Whatever it is, religion on a government platter has never provided much spiritual nuture for the people nor has it given strength to the nation."

DICTATORSHIP IN SAIGON

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 7, 1971

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, Tuesday's New York Times contained an editorial appropriately entitled "Dictatorship in Saigon," in response to the voting in South Vietnam last Sunday. This is an excellent commentary on the "electoral farce" and its implications for U.S. policy in Vietnam. I insert the editorial in the RECORD for the benefit of my colleagues. The editorial follows:

DICTATORSHIP IN SAIGON

The lopsided election results announced by the Saigon Government can give no comfort to Americans or for that matter to democratically inclined South Vietnamese. President Thieu's proclaimed 91 per cent mandate in a one-man vote is the kind of result that could be expected from the regime in Hanoi, to which Saigon was supposed to offer a democratic alternative.

The returns shatter the theory that President Nixon's policy of unwavering support for the Thieu regime can advance the proclaimed objective of assuring meaningful self-determination to the people of South Vietnam. President Thieu's victory undermines whatever hope is still left for a negotiated political settlement of the Vietnamese conflict and for the early peace that Mr. Nixon promised before his own election three years ago.

A reasonably fair election might have brought to power in Saigon a government willing and able to negotiate with the Communists. But President Thieu, with full United States Government support, has now re-established himself in office for four more years on a platform of "four no's—no coalition government, no territorial concessions to the Communists, no pro-Communist neutralism, no political freedom for the Communists."

Government banners displayed at the polls along with pictures of President Thieu proclaimed: "There is only peace in victory." Despite the vote, it is extremely doubtful that a majority of South Vietnamese support such a policy, one that the tragic course of the war long ago demonstrated to be delusive. Nevertheless, President Thieu is girding for a decisive battle with the Communists two years hence and he has made it clear that he expects direct American support in the military showdown.

It is time President Nixon disabused the Saigon regime of that expectation. Far too many American lives have been lost already

in a mistaken cause that has been further demeaned by Sunday's electoral farce. The only way to persuade the one-man Government in Saigon of the necessity for a turn toward a negotiated peace is by setting an early terminal date for all American military actions in Indochina, as proposed by Senator Mansfield in the amendment which was adopted by the Senate last week.

HOW CITIZENS USE THE REFUSE ACT TO CLEAN UP RIVERS

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 7, 1971

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, on August 25 the Dallas (Pa.) Post published an article by J. R. Freeman, vice president of the Greenstreet News Co., entitled "Water Pollution Control Program Fizzles; Polluters Being Caught by Private Citizens." Mr. Freeman's article presents an excellent summary of the Refuse Act and how two young people are utilizing it to track down polluters of the Lackawanna River:

WATER POLLUTION CONTROL PROGRAM FIZZLES: POLLUTERS BEING CAUGHT BY PRIVATE CITIZENS
(By J. R. Freeman)

Bounty hunting died out with taming of the old West. But today it's staging a comeback, and this time in the East as well. Only in modern times it's added a new dimension: pollution bounty hunting.

Though it's a little known fact, an old law, part of the 1899 Rivers and Harbors Act, says that the government will split fine money 50-50 with whoever supplies the evidence against water polluters.

As more and more ecology groups and environmental clubs spring up across the country these days, citizens will obviously become more pollution-conscious. A good many are concerned enough now to try to do their part in cleaning up man's environment, and among them may develop a handful who are not satisfied to live with the frustration of knowing no way to make any major achievements toward pollution control. Using low-phosphate detergents is simply not enough.

But such frustration should diminish for those few people public-spirited enough to become pollution bounty hunters, at least when it comes to the filth pouring into our lakes and rivers.

Consumer crusader Ralph Nader has charged that the Federal Government's program to clean up the nation's water pollution problems is a total failure. According to Mr. Nader, 40,000 industrial polluters routinely violate the provisions of the 1899 Refuse Act, part of the old Rivers and Harbors Act, while the U.S. Justice Department has initiated legal action against only 14 of these violators. But that could change drastically, particularly if justice is prodded along by the new bounty hunters.

\$3 BILLION WASTE

William Ruckelshaus, administrator of the new Environmental Protection Agency in Washington, agrees with Mr. Nader's conclusions. According to the administrator, Mr. Nader and his assistants are correct when they tell us that "we are in danger of creating a water wasteland if we permit to happen in the future what has in the past." But by explaining this old law, Mr. Nader has alerted citizens across the country to what they can do individually to clean up the nation's waterways.

The Federal Government, Mr. Nader tells us, has spent \$3 billion and enacted seven new legislative acts in its attempt to foster water pollution abatement, all to no avail, while failing to recognize that if strong measures were taken to enforce the 72-year-old Refuse Act, the nation's first clean water law could curtail many water pollution problems. And that's where the pollution bounty hunters come in.

BOUNTY HUNTERS

From New York to Pittsburgh to Chicago and Seattle bounty hunters are becoming active to see that the Refuse Act is enforced. And some stand to reap substantial rewards for their public interest activities, in plain everyday dollars and cents.

In Pittsburgh, for example, John Zavodni and David Nixon, both associated with the Penn State McKeesport campus, have taken a 65-mile canoe trip down the Ohio and Monongahela Rivers. Along the way they noticed at least four corporations were polluting the rivers. Following the Refuse Act to the letter, the two zoologists have prompted the Justice Department to file criminal charges against the four violators on a total of 73 counts of water pollution which could net them rewards of as much as \$91,250 in bounty money.

"It was never a question of whether I should do it, but one of how," Mr. Nixon said. "The 72-year-old law had to be it."

Included in the legal action started by the U.S. Attorney for Western Pennsylvania, Richard L. Thornburgh, are charges against U.S. Steel Corp., Jones & Laughlin Steel Corp., Wheeling-Pittsburgh Steel Corp., and Pennsylvania Industrial Chemical Corp. Mr. Thornburgh said the corporations have been notified of the charges, and that if convicted, could be fined a maximum of \$2,500 on each of 73 counts. These 73 violations could mean total fines of \$182,500, of which the two active environmentalists would receive half.

In New York City Gwen B. Ziechner and her son were awarded \$12,500 by Judge Inzer B. Wyatt late last year for information that led to the prosecution of Transit-Mix Concrete Corp., which pleaded guilty and was sentenced to a 100-count indictment under the Rivers and Harbors Act for discharging concrete and alkaline water into the East River. The company was fined \$500 on each of the first 50 counts (each day of polluting is considered a separate offense), for a total of \$25,000. The Zeichners got half.

THE REFUSE ACT

The way the 1899 Refuse Act works goes something like this: the law states that no individual, group, or corporation is permitted to dump any refuse into a navigable waterway of the United States, either in liquid or solid form, unless first obtaining a discharge permit from the Army Corps of Engineers. And the courts have held that a navigable waterway is almost any body of water that will float a small boat, as well as tributaries thereto.

The fact that the old law was never enforced, while surprising, is based on the fact that until recently, the Corps of Engineers interpreted it to mean only pollution, which might obstruct navigation. The U.S. Supreme Court, however, several times had upheld the constitutionality of the act, declaring it the nation's first clean water law. The high court has ruled that refuse can be just about anything that is foreign to a natural body of water, including oil, chemicals, hot water, and other substances. As explained by Cong. Henry Reuss, chairman of the Conservation and Natural Resources Subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations, in a citizens' kit his office prepared for distribution to prospective bounty hunters:

"The 1899 Refuse Act is a powerful, but little used weapon in our federal arsenal of water pollution control enforcement legisla-

tion. Section 13 of the act (Title 33, United States Code, section 407) prohibits anyone, including any individual, corporation, municipality, or group, from throwing, discharging, or depositing any refuse matter of any kind or any type from a vessel or from a shore-based building, structure, or facility into either the nation's navigable rivers, lakes, streams, and other navigable bodies of water, or any tributary to such waters, unless he has first obtained a permit to do so. Navigable water includes water sufficient to float a boat or log at high water. This section of the act applies to inland waters, coastal waters, and waters that flow across the boundaries of the United States and Canada and Mexico."

Additionally, the kit explains, "the section prohibits anyone from placing on the bank of any navigable waterway, or of any tributary to such waterway, any material that could be washed into a waterway by ordinary or high water, or by storms or floods, or otherwise and would result in the obstruction of navigation.

STIFF PENALTIES

As further explained by Rep. Reuss, penalty for violations are stiff. "Violations of the Refuse Act are subject to criminal prosecution and penalties of a fine of not more than \$2,500 nor less than \$500 for each day or instance of violation, or imprisonment for not less than 30 days nor more than one year, or both a fine and imprisonment. A citizen, who informs the appropriate United States attorney about a violation and gives sufficient information to lead to conviction, is entitled to one half the fine set by the court."

Because enforcement of the act has been lax, the Corps of Engineers has been asked for few permits across the country. A spokesman for the Pittsburgh regional office, for example, has admitted that no permits have been requested in that area. Likewise, a Corps spokesman for this region, headquartered in Baltimore, indicated that to his knowledge there had been no permits granted in Northeastern Pennsylvania, nor had any been asked for until recently. This means that virtually any polluter of any body of water in the region is in violation of the Refuse Act.

LOCAL HUNTERS

Regionally, at least two people are trying to become active pollution bounty hunters. Jodi Schautz, 19-year-old daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Georges Schautz, 214 Ashmore, Clarks Summit, and her friend, Robert Crimmel, also 19, the son of Mr. and Mrs. George Reiner, Haven Lane, Clarks Summit, have decided that they would concentrate their efforts on the polluted Lackawanna River in Lackawanna County. Jodi, a student at Juniata College, and Robert, a University of Nevada at Los Angeles student, teamed up several weeks ago and went in pursuit of possible culprits.

To date the students have made several trips, usually wading in waist-deep murky water, up and down the Lackawanna from the point where it empties into the Susquehanna River to Scranton.

Last Monday, with the help of Larry Pawlish of the Kingston office of the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Resources, the students observed a host of river pollution violations.

Aided by Jodi's mother, Mrs. Shautz, the students reported to Mr. Pawlish that Montrose Beef in Duryea was permitting blood and animal tissue to flow into the river near where the Lackawanna and Susquehanna converge.

Further upstream, the students reported, they observed the Wallace-Murray Corp. discharging hot liquid, a brown liquid, and a foamy liquid into the river via four pipes. As with several of the other apparent polluters tracked down by the students, a chemical analysis performed by the DER labora-

tory in Harrisburg is being processed after samples were taken by Mr. Pawlish. Continuing on their journey upstream, the students reported possible violations including:

A sewage outfall discharging raw sewage between Meadow Brook and Roding Brook, both tributaries to the Lackawanna;

A blue, milky substance flowing into Roaring Brook from the Chamberlain Corp., Scranton;

Animal tissue flowing from the Alan Beef Co., Dunmore, into Roaring Brook;

A discharge of clear hot water via a pipe one block north of the Hickory Street Bridge, flowing from an unknown source;

A raw sewage outfall and animal blood and tissue from a point just beyond the Lackawanna Avenue bridge;

A raw sewage outfall south of the Linden Street bridge;

The flow of a black dye substance from an unknown source between the Linden Street bridge and the Mulberry Street bridge;

Dumping of solid waste of stone and concrete into the river by the Stipp Construction Co., Scranton, north of the Mulberry Street Bridge;

A sewage outfall between the Mulberry Street bridge and the Olive Street bridge.

The bounty hunters told a staff writer of this newspaper that they were now awaiting on the DER analysis. They said they had the impression that the U.S. attorney's office in Scranton had never had a case of Refuse Act violation.

The procedure for a citizen to use in seeking enforcement of the Refuse Act, according to the bulletin from Rep. Reuss, entails the bounty hunter to first find the possible polluter, then determine whether the discharge is authorized by Corps permit.

"The Refuse Act specifically directs that the appropriate U.S. attorney (Atty. John Cottone in this region) shall 'vigorously prosecute all offenders.' In order to do so he needs adequate information to prove that the discharges were made and that they violated the law or the conditions of the permit. Furthermore, the statute specifies that the citizen's right to half the fine is conditioned on his providing to the U.S. attorney information sufficient to lead to a conviction of the violator."

Both Jodi and Robert said they were aware and prepared to face the day when they would be possibly called to testify in court against the violators they had detected.

In providing information to the U.S. attorney, according to the Reuss packet, the citizen should make a detailed statement, sworn to before a notary or other officer authorized to administer oaths, setting forth:

The nature of the refuse material discharged; the source and method of discharge; the location, name and address of the person or persons causing or contributing to the discharge; the name of the waterway into which the discharge occurred; and each date on which the discharge occurred.

The names and addresses of all persons who saw or knows about the discharges and could testify about them if necessary;

A statement that the discharge is not authorized by Corps permit, or, if a permit was granted, state facts showing that the alleged violator is not complying with any condition of the permit;

If the waterway into which the discharge occurred is not commonly known as navigable, or as a tributary to a navigable waterway, state facts to show such status;

Where possible, photographs should be taken, and samples of the pollutant or foreign substance collected in a clean jar which is then sealed. These should be labeled with information showing who took the photograph or sample, where, and when, and how; and who retained custody of the film or jar.

LEGAL PROCEDURE

Some environmentalists have charged the Justice Department with dereliction when it comes to prosecuting violators of the Refuse Act. But most often it is not that a U.S. attorney is reluctant to prosecute when the evidence is brought to him, but rather that his office is understaffed—with the legal expertise for such suits, or directives from Washington which appear complex for many attorneys at best.

Scranton Attorney Earnest Preate, Jr., for one, thinks the rules and regulations which have been forwarded to the U.S. attorneys across the country are much too restrictive and complicated to be readily effective when a violator is detected. But Cong. Reuss in his bulletin, covers this aspect with a possible solution.

"Where a statute, such as the Refuse Act," he explains, "provides that part of a fine shall be paid to citizens who furnish sufficient information of a violation to lead to a conviction of the violator, and the government fails to prosecute within a reasonable period of time, the informer can bring his own suit, in the name of the government, against the violator to collect his portion of the penalty. This is called a 'qui tam' suit. The informer has a financial interest in the fine and therefore can sue to collect it. The Supreme Court has upheld such qui tam suits. Some of these decisions are cited in the Report of the House Committee on Government Operations entitled 'Our Water and Wetlands: How the Corps of Engineers can help prevent their Destruction and Pollution.'"

The U.S. district courts apparently have exclusive jurisdiction to hear and decide such suits, the congressman points out. In such a qui tam suit, the citizen must prove that the alleged violator did, in fact, violate the act.

"QUI TAM" SUITS

A Greenstreet News staff writer addressed a letter to both U.S. Attorneys Cottone and Thornburgh last year, requesting information about the possible prosecution of Refuse Act violations. Though Mr. Cottone failed to reply, his counterpart, headquartered in Pittsburgh, did. His letter in part read:

"Your comments as to the apparent laxity of the Corps of Engineers may have foundation in fact. At this point, however, we have no evidence in support of your comments. Perhaps you may desire to communicate directly with the office of the chief of engineers in this matter to obtain the views of that agency on this important issue.

"We are quite interested in your comment to the effect that there are thousands of violations of the Refuse Act in Pennsylvania. Unfortunately, this office does not have investigative capabilities and we must rely upon specific information furnished by private citizens, such as yourself, or the agencies having an interest in these matters. Therefore, if you have any specific information of violations within this district, we would greatly appreciate receipt of same and shall endeavor to take action on a case by case basis.

"With respect to your comments pertaining to 33 U.S.C. Section 411 and in particular to the part an informant, you are advised that your interpretation requires some clarification. Section 411, which is the criminal section of the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1899, provides for payment of one half of the fine "to be paid to the person or persons giving information which shall lead to conviction." Furthermore, said payment is a matter 'in the discretion of the court.'

"We trust that the foregoing response to your letter will be satisfactory for your purposes, and we encourage you and other interested citizens to furnish this office specific facts of pollution violations so that we may take whatever action the situation warrants."

FAUNTROY URGES STRENGTHENING OF EQUAL RIGHTS ENFORCEMENT

HON. ABNER J. MIKVA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 7, 1971

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, our national commitment to equal employment opportunity suffered an unfortunate blow recently when the House refused to grant the additional enforcement powers needed by the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission in order to obtain compliance with Federal laws prohibiting job discrimination.

Rather than approve the cease-and-desist powers which H.R. 1746 would have given to the EEOC, the House agreed to a substitute version which would leave the EEOC with lots of bark, but a woefully inadequate bite.

The bill is now before the Senate, which hopefully will resist the efforts to weaken the original bill. One of the strongest advocates of increased enforcement powers in this area has been my distinguished colleague from the District of Columbia, Mr. FAUNTROY. I share with my colleagues a cogent statement made by my colleague from the District of Columbia when he appeared before the Senate Labor Subcommittee to testify in favor of strengthening the hand of the EEOC:

TESTIMONY OF CONGRESSMAN WALTER E. FAUNTROY BEFORE SENATE LABOR SUBCOMMITTEE ON S. 2515, THE EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 1971

Mr. Chairman, and Members of the Subcommittee, first let me thank you for the opportunity to testify on behalf of what I believe to be the most vital piece of legislation that Congress has had the opportunity to consider in many years. Other legislation has been described in a similar way, but in this case the description rings particularly true. S. 2515 is a vital and urgent measure because equal employment opportunity rests at the center of the hopes of Blacks, Spanish-surnamed, and other minorities for an equal chance in our society. Without equal access to job opportunities and a fair chance for advancement up the economic ladder, the promise of decent housing, adequate education, and full participation in the life of our nation will remain an unfulfilled promise for minority groups.

S. 2515 offers basic and desperately needed changes in the way we go about ensuring equal employment opportunity, and it gives substance to the principles of non-discrimination in employment that have become embedded in our national policies over the past several years.

Others who will testify before you will argue ably in favor of S. 2515. I wish to take a moment to center your attention on one important feature of the bill that, for me and thousands of Federal employees, is of special importance.

Section 11 of S. 2515 would codify in statutory law the national policies expressed in legislation and presidential executive orders mandating non-discrimination in Federal employment. Most significantly, the bill would transfer the responsibility for implementing Federal non-discrimination requirements in Federal employment from the Civil Service Commission to the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission.

There are few in this Congress who can testify with more experience than I about the pervasive and continuing discrimination by the Federal Government in the employment of Blacks, Spanish-surnamed, and women employees. As a pastor and community leader in the District of Columbia during the past 12 years, I have had to respond to thousands of complaints of job discrimination from among the 58,000 Federal employees in the District who are Black. My father was employed at the U.S. Patent Office here for 44 years before retiring. He knew the effects of discrimination and we, his children, knew his frustration and despair. He trained two generations of White employees who were then passed up and over the shoulder to higher level and higher paying jobs. From all the evidence I have seen, even today in this supposedly enlightened time, these practices continue daily with little substantive change.

When I came to the Congress five months ago, I expected that a significant portion of the casework of my office would be devoted to helping Federal employees resolve job discrimination problems. But I did not foresee the incredible deluge of pent-up grievances that have descended upon my office in the few short months I have been here. These are brought by people with just claims who are deeply angered and frustrated by the unfair treatment they receive at the hands of the Federal Government. These people have nowhere else to turn. They have sought help from their agencies, and from the Civil Service Commission—all with little success.

Allow me just one brief moment to give you a flesh and blood illustration of what it means to be Black and in the Federal service. Shortly after opening my district office last April, a GS-12 Computer Analyst came into the office complaining that he had been discriminated against because of his race. He had been rated eligible for a GS-13 rating by the Civil Service Commission but had been passed over for advancement several times. He filed an equal employment complaint with his agency, naming his supervisor. Shortly, thereafter, his superior filed an unfavorable career appraisal only four months after a favorable one had been entered. This latest appraisal, of course, became part of his permanent file, and robs him of any serious chance of further advancement. About this same time, two White GS-13's have been brought in and promoted over him, and he has been relieved of virtually all his responsibility and authority. The Civil Service Commission is aware of this case but no corrective action has been taken. This man's plight is not atypical and I am sure that there are hundreds of Federal employees who happened to be members of minority groups who have suffered similar fates.

At present national policy mandating non-discrimination in Federal employment has been strongly expressed by both Congress and the Executive. Congress has stated that it is "the policy of the United States to ensure equal employment opportunities for Federal employees without discrimination because of race, color, religion, sex or national origin . . ." (5 U.S. § 7151 (1970)). The primary responsibility for implementing this national policy has been given to the Civil Service Commission, pursuant to Executive Order 11748. President Nixon stated that "discrimination of any kind based on factors not relevant to job performance must be eradicated completely from Federal employment." This has not happened, and one important reason it has not happened is that the Civil Service Commission is not up to the job.

I am convinced that E.E.O.C. with its experience in battling job discrimination in the private sector and with its sensitivity to the systemics and institutional roots of

job discrimination offers far greater hope to the thousands of employees who every day must suffer the indignity of being discriminated against because of their race, religion, sex, or national origin.

The Civil Service Commission's record in rooting out discrimination is all too clear. Statistical evidence demonstrates beyond serious question that minorities and women find it difficult to secure Federal jobs, particularly at higher paying, decision-making levels. Blacks, women, Spanish-surnamed employees are unduly concentrated in jobs paying the lowest salaries and having the least amount of policy-making responsibility. A report issued by the Civil Service Commission in May, 1970 showed that minorities make up 19.6 percent of the total number of government employees and 14.4 percent of the general schedule employees. Approximately 80 percent of these general schedule minority employees are locked at grades 1-8. While comprising slightly over 14 percent of the general schedule work force, minorities account for 27.3 percent of the lowest level GS 1-4 positions. The picture grows even more gloomy when we look at the record of individual cabinet level departments. As of November, 1970, only 5.2 percent of Interior's employees were Black, 5.8 percent of Agriculture's, and 6.2 percent of Transportation's.

These pervasive patterns are reflected in employment practices at Federal executive levels. In grades GS 14 and 15, minority employees account for only 3.3 percent of employees, and at grades GS 15-18 minorities account for only one in fifty of all employees. While Spanish-surnamed employees are 2.9 percent of employees, only 6/10 of one percent have managed to make it to executive level positions. Similar patterns also pertain to women employees.

In individual agencies, the presence of Blacks in executive level positions earning more than \$15,000 and presumably having some decision-making authority, grows even more infrequent. In the Department of Interior, less than one percent of the Blacks in the agency earn more than \$15,000. In Treasury, Defense, Agriculture, and Transportation, two percent or less of all Black employees make more than \$15,000. Most remarkably of all, in the Justice Department, which at one time had the major responsibility for securing equal rights for all Americans, only 1.4 percent of Black employees reached a salary range of \$15,000 or more.

When the "super grade" positions—GS 16-18—are sifted out and reviewed, the picture becomes nothing less than a national scandal. As of November, 1970, there were 5,586 super grades, but only 130 of these were minorities—92 Blacks, 18 Spanish-surnamed, 15 Orientals, and 5 American Indians. The most shocking instance of exclusion of minorities from high level positions is found in the regulatory agencies, especially in the so-called "big-six"—FCC, FTC, ICC, CAB, FPC, and SEC. This almost defies belief but of the 327 GS 16 through 18 employees, not a single one was Black, Spanish-surnamed, or American Indian. Almost as amazing, in the Departments of the Army, Air Force, and Navy, which have a total of 811 super grades, there were one Black, one Spanish-surnamed, and one Oriental in super grade positions. In the Department of Defense, having 216 super grades, only two of these are minority group members.

An inordinately large number of the 130 minority super grades are found in civil rights positions and therefore, have no direct influence on program decisions. The two minority super grades in the Department of Defense are both civil rights officers. The one minority super grade in the Small Business Administration is involved in civil rights work. Over 10 percent of all minority super grades in the government are in two agencies—the Civil Rights Commission, and the Equal Em-

ployment Opportunity Commission—which deal with civil rights matters.

The difficulty of minorities and women in curing Federal employment, their high concentration in low level jobs, their virtual absence from executive level positions, can only be attributed to systematic and institutional failures, failures that Civil Service Commission has proved unable to root out effectively.

These patterns are not accidental; they are the direct result of the failure of the Civil Service Commission to come to grips with the deep roots of discrimination pervading Federal employment practices. The Commission's failure springs from several sources. The Commission has the ultimate responsibility for establishing Federal personnel policies. At the same time, Executive Order 11748 places primary responsibility for ensuring equal employment opportunity in the hands of the Civil Service Commission. It seems anomalous to have the Commission both establish policies for rooting out discrimination and at the same time have the basic responsibility for measuring the effectiveness of its personnel policies against the demands of the law. S. 2515 will remedy this inequity and provide for objective review of Federal discrimination policies.

Beyond the Civil Service Commission's conflict of interest in enforcing non-discrimination standards, the Commission has failed to acknowledge the institutional and systemic origins of discrimination in Federal employment. The Commission persists in searching out supervisors with malicious intent rather than focusing on personnel policies that have the inherent effect of discriminating against Black, Spanish-surnamed, and women employees. Yet even when such supervisors are identified, strong steps are almost never taken to discourage further discrimination.

We should have little reason to expect results from the Civil Service Commission when it cannot even keep its own house in order. The Commission's record in employing minority group members at the decision-making level is far from exemplary. Of the 53 super grades at the Commission, only two are Black, and as has become an emerging pattern, at least one of these is a civil rights officer. In its ten regional offices, the Civil Service Commission has not one Black in a regional director or deputy director position. Beyond the top leadership positions, the Civil Service Commission's record in employing minority group members at the regional level is dismal. As of February, 1971, in the Boston office, one of 39 employees at GS 10 or above was minority, and only seven of 66 employees at GS 9 or below were minority. In the Chicago office, only 3 of 182 employees at the GS 10 level or above were minority. In its headquarters staff, there is no improvement. In the Commission's Bureau of Recruiting and Examining, a scant 2 of 68 employees at GS 10 or above were minority; in the Bureau of Policy and Standards, 4 out of 117; and in the Bureau of Personnel Investigations, 3 out of 89.

The Commission's procedures in processing equal employment complaints are marked by long delays and timidity. The Commission's procedures generally give the agency against which an equal opportunity complaint is asserted the responsibility for investigating and initially resolving the matter. The agency is supposed to reach a decision within 60 days. Yet, according to recent figures that I have obtained, 59 percent of the complaints pending in the agencies are now overdue. The Civil Service Commission has the authority to reach down and pull a case from a dilatory agency, but it rarely does. Rather, it simply waits until the agency makes a decision, and then it is normally up to the employee to bring the case before the Commission. In addition, it

is not at all unusual for an employee to wait eight or nine months before a complaint is fully resolved administratively.

Even when the discrimination is proved, the Commission is extraordinarily timid in imposing meaningful remedial action. In fact, the Commission's remedies fall far short of what the Government would accept from a private employer under Title VII of the 1964 Civil Rights Act. The Commission has refused to grant retroactive promotions. While it should be acknowledged that decisions of the Comptroller seem to limit back-pay awards, the Commission has nonetheless failed to seek vigorously authority for back pay awards—a remedy commonplace in private employment discrimination cases. Similarly, the Commission has steadfastly failed to institute government-wide affirmative action plans with goals and timetables to measure progress as are now routinely required of private employees having government contracts. The Commission will merely order that the employee be given some priority for future promotion when discrimination is proved. But little attention is given to compensating the employee for the damages that he has suffered as a result of the unfair treatment.

To many of us who have closely followed the work of the Commission in the area of equal employment programs, it has seemed that often it is more concerned with fashioning a tidy personnel system than in effecting equal job justice for Federal employees. Present Civil Service standards continue to overemphasize paper qualifications and test results, even when an employee in his work experience of performance has demonstrated a capacity for a better job or advancement. Furthermore, the tests used by the Commission are not directed in any significant way to specific job requirements. A recent study by the respected Urban Institute concluded that the "use of the (test) is unfairly discriminatory to many Black applicants. . . ." As the House Labor and Education Committee pointed out in its Report on H.R. 1746, "The inevitable consequence of this . . . is that classes of persons who are culturally or educationally disadvantaged are subjected to a heavier burden in seeking employment." These policies are wrong, but the Commission has utterly failed to see that they are wrong.

The time for change has arrived, and I urge you to seize the time. The Civil Service Commission has demonstrated that it is incapable of providing fair and equal job opportunities for all government employees. A new and more sensitive expertise is required. I believe that E.E.O.C. offers far greater hope to these thousands of employees who today have no real hope for change. I urge your approval of S. 2515, particularly the transfer of equal employment functions in the Federal Government from the Civil Service Commission to E.E.O.C. I believe that the transfer is desperately needed, and I urge your support for it.

CYNICISM IS HEALTHY

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 7, 1971

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, a bit of homespun philosophy was certainly evident in the editorial which appeared in the September 22 edition of the La-Grange, Ill., Citizen, commenting on the maintenance of a healthy cynical attitude.

I believe this commentary treats the subject properly and clearly and is a far better analysis than that of chronic complainers or bitter cynics who lose all of their objectivity:

CYNICISM IS HEALTHY

Seems only a few weeks ago that crusaders for a better environment, stimulated by a massive publicity campaign from the sacrosanct federal bureaucracy, were warning of the dangers of using detergents containing phosphorus.

As we remember, housewives were picketing grocery stores, posting brand names with percentage of phosphorus content and urging shoppers not to buy and merchants not to stock the detergents with the higher ratings.

College students, we recall, used their chemistry laboratories to make "scientific" analyses of cleansing preparations. All this was part of their concern for the environment.

Now comes a federal functionary with the word that phosphorus isn't all bad. It might, indeed, be better than some of the substitutes.

The question is not whether the latest pronouncement is right or wrong. It is a question of the credibility of a spokesman for the federal establishment.

"It is one of the happiest characteristics of this glorious country," said the First Lord in Gilbert and Sullivan's satiric operetta, "H. M. S. Pinafore", "that official utterances are invariably regarded as unanswerable."

That has been the handicap, and may be the doom, of the anti-pollution movement: to accept without question, reservation or investigation the pronouncements of those in official positions.

Governmental functionaries are usually more interested in the size of their appropriations than in the welfare of the commonwealth.

A little cynical scrutiny would be a healthy attitude.

WHO CARES FOR THE BROKEN MAN?

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 7, 1971

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, few of us who have not directly experienced the tragedy of spinal cord injury have any conception of the kind of personal disaster it can be. Nor are many of us aware of what is required to treat or care for those who have suffered this type of injury, or what is involved in the rehabilitation process, where rehabilitation is possible.

As a member of the Appropriations Subcommittee exercising jurisdiction over the programs through which funds for spinal cord injury research, treatment and rehabilitation are directed, I have a special interest in this particular medical and social problem. One of my principal concerns is over the fact that so many of these injuries occur with young people between the ages of 18 and 25 years who have their whole vocational careers before them.

A recent issue of the Chicago Tribune magazine featured an article which I think does an excellent job of outlining the problems associated with spinal cord injury, and the fine work being done in

this area by the Rehabilitation Institute of Chicago. I believe my colleagues will be interested in reading it.

Four years ago the institute undertook a major \$26 million expansion project to provide new facilities to serve the severely disabled in the Midwest. These are to be very special facilities, to provide for research and training as well as patient care.

To finance this project, the institute turned to its own resources, and to the private community for more than two-thirds of the needed funds, and to the Federal Government for the remainder.

Our subcommittee has given the institute support and encouragement in this undertaking over the years and this spring President Heyworth and Dr. Henry Betts appeared before us to make their request for the final \$3 million in Federal funds needed to complete the project.

We put that money in the appropriation bill which was signed by the President on August 10. I am happy to have been of help in obtaining these funds for the institute for this most worthy and meritorious project, and I think more than commendations are in order for the public-spirited and civic-minded folks in the Chicago area and all over the Midwest who have given so generously to make this plan a reality.

The article follows:

WHO CARES FOR THE BROKEN MAN?

(By Ridgely Hunt)

When you injure your spinal cord, a number of curious things happen to compound your original disaster.

In the first place, because you are probably both paralyzed and insensitive to pain in the lower part of your body, you can neither shift position in bed nor feel the necessity for doing so. Many hospitals, ignorant of the dangers imposed by this condition, will permit you to lie immobile for weeks and months while your body weight squeezes the circulation out of your skin. Inevitably, you will develop appalling bed sores, sometimes as big as a watermelon and deep enough to encompass your entire fist. These may become infected and eventually kill you. At the least, they will delay by many weeks any attempt to liberate you from the prison of your shattered body.

But worse, both psychologically and physically, is the loss of bowel and bladder control. The spinal-cord patient typically can neither force himself to urinate nor prevent himself from passing stool. To cope with the former problem, a catheter—a rubber tube—must be threaded thru the urethra and left in place with one end inside the bladder and the other end draining into a bag strapped to the leg. For the latter infirmity, the patient is diapered like a baby. [Dr. Henry B. Betts, medical director of the Rehabilitation Institute of Chicago, has seen such patients permanently installed in boxes of sawdust. When the patients' bowels moved, the attendants shoveled out the soiled sawdust and replaced it with new.]

The loss of control over these two most elementary functions presents enormous hazards for the patient. On the physical plane, the catheter causes a constant irritation. Altho the spinal-cord patient may not feel it, the catheter encourages the formation of calcium deposits that serve as the situs—the location and hiding place—for infections. These, in turn, may spread from the bladder to the kidneys with lethal consequences.

On the emotional plane, the results are

frequently even more devastating. The patient is reduced to a humiliating dependency, literally as helpless as a baby. He is compelled to submit to procedures that from earliest childhood he has been taught to regard as disgusting and demeaning. And this at the hands of the nursing staff, many of whom are young and pretty.

Because hospitals are staffed in large part by attractive women, the male patient in particular is forever reminded of his crowning misfortune: the loss of his sexual competence. Not all spinal-cord patients are similarly afflicted in this respect. Some men remain capable of an erection, tho they need help to achieve an ejaculation. Whether they will receive that help hinges on the love and skill of their wives, a fact that further emphasizes their dependency. In any event, because they have lost sensitivity in the lower part of the body, they will get little physical gratification from the act of love and must content themselves with the knowledge that they are fulfilling their roles as men, if only after a fashion. Furthermore, their muscular impairment will usually cause the sperm to be projected backward into the bladder, rendering them unable to beget children. [As in everything else pertaining to medicine, exceptions can be found to this generally. There is on record at least one Illinois couple, both of whom are paralyzed from the waist down, who have produced a succession of offspring.] Because women can adopt an entirely passive role in lovemaking, a spinal-cord injury does not inflict so grievous a loss on their sexuality. They can conceive and bear children, and indeed, the inability to feel pain may come as a positive blessing in labor.

So the spinal-cord patient finds himself beset by a sea of difficulties. First is the catastrophic injury to his body, which may prevent him from walking or even moving his legs for the rest of his life. Worse, he may never move his arms. And second is the blow to his emotions, especially to his self-esteem. In several important ways, he has reverted to infancy: He wets his pants and soils his bed; he can neither feed nor dress himself; he must be lifted and carried like a baby. And third, he has lost his place as an adult—lost his job, lost his freedom, lost his manhood. He has become an anomaly in the eyes of the world. He knows that he will be stared at if he ventures out in public. He fears that his wife and friends will reject him, and in this he is sometimes right. Depending on the kind of person he was before his accident, he will feel resentful, angry, terrified and defeated. Or he will be determined, inventive, serene and courageous. Or typically he will be all of these things at one time or another.

It's surprisingly easy to injure your spinal cord. Cook County Sheriff Richard Elrod did it in a tussle with an S. D. S. rioter on Madison Street. Many victims do it while swimming, usually by diving into shallow water and hitting their heads on the bottom. The most common cause among patients at the Rehabilitation Institute of Chicago is automobile accidents. But one way or another, the victim has suffered a traumatic injury that has broken his spine and damaged the spinal cord, the bundle of nerves that runs like a trunk telephone cable from the base of the brain downward for about 18 inches to the small of the back. Sometimes the cord is entirely severed, in which case, in the present state of medical knowledge, it can never be rejoined. Sometimes it is merely bruised and in time will regain some—possibly all—of its function. Because the cord does not visualize in X-rays, you cannot tell for sure how badly it is damaged; you can only wait and see. Patients often announce a firm expectation of walking again. Usually they are disappointed, and their failure plunges them into deeper gloom. But some achieve the miracle.

The extent of the disability depends on the location of the injury. If it is high up in the

cervical vertebrae of the neck, it will disrupt the nerves that control breathing, and the victim will die. If the damage occurs somewhat lower, he will be paralyzed from the neck down, breathing shallowly but unable to move arms, legs or trunk. [This happened to Jim Braun, a 21-year-old patient at the Rehabilitation Institute, who dove into 3 feet of water one golden afternoon during a picnic in South Dakota. Still entirely conscious, he lay on the bottom of the pond, looking up at the fading sunlight on the surface but unable to reach it. Happily, his friends eventually realized that he wasn't fooling and pulled him out half-drowned.] Lower still, as the 31 pairs of nerves branch off from the spinal cord to the various organs of the body, the victim retains more function. He may be able to move a single muscle in his left shoulder. Perhaps he can shift his entire right arm although denied the use of the fingers. Or arms and hands may work while the legs dangle uselessly.

Tho the extent of the loss varies, all spinal-cord patients can be divided into two camps: the more fortunate who can move their arms but not their legs and the less fortunate who can move neither. The first are called paraplegics; the second as quadraplegics. In the vernacular of the rehabilitation business, they are often referred to as "paras" and "quads." Most doctors and therapists who work with them deplore the tendency to categorize, to put labels on them, because like all humanity, spinal-cord patients are infinitely varied. But certain classifications must be drawn for the sake of brevity, and so this man is a para and that girl is a quad. Thru the accident of a moment, they have become lifetime members of a special minority, an aberrant class feared or despised or patronized by the ambulatory majority.

And thus they come to the Rehabilitation Institute, some of them despairing, some of them hoping for the miracle and none of them knowing what they will find inside those white-painted brick walls. The place looks like another of the warehouses and loft buildings that dot the semi-industrial area on Ohio Street out by Lake Shore Drive. Motorists, hell-bent to get home for their evening martini, could pass it for a dozen years and never guess at the maimed and crippled people who dwell inside.

Just as well. At first glance, they would make you cry out in shock and horror. Here on this wheelchair is a little boy whose legs have been amputated above the knees. There, silent and withdrawn, sits a girl injured in a college laboratory explosion; the left side of her head is crushed in. On that bed lies one of the nation's ablest newspaper editors, paralyzed from the neck down by an automobile crash. His voice breaks on the edge of tears when he speaks of his misfortune. His brain is undamaged. Only his body is broken. He has not yet learned to accept this, and acceptance is an important requisite to adjustment and rehabilitation. The middle-aged woman with the gray running down her chin, she's a "hemi," a hemiplegic, paralyzed on one side of her body by a stroke. She used to be an office supervisor, but she won't go back to that. Her powers of speech have been entirely wiped out by the hemorrhage in her brain. And over there, lying prone on a cart, that's a bilateral amputee with disarticulation. They took off both his legs as high as they could go, which in this case means removing the top joint of the leg from the hip socket. To look at him quickly, you would think he had been sawed in half at the navel, leaving only half a man. In ages past, a man like that could make a living by displaying himself in public places, and parents sometimes maimed their own children to capitalize on the popular delight in freaks. But modern society, grown delicate and refined, prefers to shut its freaks away from view—in hospitals, in nursing homes, upstairs in the back bedroom. In the Pepsi

generation, where everyone is beautiful and no one passes the age of 28, no place remains for the lame, the halt and the blind.

Even the medical profession has traditionally turned its back on them. After the "acute-care" phase, after the arm has been amputated and the stump has healed, after the broken spine has been fused, the doctors have had neither the time nor the inclination to help their patients master their newly circumscribed lives. Most of them still don't, nor do they encourage their students to take up this work.

"When I was a medical student," says Dr. Betts, who is today an improbably handsome 43 years old, "there was a subtle disparagement of chronic disease. It was infused into our minds that geriatric and chronic problems were not the most interesting. Acute cases were the ones that the professors got excited about. There was a little groaning when you got an arthritic or an asthmatic. So you ended up with a subtle feeling against this sort of thing. I once had great hope for the younger generation of medical students. They just love 'dealing with the whole man,' which is what you have to do in rehabilitation. I was delighted with them. They came here to see what we were doing in the institute, and they loved it, and almost all of them went into something else."

When the institute first opened its doors in 1953, it was starved for patients because most doctors refused to refer patients there. The situation has vastly improved since then, but to this day, many doctors will not send a patient there, either because they are ignorant or indifferent to the new science of rehabilitation or because they fear to lose a paying customer. Money, after all, influences all mortals, even physicians.

This fact helps to deter doctors from entering the field of rehabilitative medicine. There's more money as well as glamor in the practice of surgery. And the turnover is faster. Why tie yourself up in a long-term relationship with a physical ruin who soils his pants when you can knock off an appendectomy and collect your fee in a month? Besides, surgeons are community heroes, and lurking always in the background is the suggestion that rehabilitative medicine is somehow not quite respectable.

It is, in fact, a recent bloom in the garland of medical specialties, invented almost single-handedly by a physician named Howard Rusk toward the end of World War II. An Air Force medical officer at the time, Rusk observed and abhorred the crippled future that awaited many seriously wounded soldiers. For them medicine offered little help and less hope. Rusk supplied both in the new specialty of rehabilitation, which was largely pioneered in American military and Veterans Administration hospitals.

Even today, few medical schools offer training in rehabilitation. Of these few, Northwestern University is a leader. Physicians skilled in this field are called physiatrists [usually pronounced "fizzy-at-rists," but not always]. Working under them is a corps of paramedical specialists: physical and occupational therapists; prosthetists, who make and fit artificial limbs; and orthotists, who make braces. Training in these skills usually takes two or four years on the college level and is available, among other places, in branches of Chicago City College.

But the field still suffers from a lack of specialists and indeed from a lack of civilian institutions devoted exclusively to rehabilitation. Many hospitals maintain departments of rehabilitation, but many of these are understaffed, ill-equipped and poorly trained. Of large centers like Chicago's Rehabilitation Institute there are not half a dozen in the country. This is a pity for two major reasons. In the first place, it dooms 90 per cent of the physically disabled to a sort of living death, immobilized and hidden away. And in addition to the cost in human agony, this short-

coming presents society with a huge financial bill to support the nation's 250,000 disabled. It has been reckoned that, for every dollar spent on rehabilitation, \$8 has been returned in welfare costs saved and income taxes paid by workers restored to usefulness. If humanitarianism will not spur this endeavor, then perhaps the motivation will come from a decent regard for the buck.

Rehabilitation itself is not cheap. Each day of inpatient care at the Rehabilitation Institute costs \$100, and the average patient stays 53 days. Federal and state funds pay for some of these cases, and the institute itself carries five per cent of them free. But the majority are financed by so-called "third-party payers," mostly insurance companies, of which by far the largest share is borne by Blue Cross-Blue Shield. In general, the rich can afford the treatment; the poor will get it for nothing; and the middle-class may very well be wiped out. But for all, the money can be found one way or another. Finding a vacancy among the institute's 71 beds is another matter. At the moment, the waiting list is 8 to 12 weeks long.

A spinal-cord patient can suffer a shocking amount of deterioration in 8 to 12 weeks. Frequently he will spend these months held rigidly immobile within a Stryker frame, a two-layer cot built like a sandwich in which the patient becomes the filling. Bed sores will ravage his skin. His joints will harden from disuse, and from inactivity his muscles will wither and his tendons will stretch until arms threaten to disengage from shoulder sockets and legs from hips. And in this condition, if he is lucky, he will at length be brought to the Rehabilitation Institute.

An enormous amount of work lies ahead. Before anything else, his bed sores must be healed and new sores prevented from developing. In this the principal tactic is to turn him frequently and regularly, day and night, as often as once an hour. In some cases, it may take three people to "logroll" the patient. If he had received this kind of nursing during his earlier hospitalization, his skin would not be so ulcerated now.

His sores healed at last, the patient can work toward the considerable feat of sitting upright. He has no tolerance for this exertion, but he can be led toward it. At first he will be strapped onto a tilt table and tipped so that his feet rest lower than his head. In time, he can learn to endure an upright position for an hour or more.

From the beginning, he has submitted to the attentions of the institute's large and variegated staff. He has been interviewed by a social worker, a psychologist and a psychiatrist. He has been examined by at least one doctor and a physical therapist and an occupational therapist. And unknown to him, he has been the subject of a large conference at which Dr. Betts presided while the staff reported at length upon his case. Teamwork is important in rehabilitation. The occupational therapist must know what pitfalls the psychologist has discovered, and the nurse's knowledge of the patient's bladder program may vitally affect the social worker's recommendation for family relationships. If the doctor has detected a return in the right biceps, the physical therapist will want to know about it. If the patient is contemplating suicide, they will all want to know about it.

The bowel and bladder programs assume early importance, primarily because of the need to remove the catheter before it causes an infection. Altho the patient may never recover the ability to urinate at will, it is possible to train the bladder to empty itself periodically into a leg bag. Similarly, thru training and diet control, the bowels can be taught to move on a predictable schedule. These accomplishments are vital if the patient is ever to venture forth into the world again.

And he must learn to use a wheelchair.

He may well have to spend the rest of his life in it. The wheelchair brings both freedom and restriction. In it he can move freely about his apartment—except into the bathroom. [Perversely, bathroom doors are almost always built too narrow to admit a wheelchair. If the door can't be widened, he will have to make do with a wash basin and a commode in his bedroom.] He can go outdoors, hoist himself into his car, fold up his wheelchair and stick it in the back seat, and drive away with the help of special hand controls. He can go to the movies, go shopping, go to work.

But he can't climb stairs. Unless he can find an elevator or a couple of husky friends to carry him, he is forever barred from the downstairs men's room, his favorite restaurant with the flight of steps out front, even the second floor of his own house. He will look for driveways whenever he wants to cross the street because Chicago has provided few ramps to help him up onto the curb. He can bounce his wheelchair over a curb by balancing it on its hind wheels and getting a running start, but that takes practice.

All of these tribulations must wait, however. At this point he can't even put on his own pants. The institute will teach him that too in a field of study called "activities of daily living." The problems here are formidable and the solutions often ingenious. The stroke victim, for instance, frequently suffers paralysis of both arm and leg on the same side and will probably have to get thru the rest of his life one-handed. He can make out quite nicely with a few exceptions. He can put on his clothes and button his shirt—all except the cuff button on his remaining useful wrist. This last cuff he can fasten by having a patch of Velcro sewed beneath the button and pressing it closed. Neckties can be tied one-handed more easily than he might suppose. So can shoelaces; there's a special trick that the therapists will show him. It would be easier to wear loafers, but stroke victims often need leg braces, and these work best with laced shoes. You can scrub all the parts of your body except the hand you're using, and you can scrub that, too, by gluing a scrub brush inside the basin and rubbing the hand against it.

Women stroke victims have difficulty fastening their bras. A front-opening model helps and can be equipped with Velcro instead of hooks. The application of a deodorant presents certain obstacles. So does lipstick. If she has lost all sensation on her paralyzed side, she cannot feel where she is applying her lipstick and sometimes winds up with a clown's mouth.

Often the stroke victim sustains a mental as well as a physical loss. He may no longer be able to speak or perform simple arithmetical chores such as counting his money. The institute's staff of speech therapists will help with these disabilities. But in addition, he may be subject to a general confusion so that he gets both feet into the same trouser leg or becomes lost while trying to work his arms and legs into his undershirt.

Aside from the neuroses that may stem from his injury, the spinal-chord patients usually suffers no such mental debility. Inside his wrecked body, his brain is scheming and plotting ways to help himself. And there are a thousand ways to survive in this predicament. Most of them he'd never think of for himself, but the therapists know all the tricks. They have forks that strap to the hand and typing sticks that can punch typewriter keys and paint brushes that can be held in the teeth. They have splints that convert wrist movement into gripping action.

And they make the patient work. They set him a task, like the construction of a bookshelf, and they keep him at it, endlessly sanding and sanding. It's good for the muscles. Jim Braun, the quad who lay so long on the bottom of the pond, has already

completed a ceramic serving tray for his girl and gone on to a candleholder for his parents, both made almost entirely with his right arm since his left arm and both hands are pretty well useless. He gets around now in an electric-powered wheelchair which he controls by showing his right palm against a couple of levers. He is about ready to go home to South Dakota.

For the goal is always to go home. The institute staff talks a good deal about "goals," which differ in detail from patient to patient. Many hope to walk again, and some do. Even tho both legs are paralyzed you can stiffen them with braces and learn to walk on crutches. A few achieve the miracle and regain the ability to walk with no mechanical assistance whatsoever. Nancy Hendricks did that. A pretty, 16-year-old blonde, she broke her spine in a motorcycle accident. Last Christmas, she was a paraplegic, flat on her back in bed. Five months later she was walking without even a cane. Now she works as a volunteer in the institute.

Most working men want to go back to their jobs. For many, the ability to support their families has been their only pride in an otherwise drab life. The man accustomed to working with his brain can usually expect to work again, but the manual laborer faces a more dubious prospect. He can no longer earn his bread by the strength of his arms. Neither can he be readily turned into an intellectual, tho there are exceptions. One institute alumnus, a 51-year-old truck driver, was found to possess remarkable computational abilities. Now he's enrolled in junior college, learning to be an accountant. The stroke victim may hold a job again, but his loss of mental acuity may prevent him from regaining his old position. One 15-year railroad veteran was forced to accept a job working for men he had once trained. His mind may have slipped, but he fully knows how his status has been degraded, and it breaks his heart. For some men, the most practical solution lies in "role reversal," in which the man stays home and keeps house while his wife goes out to work. But to the man who sets great store by his masculinity, this is often no answer at all.

Amputees face a brighter future, depending on their physical condition, their sex and the extent to their loss. It takes considerable strength to swing an artificial leg attached to a stump above the knee. Two such legs are much harder. And many amputees lose their legs as a result of the vascular diseases attendant upon old age. They are too old and feeble to support this burden, much less to master the skill of walking on prostheses, and so they resign themselves to life in a wheelchair. Men usually take more readily than women to artificial limbs. A man, after all, can hide his leg inside his trousers, but a woman's dress displays her aberration. In both sexes, vanity plays an important part in fitting prostheses. Great care is taken to match shape and skin color as well as to construct a socket that will intimately fit the stump. And more ingenious devices are under development such as an artificial arm and hand that respond to electric impulses generated by the arm muscles. Much of this research, as well as the training of prosthetists and the fitting of artificial limbs, goes on within the walls of the institute. The amputees must buy their arms and legs from a commercial limb shop, but they learn to use them at the institute.

And learning is perhaps the most important part in rehabilitation. The institute sees an endless procession of nurses, therapists, medical students who have come for training. It will see still more three years from now when it completes its new \$25-million building, twice as big as the one-time bookprinting plant it now occupies.

But the major portion of the learning falls to the patients themselves, who have so much to accomplish. Not only must they learn

again to dress and feed themselves and perform useful work and walk or wheel themselves about as best they can, but also they must learn to live in a world that was never made for them. The institute helps them with this, too. As part of "recreation therapy," they make frequent sorties into the outside, sometimes to the theater or to a concert at Ravinia, sometimes to a ball game or a department store, occasionally even to Europe on a tourist's holiday.

The goal is not so much to divert them as it is to teach them how to exist in an ambulatory society. They learn that, if the theater restrooms are downstairs, they may be able to roll their chairs to the men's room in the soda shop, two doors away [or falling that, to empty their leg bags in a dark alley]. They learn that taxis sometimes refuse to stop for a man in a wheelchair [but the next cabbie will not only stop but haul him up three steps into a restaurant]. They learn to shift for themselves as much as they can, and when they must be picked up and heaved into an automobile seat, they learn to accept that, too, with grace and gratitude. They learn to live again—tho within their limitations.

For the limitations always remain, whether as a burden or a weapon. Some patients go forth from the institute as full-fledged wheelchair generals, determined to use their disabilities to bludgeon their families into servitude. Others, despite the best efforts of the staff, go out in defeat, convinced that they have lost their future and the love of their families.

But most set out with some improvement and with reasonable expectations. Tho they may never play golf again, perhaps, at least they can hobble around on braces and canes, which is better than they could do when they came in. If they must sit in a wheelchair, perhaps they can now feed themselves and type a letter. It may be a bitter bargain, but it's better than nothing. In the final extremity, most men cling to life, even tho it must be endured in agony.

And out of the pain may come some good. A remarkable number of patients embark upon their new lives with a deeper understanding of themselves, an enlarged wisdom about mankind. In their new weakness, many find new strength. And for some, that bargain is at least acceptable.

CHRISTOPHER COLUMBUS

HON. ELLA T. GRASSO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 7, 1971

Mrs. GRASSO. Mr. Speaker, this year we celebrate a new national public holiday. It is a celebration to honor the magnificent courage and boundless imagination of a discoverer who 479 years ago embarked on a voyage destined to change the course of human existence.

Christopher Columbus combined the creativity of the romantic with the precision of the scientist to challenge the established "facts" of his time. The dangerous challenges he undertook reaped rewards—he sailed uncharted seas until he found land where it was said there was no land.

Christopher Columbus is rightfully credited with having done more than chart the new waterways to a new land. More than perhaps any one individual, Columbus, through his personal daring, enabled us to become the beneficiaries of

western civilization. Undeterred by setbacks and the discouragements of less adventuresome critics, Columbus sparked the American spirit which continues to seek out and discover new frontiers.

In 1492, Columbus established himself as the "Father of All Immigrants"—a distinction now recognized by this national day in his honor. He was the first of many Italian-Americans who have placed their mark of greatness on this country. Perhaps the greatest legacy he leaves us is the unifying symbol reflected in his life. In spanning the gulfs of ignorance and the oceans separating the hemispheres, Columbus incorporated the talents of his day—from Spanish ships to Portuguese charts—to make his journey a source of international achievement.

All Americans take special pride on this day. However, we share our celebration with the people of the world—whether through national or ethnic inheritance, through faith in and devotion to God, or through the benefits of his great deed in connecting the two halves of the world. In gratitude and in emulation, let us work together in a renewed spirit of unity to ease the divisions in the Nation and build a world whose strength lies in peace and friendship among all people.

HEARINGS ON THE DAY LABORER PROTECTION ACT OF 1971 WILL BE HELD OCTOBER 20 AND 21

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 7, 1971

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I wish to announce to my colleagues that the Special Subcommittee on Labor will conduct hearings on October 20 and 21 on H.R. 10349, the Day Laborer Protection Act of 1971.

The purpose of the hearings is to inquire into the working conditions of people employed by temporary help supply firms. There appear to be some abuses of employees in this field but we are not sure whether they are isolated instances or are characteristic of the industry.

We plan to listen to workers, employer organizations, and social action groups working with day laborers, and then decide whether further hearings and legislative action are called for.

My good friend and distinguished colleague from Illinois (Mr. MIKVA), the author of H.R. 10349, proposes regulating temporary help supply firms by requiring that they obtain a license to do business from the Secretary of Labor. Firms which did not meet certain minimum standards would be denied a license.

In the event that legislation appears necessary, this strikes me as a sensible approach since only a few States, including my own, currently regulate these firms. We are, of course, open to other approaches and would be happy to hear from any of our colleagues who wish to present testimony at the hearings.

THE WORKING POOR: STOP THE FREEZE

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 7, 1971

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, on October 4, I introduced House Concurrent Resolution 414 to assure that low-paid workers are exempted from any wage freeze which may ensue following the end of the present freeze in November.

Millions of Americans, despite their toil, are unable to support themselves and their families at more than a bare bones level. The President himself acknowledged the plight of the working poor in his espousal of the family assistance plan, which would cover them. Yet his freeze on wages has locked these individuals and their families into poverty and near poverty.

That such should be the case in this land of untold affluence is unconscionable.

Today, 1,000 stewards and local officials from District 65, Distributive Workers of America, traveled from New York City to our Nation's Capital to say "no more freeze," and to show their support for House Concurrent Resolution 414. These workers are symbolic of the millions of Americans whose incomes derive from decent, steady employment—yet are far from adequate, especially at this time of inflation. They are the men and women to whom this country belongs. And they must not be denied that which they have earned through free collective bargaining—their wages.

The need to spare the working poor from the ravages of the President's economic policies was eloquently stated at District 65's rally on the Capitol steps today on behalf of the entire union by Frank Brown, organizational director, and Cleveland Robinson, secretary-treasurer of District 65 and national president of the Distributive Workers of America. The Congress must not fail to heed their call for justice for the working man.

At this point I include in the RECORD a letter by David Livingston, president, District 65, Distributive Workers of America, which appeared in the New York Times of October 6. I commend this well reasoned and cogent letter to the attention of my colleagues. As David Livingston said:

... If the President fails to meet the responsibility to those who don't make a living, then the Congress should. If both fail, it would be tantamount to a Government edict to condemn poorly paid American workers to permanent poverty.

The letter follows:

PHASE II: SPARE THE WORKING POOR

To the Editor:

If President Nixon in his proposed Phase Two of the Administration's New Economic Policy tries to freeze or limit wage increases to the working poor, it will be a national disaster. In New York City, 25 per cent of the work force earns less than \$100 a week, and throughout the country the number runs into many millions. Among nonunion workers—about 75 per cent of the work force—the percentages whose earnings are substandard is even greater.

The leaders of the labor movement have directed attention to the fundamental inequities of President Nixon's program—especially its failure to control profits and interest rates. But even if these inequities were corrected, it would be criminal to try to limit the wages of many millions whose earnings are substandard. There are organized workers whose earnings do permit them to support their families properly. But what of those whose earnings do not?

Both the War Labor Board of World War II and the Wage Stabilization Board of the Korean war took note of the existence of many workers whose earnings were substandard. The War Labor Board specifically exempted from any control, even from the necessity of seeking approval, any wage increases for workers whose earnings were at or below 50 cents per hour. At that time, the Federal minimum wage was 30 cents an hour. Thus, the automatically approvable rate was two-thirds above the legal minimum. Now the legal minimum is \$1.60 per hour and the rate in New York State is \$1.85. Using the same approach would lead to exempting from regulation any worker (union or nonunion) with hourly earnings between \$3 and \$3.50.

In truth, the current legal minimums are ridiculously low. That is why so many of the working poor must supplement their wages with welfare payments. To hold that wage increases for such workers are in some way productive of inflation is to insult the intelligence of people. There must be no freeze of controls applied against workers who don't make a living.

In our union, there are large numbers of workers whose contracts provide increases which will bring them up to or just barely \$100 per week. In previous times, the Government did not attempt to destroy the results of collective bargaining. Indeed it was established national policy to encourage labor-management agreement through collective bargaining. Thus both wage boards in the 1940's and 1950's took pains to authorize all increases negotiated prior to the onset of the wage stabilization process. In both wars, the boards permitted any worker who had not received an equal wage increase in the same period to "catch up."

Perhaps our difficulties arise from the fact that the President has such unilateral power now to control workers' lives. Both in World War II and in the Korean war, the rules were set by Congress rather than permitting the President to wield absolute power. This is a proper and constitutional exercise of authority and responsibility. Working people, union and nonunion, the overwhelming majority of whom are struggling to make ends meet, look to the Congress to protect them. In the 1940's, in the midst of the most terrible war in history and the greatest threat to America, the Congress did not forget its duty to the working population. The Congress acted firmly to protect the working poor and declared, "The National War Labor Board may authorize wage increases clearly necessary to correct substandards of living."

In preparing for Phase Two, if the President fails to meet the responsibility to those who don't make a living, then the Congress should. If both fail, it would be tantamount to a Government edict to condemn poorly paid American workers to permanent poverty.

DAVID LIVINGSTON.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JOSEPH G. MINISH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 7, 1971

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, on Monday October 4, I was in Genoa, Italy as

a member of our country's delegation to that city's celebration of Columbus Day. Consequently, I was absent for the vote on House Concurrent Resolution 374, calling for humane treatment and release of American prisoners of war held by North Vietnam and its allies in Southeast Asia.

This resolution is similar in spirit and intent to House Concurrent Resolution 115, which I introduced on February 3, 1971. Had I been present Monday, I, of course, would have voted "yea" for the resolution.

NATIONAL HEALTH INSURANCE

HON. JERRY L. PETTIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 7, 1971

Mr. PETTIS. Mr. Speaker, the Ways and Means Committee is soon to begin extensive public hearings on national health insurance. One of the many facets to be considered is whether coverage for mental illness shall be included in the final package that is developed.

I believe that the following article from the October 4 issue of the American Medical News sheds some important light on whether coverage for mental sickness is feasible:

MENTAL ILLNESS COVERAGE URGED UNDER NHI

If and when Congress enacts a national health insurance program, it should include provisions for treating mental illnesses the same as physical ones.

This conclusion was reached at the annual conference of State Mental Health Representatives last month in Chicago sponsored by the American Medical Association's Council on Mental Health.

The conference devoted its attention to the topic, "National Health Insurance: Implications for Mental Health," through a series of workshops, each of which presented recommendations.

Workshop areas dealt with public psychiatric hospitals, private psychiatric hospitals, general hospitals, private practice, community mental health and neighborhood health centers, extended care and aftercare programs and facilities, and medical education.

All indicated that insurance coverage should be available for diagnostic and/or treatment of mental illness equal to that of physical illnesses.

The AMA's Mediredit proposal includes coverage for mental illnesses.

Max H. Parrott, M.D., chairman of the AMA's Board of Trustees, described its proposal at a luncheon. He expressed concern that attempted solutions "will force a crisis if implemented as written. The present system," he argued, "offers opportunity and under this we are better able to grow with the times than we would be under a monolithic system."

Dr. Parrott said that Sen. Edward Kennedy's proposed health insurance program would "ultimately lead to the demise of health insurance." Dr. Parrott declared:

"The plan of American medicine is not poured in concrete. It is a flexible one. But there are some factors on which our House of Delegates stands firm. These include a distinct preference for general revenue financing as opposed to a payroll tax or a mandated payment plan with an employer; freedom of choice, both for the physicians and the hospitals; pluralism of delivery methods; keeping peer review under the supervision of physicians; and maintaining local juris-

dition and opposing national licensure and national standards of practice."

Dr. Parrott insisted, "The prospect of national health insurance doesn't alarm the medical profession. But we are generally concerned that in the pursuit of health goals we are charging off in the wrong direction. We believe," he concluded, "that the American Medical Association is the organization that should provide that direction."

Actuarial data showing widespread coverage of mental disorders under insurance plans were presented by Evelyn S. Myers, coordinator of psychiatric care insurance coverage for the American Psychiatric Assn. and managing editor of the *American Journal of Psychiatry*.

After a look at the various current health insurance packages, Mrs. Myers compared the number of people with coverage of various kinds of care for mental illness with the number of people with coverage of care for all illness.

"The Social Security Administration estimated that at the end of 1969, 157 million persons in the U.S., or 78% of the civilian population, had some private health insurance of hospital care," Mrs. Myers said. "About 126 million or 63% of the population had some coverage for hospital care of mental conditions.

"About 134 million people or 67% of the population had some coverage for physicians' in-hospital visits; for mental conditions, about 108 million people or 54% of the population had some coverage.

"About 86.3 million persons or 43% of the population had some coverage for physicians' office visits; for mental conditions about 73 million or 36.5% of the population had some coverage."

She concluded, "Those persons with some coverage of care for mental illness comprise about 80% of the total with health insurance for any illness—be it for hospital care, physicians' in-hospital visits, or physicians' office visits. While recognizing that the mental illness coverage is often meager, we think this settles once and for all the question of whether insurance coverage of mental illness is feasible. How could it not be feasible when it is so widespread?"

ANTIWAR DEMONSTRATORS ARE FREED TO DO IT ALL OVER AGAIN

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 7, 1971

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, announcement that the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia had dismissed the some 12,000 criminal arrests growing out of the Mayday antiwar demonstrations last spring was followed the same day by the announcement from Hanoi's "dear American Friends" that new "antiwar" demonstrations are to be held again in Washington, D.C. starting October 22.

Apparently the Federal judges have not had enough, although Chief Justice Warren E. Burger—who reportedly meets all after—sundown—guests at his door with a pistol in hand—has announced plans to redesign all Federal courtrooms now under construction. Chief Justice Burger's explanation is that the Federal courtrooms need "be made more secure"—for the judges and with an English flavor.

In the meantime those unfortunate, misled, idealistic young people who claim

that they are against everything establishment continue to allow themselves to be exploited as ploys to soften public opinion for acceptance of the police-state rule by the establishment.

What better examples of pressure from the top, from the bottom, and in the preparation?

I insert related news clippings in the RECORD at this point:

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 2, 1971]

COURT VOIDS MOST CASES ON MAYDAY

(By Sanford J. Ungar)

The U.S. Court of Appeals here acted last night to strike down virtually everything that the government has done to prosecute the more than 12,000 people arrested during the Mayday antiwar demonstrations last spring.

A three-judge panel of the court ruled that the police must refund collateral to the overwhelming majority of the people who forfeited it during the demonstrations and subsequent legal proceedings.

It also placed a total ban on dissemination of all Mayday arrest records, even to the FBI, except for the fewer than 200 persons convicted for illegal activities during protests between April 28 and May 5.

In a sweeping order filed in a case brought by the American Civil Liberties Union on behalf of arrested demonstrators, the Appellate Court also:

Temporarily enjoined further prosecution of all the estimated 325 Mayday cases remaining to be processed, pending a thorough "screening" of them by the D.C. corporation counsel.

Ruled that the city prosecutor must provide "adequate notice" to all people who are still expected to appear for trial in connection with Mayday after the screening.

Directed the corporation counsel to track down any copies that may already have been made of Mayday arrest records and get them back into the metropolitan police department files.

Told the prosecutor to report back to the court "within a reasonable time demonstrating compliance" with an earlier injunction entered in the case as well as the one entered yesterday.

Warned that unless the corporation counsel can demonstrate "legitimate governmental interests" in another course of action, it may order all Mayday arrest records to be completely expunged except those of persons convicted after trial.

Retaining jurisdiction over the case, the panel—Chief Judge David L. Bazelon and Judges Harold Leventhal and Spottswood W. Robinson III—left open the option of taking further action later.

Sources at the ACLU hailed the Court of Appeals decision as an "almost total victory" for the critics of government action during the militant antiwar demonstrations intended to keep the capital city from functioning.

A spokesman for the corporation counsel's office suggested that parts of the court order may be virtually "impossible" to carry out.

The city prosecutor will be required, however, to produce detailed statistics on Mayday that have been sought in vain by the courts, the press and private groups for the last five months.

Within 20 days, the court order said, the corporation counsel must spell out:

The total number of persons arrested during the protests between April 28 and May 5. (Police estimates have been 12,000 to 13,000.)

The disposition of all cases, including how many were dropped, the collateral forfeited, resulted in convictions or acquittals after trial, etc. (Since forfeitures and no-contest pleas have been lumped with convictions in court records, no one has ever been certain of the exact number convicted.)

The number of dismissals and dropped

cases due to the police lack of standard field arrest forms and photographs for the defendant or the inability of witnesses to identify the alleged offender with his offense.

The number of people who have already sought expungement of their arrest records in D.C. Superior Court and the decisions in those cases.

During a Sept. 22 hearing that resulted in yesterday's ruling, the city representatives were unable to provide the court with any of that information.

Assistant Corporation Counsel David P. Sutton argued at that hearing that the ACLU's efforts to represent all of the arrested persons as a single class should be rejected, leaving each individual to initiate his own court action.

Informed of the court order by telephone last night, the city prosecutor's office was still unable to estimate how many people would be affected by each of its provisions.

A spokesman suggested that the part of the order requiring a refund of collateral could affect more than 3,000 persons. This would mean a refund of at least \$30,000 in fines.

Yesterday's court ruling, which reversed earlier decisions by U.S. District Court Judge Howard F. Corcoran, did not touch on the question of whether persons were illegally arrested and detained during the Mayday demonstrations.

Several lawsuits are pending that raise those questions, and the ACLU has mounted a fund-raising drive to finance additional broad legal actions critical of the government's response to the spring protests.

The White House and Justice Department have repeatedly praised Washington Police Chief Jerry V. Wilson for his handling of the mass demonstrations, and Wilson himself has insisted that he would follow the same course of action if such problems arose again.

Other court actions, however, have already struck down many of the Mayday arrests, including those made after the government revoked a camping permit for the demonstrators in West Potomac Park.

Some provisions of yesterday's court order leave the corporation counsel the option of sticking with its previous actions, but the court instituted strict procedural requirements.

In any case where it does not want collateral refunded, for example, the prosecutor's office must assure that probable cause existed for the individual's arrest in the first place and must demonstrate, by interviewing witnesses who would have been called at trial, that the case would have been a sound one.

If the Appellate Court eventually follows through and expunges the arrest records of those not convicted, the official record could show that only a few hundred people were arrested during Mayday.

As for the others, they may eventually be able to claim damages from the city under the requirements of another recent Court of Appeals decision holding the local government responsible for all wrongful police action.

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 2, 1971]

ANTIWAR ACTIONS SET HERE OCTOBER 22-26
(By Paul W. Valentine)

Thousands of demonstrators will return to Washington late this month to convene a "people's grand jury" against the Republican administration and serve an "eviction notice" on President Nixon in a mass civil disobedience action around the White House Oct. 26, antiwar spokesmen said yesterday.

Part of the antiwar movement's "fall offensive," the actions mark the first large-scale demonstrations planned here since the Mayday disruptions last spring.

Rennie Davis, veteran activist and spokesman for the Peoples Coalition for Peace and Justice, outlined these general plans:

A "grass roots" grand jury of "working

people, welfare mothers, people from the religious community, ex-prisoners and others" will be convened Oct. 22 to investigate Nixon administration policies, especially those pertaining to the Indochina war abroad and the treatment of prison uprisings at home. The jury will hear formal testimony from professional, academic and other witnesses.

A mass afternoon rally will be staged, probably at Sylvan Theater, on Oct. 25, Veterans Day, renamed "People's Armistice Day," by the antiwar movement. Speeches will be made and the grand jury will report its preliminary findings.

A public display of exhibits from the grand jury—enlarged photographs depicting ghetto poverty, alleged war atrocities, the siege of Attica State Prison and other items—will be shown simultaneously Oct. 25 on the Ellipse near the White House.

Protesters coming from the Sylvan Theater rally will conduct a candlelight procession around the White House on the evening of Oct. 25, carrying the grand jury displays with them.

The next morning (Oct. 26) at 7:30, demonstrators will surround the White House, Executive Office Building and Treasury Building. They will serve an "eviction notice" on Mr. Nixon, declare a "national mourning service" for the war dead, demand a work stoppage, block the buildings and possibly the surrounding streets if the government does not comply.

Davis said specific tactics of civil disobedience have not been worked out but "will depend somewhat on how the police behave."

He said organizers plan to negotiate with government officials for the use of Sylvan Theater and the Ellipse on Oct. 25 but will not seek any permits for the White House action Oct. 26.

The demonstrations will come two weeks after a national work strike and "moratorium on business as usual" called for Oct. 13 by the peoples coalition and the National Peace Action Coalition, the other large antiwar umbrella group in the nation.

The two coalitions have also set a series of traditional mass antiwar rallies for Nov. 6 in 16 cities, including Washington. Details for the Washington rally are being formed, Davis said, but it will probably be held on the Washington Monument grounds or at the Ellipse.

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

EFFICIENCY, SECURITY STRESSED—UNITED STATES TO REDESIGN COURTROOMS
(By Sanford J. Ungar)

Government architects have altered the blueprints for federal courtrooms now under construction, making them smaller and more "secure," in keeping with the expected recommendations of a committee of lawyers and judges named by Chief Justice Warren E. Burger.

The committee, which has inspected courtrooms in Chicago, San Francisco and London in preparing a report for the U.S. Judicial Conference, has been asked to make long-range design suggestions for nationwide implementation.

Sources close to the committee said yesterday that it will probably urge changes which increase the capacity of the federal courts for handling trials, while reducing courtroom spectators' space.

The new design plans raised the question whether the federal courts will continue to be able to accommodate large numbers of onlookers at controversial trials of special interest to the public.

Committee sources have stressed that security is only a secondary consideration to that of efficient design and operation.

"We paid a great deal of attention to courtroom security," one member said, pointing out that there had been discussion of the physical relationship of courtroom to cell-block and of the extent of public access.

Among the courtrooms visited, he said, was the one in Marin County, Calif., where black militant Angela Davis will be tried on first-degree murder.

Authorities have erected a "physical separation" between the trial participants and the public there, he explained.

The committee's report, based on months of study, is to be drafted at a meeting here Tuesday and presented to the Judicial Conference Oct. 28.

One aim, a committee member said, is to give the General Services Administration (GSA) new "guidelines" for courthouse and courtroom construction.

Under traditional specifications, which set out minimum size and little else, the committee member said, judges have often sat in "big mausoleums" while court calendars began to bulge with backlogs.

The committee is also expected to comment on a touchy issue in judicial politics, whether retired judges are entitled to retain full court facilities while newly appointed ones are shortchanged.

Robert L. Kunzig, the GSA administrator, who accompanied the committee members on the inspection tour, said yesterday that his agency has been "cooperating in every way" to facilitate the group's work.

He said new design techniques have already been incorporated in the federal courthouse under construction in Philadelphia.

As the committee is expected to recommend, that courthouse will contain more courtrooms—and smaller ones—than originally planned. Individual courtrooms being added to buildings around the country will be similarly adapted.

Every courthouse facility is expected, however, to keep at least one large ceremonial courtroom of the variety used for swearing in newly naturalized American citizens.

Chief Justice Burger named the committee last spring. It is officially labeled an ad hoc unit of the Judicial Conference, the organization linking all federal judges.

It includes federal district judges Edward J. Devitt of Minnesota, Lloyd F. MacMahon of New York, A. Sherman Christensen of Utah and Aubrey E. Robinson, Jr. of Washington.

Also on the panel are five prominent lawyers, W. Reece Bader of Chicago, William T. Kirbey of San Francisco, B. Warren Hart of St. Paul, Robert W. Meserve of Boston (scheduled to be the next president of the American Bar Association) and Edward Bennett Williams of Washington.

The chief justice has frequently expressed his concern about the need to achieve speedier justice in the federal courts.

In several speeches this year, he has also expressed his concern about courtroom security and the alleged misconduct of "a small minority of lawyers" whose vigorous advocacy has become an issue in trials with political overtones.

Burger was reportedly impressed with the courtrooms he and several committee members observed last July during London meetings of the ABA. In those courtrooms, the judge and other trial participants are on different levels, thus limiting their movement.

HON. WILLIAM D. COWGER

HON. EDWARD G. BIESTER, JR.

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 5, 1971

Mr. BIESTER. Mr. Speaker, one of the privileges of service in this House is the opportunity to come to know a host of extraordinary men and women as colleagues in this Chamber. Among the most

extraordinary in my brief experience here was, and how disconcerting it is to speak in the past tense, was Bill Cowger.

There was a clarity of purpose in Bill's public life. He wanted his city to be healed of racial division, he wanted his city to realize its enormous potential, and he wanted to find ways and means to carry into national policies the lessons he had learned as mayor of Louisville. These lessons were that racial division need not be a permanent scar in America and that our cities, if given the proper attention they deserve from Congress could become environments that grace their inhabitants' lives.

His strong, clear voice was naturally one the 90th Club wished to speak out in its behalf. We were proud to elect him our first president; and he was very proud to be chosen.

The ironies of life are often more than I can accept. How ironic and frustrating that at the moment his words are needed most they are suddenly hushed. But his vision for his city and for his country can still be attained, and I for one will always find an inspiration in his courage, his clarity of vision, and his optimism.

Our country has lost an extraordinary man at a time we can ill afford to do so.

WHAT IS BEHIND RED CHINA'S SMILE?

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 7, 1971

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, the forthcoming trip of President Nixon to Communist China is clearly based upon the American hope to reach a political accommodation with Peking that will promote stability and peace with honor in the Far East.

Americans often mistake their own fondest hopes and dreams for reality, thinking that the motivations which stimulate their own actions and policies are similar to those underlying the action and policies of their adversaries.

In an important article in the October Reader's Digest, Charles J. V. Murphy asks the question:

Has China begun to open the Bamboo curtain out of a genuine desire to promote good relations with the United States? Or is this only a ploy to soften public opinion here and abroad and advance other, real objectives?

A look at the record gives some indication of the answer to this question. Peking has given strong, long-term support to North Vietnam—well over a billion dollars during the past 5 years—and has recently announced its intention of increasing that support. On May 20, with the American Ping-pong players barely out of sight, the official newspaper of the Peking regime, *Jenmin Ji Pao*, quoted favorably an earlier declaration of Party Chairman Mao Tse-tung which urged the masses of the world to unite against "the U.S. aggressors and their running dogs."

Mr. Murphy declares that—

Peking's goals have . . . been plain, especially for those willing to study the record. An almost unending stream of manifestoes and pronouncements point irrefutably to a strategy of stirring up revolution among the masses of poor in the "have not" nations against the United States.

Peking has a number of steps by which it hopes to achieve its ends. These include breaking American guarantees to the Republic of China on Tiawan, capturing a seat in both the General Assembly and the Security Council of the United Nations, and raising China to the first rank of Asian powers.

Mr. Murphy once again looks to the record:

If one wants proof of how serious the Chinese are, consider their behavior with the Soviet Union and India, the two nations which in the beginning transacted the most political business with the Mao regime. In October, 1962 India's friendship collapsed in gunfire . . . Communist China's break with Moscow became apparent in 1960.

President Nixon should remember, Mr. Murphy cautions, that "Mao's men are hard bargainers, and neither Red China's smile nor summit negotiations guarantee peaceful relationships."

This article challenges many of the euphoric ideas we have been hearing about, the alleged "new page" which is being turned in relations between the United States and Communist China. I wish to share it with my colleagues and insert it into the RECORD at this time:

WHAT IS BEHIND RED CHINA'S SMILE?

(By Charles J. V. Murphy)

Last April 14, Chou En-lai, the urbane, 73-year-old premier of the People's Republic of China, smilingly welcomed an American ping-pong team at Peking's mammoth Great Hall of the People. There he told the first group of U.S. citizens admitted to mainland China since the communist takeover in 1949, "You have opened a new page in the relations of the Chinese and American people."

From that moment on, events moved at a dizzying pace. On July 15, President Nixon stunned the world with his announcement of plans to visit Red China. The invitation had been extended by Chou through the President's National Security Affairs adviser, Henry A. Kissinger, who had slipped into Peking for secret discussions. Just a few days later, in a terse, carefully phrased statement, Nixon declared it was his "profound conviction that all nations will gain from a reduction of tensions and a better relationship between the United States and the People's Republic of China."

There could be no doubt the President was proceeding with all deliberate speed into a test of his skill in historic negotiation. The crucial, even fateful, part of the proposition still remains to be developed. How serious, how well-intentioned are those on the other side of the bargaining table? Has China begun to open the Bamboo Curtain out of a genuine desire to promote good relations with the United States? Or is this only a ploy to soften public opinion here and abroad and advance other, real objectives?

Actions Speak. It is essential that Americans keep these questions sharply in mind and seek straightforward answers, no matter how attractive may be the promise of rapprochement with communism's most populous power. We must in wisdom give credence to any forth coming evidence that Communist China is changing her ways. But on the side of caution we must make sure that the balance sheet takes full measure of Peking's deeply ingrained patterns of behavior. For even as the Nixon Administration lifts the latch of China's door, it must

be recognized that Chou's hostile smiles do not negate his nation's all-too-familiar aggressive policies, both clandestine and open. Consider these typical items:

Peking has given strong, long-term support to North Vietnam—well over a billion dollars during the past five years—and has recently announced its intention of increasing that support. It maintains 20,000 troops in northern Laos, building roads aimed toward the Thailand frontier, and assists the communist guerrillas in their operations against the Royal Laotian government. Peking has provided arms for guerrilla forces in Thailand and Burma, and armed the primitive tribesmen on India's shaky north-east frontier.

On May 20, with the American ping-pong players hardly out of sight, the official newspaper of the Peking regime, *Jenmin Ji Pao*, drew attention to an earlier declaration by Communist Party Chairman Mao Tse-tung which urged the masses of the world to unite against the "U.S. aggressors and their running dogs." Taking note of the anti-war demonstrations in America, the paper hailed them as a hopeful sign of what it called the "violent revolutionary storms" sweeping over the United States.

Red China has lavished arms and military training on the radical East African nation of Tanzania. Now, she is furnishing an army of 10,000 Chinese laborers and an interest-free loan of \$406 million to build a 1000-mile railroad that will link Zambia in central Africa with Tanzania's port of Dar es Salaam on the Indian Ocean. While primarily benefiting landlocked Zambia by providing a shipping outlet that will free her from any dependence on transportation through white-ruled southern Africa, the railroad will also give Red China access to the vast copper deposits of central Africa.

None of these actions should be truly surprising, for Chairman Mao and his designated successor, Vice Chairman and Defense Minister Lin Biao, wield absolute power in Peking. Mao denounced "U.S. imperialism" as early as 1945. By 1949, he had openly dedicated the totalitarian power of the People's Government to a course of unyielding opposition to the United States. In 1950, American diplomats left China because, as Secretary of State Dean Acheson stated, they had "in effect been summarily ejected from their offices." Within a year, Red China intervened in the Korean conflict and drove advancing American and United Nations forces back to the 38th Parallel.

Redprint for Revolution. Given this long-continuing hostility toward the United States, we must stop and ask: What is Communist China now after? What does it expect to gain from a resumption of contacts with Americans and their leaders?

The U.S. hope is plain enough: to reach a political accommodation with Peking that will promote a measure of stability in East Asia so that its 1.2 billion people can live in peace, not fear.

Peking's goals have also been plain, especially for those willing to study the record. An almost unending stream of manifestos and pronouncements point irrefutably to a strategy of stirring up revolution among the masses of poor in the "have not" nations against the United States and other advanced industrial nations. The steps by which Peking hopes to achieve this:

1. Break American guarantees to Taiwan—whose defense we pledged in 1954—and thus destroy our relations with the government of the Republic of China. This would gravely jeopardize the freedom of Taiwan's 14 million people.

2. Capture a seat in the United Nations, both in the General Assembly and on the Security Council. Red China would then operate as leader, strategist and propagandist for the underdeveloped nations.

3. Oppose the Soviet brand of communism, manipulated by "revisionist Soviet imperial-

ists," as too peaceful and thus unworthy of leadership of the revolutionary world. In doing so, try to drive a wedge between any possible Washington-Moscow agreements.

4. Raise China to the first rank of Asian powers, so as to dominate the great arc of nations running from Japan along China's periphery through Southeast Asia to India. Much of this would come about automatically as neighboring states became convinced that the United States was an unreliable ally and the Soviet Union a false prophet of communism.

5. By dogged effort and the sweat of 800 million Chinese rigidly controlled by the Peking dictatorship, build China up to true superpower status. Peking would count on nuclear weapons and strategic missiles to deter America's use of its superior strength, and would hope eventually to overshadow the United States and Soviet Russia by superior political strategy and a "People's War."

To some, this might sound like madness or idle propaganda. But it is how Mao interprets the turmoil and discontent of our times; and, in fact, numerous young revolutionaries in the West now proclaim aspects of Maoist doctrine. Mao says in his famous "Little Red Book" of quotations, "War is the highest form of struggle for resolving contradictions." And in a policy statement called "Long Live the Victory of People's War!" published six years ago, Lin Piao likened North America and Western Europe to "world cities" and Asia, Africa and Latin America to "world rural areas." Lin Piao says, "In a sense, the contemporary world revolution presents a picture of the encirclement of cities by the rural areas." The fact that the "rural areas" hold the "overwhelming majority of the world's population" assures them, Lin Piao argues, ultimate victory over the better-armed industrial powers.

Fate of friends. If one wants proof of how serious the Chinese are, consider their behavior with the Soviet Union and India, the two nations which in the beginning transacted the most political business with the Mao regime. In October 1962, India's friendship collapsed in gunfire when Red China quickly massed troops on India's disputed northeast mountain frontier and subsequently humiliated Indian forces in a sudden surprise attack. Indian Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru, who had generally sided with Peking against U.S. Asian policies, privately confessed that he had trusted the Chinese but that they had double-crossed him.

Communist China's break with Moscow became apparent in 1960. It was due partly to Chinese impatience with Soviet unwillingness to join Peking in showing up American military power as a "paper tiger." In the years since, Chinese propagandists have kept Russia under a drumfire of dialectical invective. The so-called Khrushchev revisionists are branded as cowards for having "no faith in the masses," for being "afraid of U.S. imperialism, of war and of revolution."

Now the invective against both Moscow and Washington has been somewhat muted, and visitors to Communist China are seeing and reporting a gentler side of the Chinese character. As they take their guided tours of the great cities and the countryside, most tend to be impressed by the thrifty, industrious, astonishingly neat people, a nation singularly at peace with itself, at least outwardly. This is precisely the impression Peking's skillful propagandists want to convey. It is their hope that the outside world will overlook the conditions that actually exist in China.

For the human and economic costs of the "Great Cultural Revolution," initiated in 1966 when Mao sent "Red Guard" youths rampaging across the land, were disastrous. All higher education came to a dead stop (and has yet to regain its momentum). In a society where scholars have been venerated for millenniums, Mao's goal is to destroy the

elitist, classics-oriented system of education. Millions of college students and many professors have been sent to factories and communes to become "students of the masses," and scholars, scientists, technicians and administrators go into the factories to sweep floors or into the fields to spread manure while undergoing "ideological re-education."

The hurricane of revolutionary purging and civil strife exhausted China's economy. But Mao has succeeded in what he set out to do. In the aftermath of the convulsions, Chinese Communism has ended up substantially as a military dictatorship. Today, army officers hold nearly half (12 of 25) of the positions in the ruling politburo, and military men wield authority in most of the 29 provinces, autonomous regions and municipalities. Mao has vowed that the nation must learn discipline and revolutionary fervor from the military, and has deliberately shaped the three-million-man army as the instrument of his party control.

Open Eyes and Open Minds. Mao's men are hard bargainers, and neither Red China's smile nor summit negotiations guarantee peaceful relationships. We can prayerfully hope that Peking will demonstrate a real change in attitudes, for the benefit of Asia and all mankind. As the President so well knows, the risks are high in his "journey for peace," and no one should have undue expectations after more than two decades of enmity and aggression. Chou, we must also remember, has insisted to this day that his government cannot tolerate U.S. support of the Nationalist Chinese government on Taiwan. His unabashed aim is not only a seat in the United Nations but concurrent expulsion of the Taiwan delegation.

President Nixon, however, has assured Chiang Kai-shek that we will continue to honor our treaty to help defend the island. Meanwhile, all our allies are watching to see how we respond to Peking's moves in the crucial private negotiations that lie ahead.

It is a striking omen that in international diplomatic circles Soviet officials are privately opposing the seating of Peking in the United Nations. They fear that, once there, the Red Chinese are likely to win over a great deal of African and Asian support hitherto split among themselves, the Americans and the Europeans, and that dangerous strategic instabilities will result.

All the same, a new page is turning in relations between Communist China and the United States. Seldom has an American President been called upon to navigate such a hazardous course between friends and adversaries. As the time nears for him to go to Peking, we can only await the outcome with open eyes, open minds—and crossed fingers.

GOVERNOR GILLIGAN, OF OHIO, TESTIFIES ON ECONOMIC POLICIES

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 7, 1971

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, today, October 7, Gov. John J. Gilligan of Ohio delivered some very thoughtful testimony to the House Banking and Currency Committee concerning the present state of the economy and some of the possible steps which we must take to improve our economic situation.

The Governor and I both represent a State where, as he points out in his testimony, there are now 99,872 citizens claiming unemployment benefits and

where 40,000 others have totally exhausted their unemployment benefits. We represent a State where 32,000 returned Vietnam veterans have been unable to find jobs—even though some have been in the labor market for over 18 months.

Governor Gilligan makes some very important observations and suggestions in his testimony. I recommend his statement to all my colleagues as we in the Congress continue to try to correct the present desperate economic conditions.

The statement follows:

TEXT OF GOV. JOHN J. GILLIGAN'S TESTIMONY BEFORE THE HOUSE BANKING AND CURRENCY COMMITTEE

Mr. Chairman and distinguished members of the committee: I am profoundly honored to be asked to appear before this distinguished Committee to offer some comments on the President's new economic game plan from my vantage point as Governor of the State of Ohio, a state of 11 million people that has historically played an important role in the industrial foundation of the American economy, and has been traditionally responsible for about 5% of our gross national product.

Let me say at the very outset that much of what I will offer for the consideration of the members of this Committee is based upon speculation and surmise, since no one really knows what the President may be planning to announce for Phase II, or Phase III, of his new program of economic controls.

An Administration spokesman was recently quoted in a national news magazine as saying, "Of course we are jittery. It's like blasting off in a two-stage rocket while the mechanics are still working on the second stage. The fact is that we don't have all the answers and we are committed to a course. This would make anyone nervous."

If that Administration spokesman is nervous in his position as a member of the launching crew, it is fair to say that those of us who must, willy-nilly, ride aboard the economic spacecraft designed by the President and his advisors are deeply apprehensive. Since we are uncertain as to where we are going, or how the flight director proposes to get us there, it might be useful to consider first where we are in the present state of the American economy.

At the recent National Governors' Conference in Puerto Rico, a substantial majority of the Governors present subscribed without equivocation to a statement outlining the dimensions of the economic crisis which presently grips America. They pointed out, among other things, that "Our country now has the highest unemployment level in a decade, coupled with the highest rate of inflation in 20 years, the lowest business profits since 1938, the first negative balance of trade in this century, a disastrous cost-price ratio in agriculture, and the largest deficit in the Federal budget since World War II. One-fourth of existing factory capacity is idle. In short, it has finally been admitted that we are faced with the worst economic crisis in a generation."

While economists have estimated that 28% of America's plant capacity now stands idle, Vice President Agnew, in an address to the Governors in San Juan, declared that it was the Administration's view that it is unrealistic to believe that any substantial share of that idle industrial capacity could be put to use unless America became involved in a major war. Without any further comment, I will simply ask the members of this committee to mediate upon the long and short range implications of that astounding statement.

Permit me to attempt to translate the statistics of idle plant capacity into more human terms as they apply in my own state.

Ohio is a major industrial state with a

widely diversified base of primary industries; coal and steel production, fabrication, assembly and distribution of manufactured products of all sorts.

Two years ago this month the number of Ohioans claiming unemployment benefits under Ohio law was 23,582. Last year that figure had come to 63,562. Last week it was 99,872—and there are, moreover, 40,000 Ohioans who have exhausted their unemployment benefits, and are now no longer even a statistic in the unemployment compensation reports.

That means that in two years almost 100,000 Ohioans have lost their jobs, and their families today are facing privation, (deprivation), and despair.

Starting as these figures may appear, they only trace the outlines of the problem. They do not take into account thousands of unemployed Ohio workers, who were laid off from their jobs not covered by the provisions of unemployment compensation programs. They do not deal with the problem of tens of thousands of young Ohioans coming into the job market in the last two years who have yet to find their first job, and who face a future that is bleak indeed.

I am not talking only about the high school and college graduates who are walking the streets searching for employment; I am talking as well about the men returning from service in Viet Nam.

Ohio was the first state to launch a program in which we sought to identify, and locate, every single returning Viet Nam veteran, to find out where he lived, what his phone number was, whether he was employed or in school, what his job skills might be, so that we could help him to reestablish himself in what the troops call "the real world."

We found that there were no less than 32,000 Ohio boys who had served their country in Vietnam yet could not find a job, although some of them had been searching for as long as 18 months. Many of them had families to support; many were reduced to asking for welfare; and it is not easy for me to convey to the members of this Committee the kind of resentment and bitterness which we found among these men who feel that this Nation has used them in an ugly and useless war, and as a reward for their sacrifice, has now consigned them to a sort of human scrap heap.

Again the statistics I have cited reveal nothing about tens of thousands of Ohioans who are still employed, but who are working shorter hours with less overtime, and who are bringing home reduced pay checks that are totally inadequate to meet the higher prices for every commodity and service their families require.

Last year, for the first time in 20 years, the real income of fully employed Ohio workers turned downwards! And I can only say again that the bare statistics are incapable of conveying the kind of economic distress and wide-spread suffering which press upon thousands and thousands of Ohio families.

As part of the answer to this problem the Administration has recommended an investment tax credit for industry, designed to encourage investment in new machinery and equipment, in the apparent hope that such investment will produce new jobs. That device should certainly be more effective than the earlier proposal of accelerated depreciation schedules for equipment and machinery already on the line; but no one should be deluded into believing that this constitutes any really effective response to the kind of problem that I have just outlined.

Some employment may result, but we all recognize that while new machinery and equipment often increase production, there is frequently a concomitant sharp reduction in the use of human labor in the productive process. And the experience over the last 20 years in our basic industry in Ohio is that production levels may well climb while em-

ployment levels in those same industries sag.

It would, in my judgment, be very dangerous for the Congress to assume that the tax credit approach will provide an automatic or effective means of cutting substantially into the unemployment problem. It has been estimated, for instance that we will need 4 million new jobs in America next year, to bring unemployment levels below 5%! I am not a trained economist, but I would most respectfully suggest to this committee and to the Congress, that America must face the fact that these new jobs simply will not be developed in the private industrial production field, but must be developed in the fields of services and most especially in government services.

That brings me to the consideration of the very great problem in the field of public employment, and of the impact upon public employees of the measures already invoked by the President, including the wage-price freeze as well as the measures designed to stimulate additional employment in the field of private production.

Much has been said of the basic inequity of an across-the-board wage freeze, but let me attempt to relate that criticism to some of the fundamental facts of life in Ohio.

The State of Ohio today employs approximately 55,000 people, almost 3,000 less than during the month of August, because we were forced to dismiss hundreds of employees due to insufficient state tax revenues. Local government employs over 65,000 people in Ohio, and in some of our major cities hundreds of these employees have been laid off because of reduced municipal budgets.

There are 100,000 teachers in Ohio schools, and again hundreds of them have been dismissed because of inadequate resources available to the school boards.

It has been estimated that state and local governments throughout the Nation in the past year lost 3.5 billion dollars because of the impact of the current recession on anticipated tax yields.

Clearly, therefore, unemployment in the public sector is directly attributable to the economic policies of the national administration.

I would emphasize that almost all of these public employees are completely without the protection of unemployment compensation, and when dismissed they are immediately confronted with economic disaster. Hundreds of them are quickly reduced to absolute destitution. While welfare rolls continue to swell, there are those who would demand that welfare recipients simply go out and find a job. Where?

In March of this year I presented to our General Assembly the results of a study of income levels of state employees in Ohio compared to people doing similar work in the Federal Government, and other states, and in the private sector. We discovered that while the average weekly wage paid in Ohio industry was \$151.45, the average wage in state government was \$130.71. We discovered further that while in the spring of 1970 the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics declared that a minimum budget for a family of four was \$6960 a year, and that anyone living below that level could be considered to be living in poverty, fully 60% of our full time state employees were earning less than that.

Incredible as it may sound, our study revealed that under the terms of the 1970 Disaster Relief Act, due to go into effect in December, nearly 2,000 full time employees disclosed that several hundred employees actually qualified for welfare assistance under the very low income standards established by our State.

I therefore recommend to the General Assembly an across-the-board wage increase of 16%, and about 2500 separate adjustments for specific job classifications within the wage structure. This proposal was designed to bring state employees up to a level with

other states and with private industry. Although we are 2½ months into the new fiscal year, our General Assembly has not yet approved a biennial budget, and has not yet acted upon the pay package for state employees. Now it is apparently the intention of the Administration, by executive edict, to freeze the income levels these thousands of Ohio public employees at their present inadequate and unfair levels. Such a proposal clearly seems to me to represent a body blow to the effort to reestablish some basic equities, and to revitalize our Nation's economy.

Moreover, the President has announced his intention to reduce the Federal Government's payroll by 5%, and if we in Ohio are to take our proportionate share of such cutbacks, the result will be an additional 5 to 6 thousand unemployed.

I don't believe that I can overstate the case: millions of American men and women are engaged in public service employment today, doing work of every conceivable description, work that is vitally important to the standard of living which all of us enjoy. Millions more can, and should, be employed in the public sector, making their own contribution to the fields of education, public health, air and water pollution control, crime control and public safety, and all the other activities which are so capable of enriching the life of our society. To cut back spending in the public sector is a double disservice: it has a direct and deleterious effect upon quality of life in all our communities, and it disempowers, or denies employment opportunity, to millions of Americans who are eager to work, and to put their skills and efforts at the service of their fellow citizens. The proposed tax credits won't touch this problem. Wage freezes, laid on across-the-board, will exacerbate the present inequities. Reductions in public spending for domestic purposes will render the problem finally insoluble.

I know that the members of this Committee will understand that the task before all of us is to put Americans back to work, in useful employment—whether in the public or private sectors—at income levels which permit people to live in decency and dignity, and to raise their families in security.

Again, I want to thank the Chairman, and the members of this committee for permitting me to express my views on this critical problem.

OPPOSITION TO WYLIE AMENDMENT—HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 191

HON. JAMES C. CORMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 7, 1971

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, when the House Judiciary Committee held hearings on the school prayer amendment in 1964 they discovered that the opposition to its enactment came from no particular special interest groups. Extensive opposition testimony was heard not only from church officials but also from renowned education and constitutional law authorities. As an example of the thinking of these learned men, I would like to insert at this time the testimony of Dr. Virgil M. Rogers, dean of the School of Education, Syracuse University:

TESTIMONY OF VIRGIL M. ROGERS,
WASHINGTON, D.C.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, my name is Virgil M. Rogers, and I am honored to have this opportunity today to tell the members

of the Judiciary Committee why I have faith in the efficacy of the first amendment to the U.S. Constitution, and why it is my conviction that Congress needs to pass no law or resolution in matters of prayer and religion.

I am here primarily as a schoolman, as one who has accumulated a certain amount of experience over some 40 years as a teacher in the public schools, as a superintendent of schools in such widely different States as Michigan, Illinois, and Colorado, and as a dean in a university (Syracuse University, New York State). I have spent most of my adult life as a schoolman, working to improve public education and to bring closer to realization the ideals that give purpose and meaning to the institutions designed to bring children to responsible adulthood.

Parenthetically, Mr. Chairman, may I say that my children went through the public schools and my grandchild is in public schools and I hope the next two or three coming along, will also go through the public schools. So I am speaking as a person who is very close to public education. I don't represent anybody here today except myself and indirectly perhaps a million teachers over the country who are deeply concerned about this and from whom you will not hear.

Like most workers in the public schools, I have found the concepts of patriotism and free public education inseparable. It is especially for that reason that I wish to present my views to the committee.

There are four points which I should like to make:

(1) The public schools have been designed as a unifying agency in our many-faceted society, and the introduction of any provision making for divisiveness cannot wisely be encouraged. The Becker amendment would, in my view, be such a provision.

(2) The Becker amendment would unleash upon us a Pandora's box of troubles in the form of questions which could not satisfactorily be answered or resolved.

(3) The issue now before the committee is not the desirability of prayer or the desirability of Scripture reading, but the right of the individual, child, or adult, to pursue his own way in religious matters, uncoerced by the state.

(4) With authority for the conduct of the classroom vested by the state in the teacher and the administrator, there can be no such thing as truly "voluntary" participation in classroom prayer or Scripture reading. Let us then proceed to these points.

(1) It is with pride that we speak of our public schools as the paramount agency for bringing together children of various origins, of different colors and cultural backgrounds. The aim is not that we shall all be made to become alike but that our differences shall be respected to our mutual advantage and to the advantage of the Nation. It is important that the schools have accepted these differences without embarrassment to the child, and have worked to promote shared experiences and common concern, without which it would be impossible for our multifarious society to function.

The absence of religious sectarianism from our schools has been most welcome because it has meant the absence of an unnecessary divisive force. Were we now to adopt the Becker amendment, we should be opening the door to such a force—always latent, we know, in our culture, but largely confinable to the private sector, to our voluntary churches, synagogues, and temples, and to other institutions which we are free to support or neglect, to attend or avoid, to strengthen or oppose, with the state helping none as against another and therefore truly strengthening each one. Even the certainly well-meant provision of the amendment for "voluntary participation" is in itself a divisive element."

(2) The Becker amendment would unleash into our midst many troublesome questions. May the teacher's participation in classroom religious exercises also be "voluntary"? Will teachers, on request, also be excused from prayers? In such a case, what will be the reaction of the pupils, who often look to their teachers as models or examples? Will some parents demand that nonpraying (in public) teachers be dismissed? Shall we thus then, in effect, be reintroducing a religious test for the employment of teachers—a practice long since abandoned.

Above all, there is the question of which prayer is to be used. Whose prayer? Taught by whom? Must the teacher be ready with a prayer to fit the child? Can any religion be advantaged by having some watered down form of common prayer recited, as the multiplication table is recited, by children whose parents may be in complete disagreement over forms of worship?

Whose Scripture is to be used? Various Christians groups read from different Bibles, in only a part of which they have common cause with the Jews. To other groups these Bibles have no validity, and to some it is repugnant to refer to religious matters in unsegregated classrooms. Each of the 264 national religious bodies has zealots in the wings, waiting for the opportunity to promote their own educational program with public support. Some teach their children that it is a sin to come to my church or to go to yours; some, that it is a sin to dance in the gymnasium. (I have been castigated and had sermons preached against me as a school official for allowing students to have dances in the high school gym.) Some, that it is a sin to read books that I might wish all youth to read.

Research studies in some of our larger cities have disclosed that in some classrooms with an average of 32 pupils, we may find as many as 22 religious affiliations or loyalties. How can a teacher find any religious verbalization that will not have potentiality for offense to at least someone in her classroom?

For me as a Christian, not the least troublesome among the many troublesome questions is one I should have to ask myself whether anyone asked it of me or not: How can I square this amendment with the specific admonition not to pray "to be seen of men" but instead to "enter thou into the closet" where prayer may be personal and individual?

The CHAIRMAN. In extending your remarks I wish you would put in that entire passage from St. Matthew.

(Subsequently, Mr. Rogers supplied the following:)

"And when thou prayest, thou shalt not be as the hypocrites are: for they love to pray standing in the synagogues and in the corners of the streets, that they may be seen of men. Verily I say unto you, They have their reward.

"But thou, when thou prayest, enter into thy closet, and when thou hast shut thy door, pray to thy Father which is in secret; and thy Father which seeth in secret shall reward thee openly."—Matthew 6: 5-6.

(3) I cannot underscore too strongly the point that the issue now before the committee is not the desirability of prayer or the desirability of Scripture reading, but the right of the individual, child, or adult, to pursue his own way in religious matters, uncoerced by the state.

It was because the Founding Fathers knew well the evils attendant upon such coercion that they chose to have none of it, and to protect us as yet unborn generations from those evils which we might be inclined to minimize because we lacked firsthand experience with them. Thus our governmentally controlled institutions were designed as "secular"—that is, civilly con-

trolled, which is not necessarily the same thing as "godless."

I would like to stress that point because I heard Mr. Billy Graham equate these terms on one occasion.

The history of many major religions includes numerous acts of martyrdom of men and women who chose to stand up for their faith in the face of persecution, torture, and other forms of opposition.

You heard Mr. Pfeffer's quotations of the Catholics who had the courage to fight back when the public schools were dominated by Protestants.

Unfortunately that still is sometimes true and in some cases the reverse is true. It is indeed deplorable that faithful, conscientious human beings should be put to this kind of test.

Were we to authorize prayer in our schools, we should be imitating certain totalitarian countries whose classrooms I have visited, where teachers are required to teach atheism, and the schools to maintain museums of atheism where all religions are ridiculed and downgraded. In countries where there is aggressive, government-sponsored atheism, it is necessary for a practicing Christian, Muslim, or Jew to stand up and be counted, sometimes allegedly without penalty. But we know that there is a penalty, whether exacted by the state or by neighbors who make it difficult for the individual who deviates from majority practice. Some neighbors practice discrimination in such cases because they are weak, some do it because they are fanatics, and still others do it hypocritically because they think this demonstrates their own loyalty to their government by picking on their devout fellow citizens. This we do not wish to encourage in our land. The public schools have helped us free ourselves from these barbarities.

We come finally to the question of what can be done "on a voluntary basis" in a public school classroom where 30 or so boys and girls represent religious groups as various as Southern Baptist, Protestant Episcopalian, Hebrew (which has also its divisions), Roman Catholic, Greek, or Russian Orthodox, Muslim, Coptic, Unitarian, Ethical Society, Black Muslim, Christian Scientist, Unity, Quaker, Jehovah's Witness, atheist.

I ask you, gentlemen of the Congress, what can be the meaning of "voluntary" for a third grader among his fellows and under the surveillance of the state authority in his classroom, represented by the teacher standing over the class and the school administration in the principal's office?

The teacher assigns the child his lessons in the secular subjects comprising his ordinary school day. She directs him to recite his number tables, to write his grammar lesson on the blackboard, possibly to remain after school for not performing as the teacher judged he should have done.

Now this same teacher—this person of unique authority—invites him to "volunteer" in an act of religious worship in the presence of some 30 of his peers and under pressure from either their open stares or their furtive glances. Because his prestige among his peers is involved, there can be no real connection between his action and the generally accepted meaning of the word volunteer.

The child thus invited has two choices, both unhappy if he cannot wholeheartedly accept. He may (a) go along with the majority out of weakness or indifference or (b) he may stand up and in effect announce that he is not eligible to the "brotherhood" of his fellow students.

Not only are both these alternatives bad; they are unnecessary. Let us permit the first amendment to continue to protect the child from being thus led toward simulation and hypocrisy, and the sense of being subtly excluded from the brotherhood of man into which, according to our major religions—he was born.

I believe that the Supreme Court prayer and Bible rulings take religion away from no one and force it upon no one. That makes religious sense, too, in light of the announced desire of the inspirer of a great religion to "draw all men unto me" rather than to impose Himself. As a nation under the Constitution, as interpreted by the Supreme Court, we have chosen the dream of Roger Williams: The civil state and the secular or civic-controlled school rather than the Puritan oligarchy of early Massachusetts, which in the name of religion hanged Mary Dyer on Boston Commons. As Zechariah Chafee, Jr. points out in his book, "The Blessings of Liberty," which I commend to all Americans: "If the noble ideal of the Puritan had persisted, there would be no godless schools in Massachusetts, and there would be nobody in her churches but Congregation lists."

I am a member of the Congregational Church myself.

In conclusion, I believe in the separation of church and state, for the sake of the church as well as the state, and for the sake of all our citizens. To allow prayer in the publicly supported classroom would be a violation of American tradition which has been found to be useful and sound. The principle of separation has served us well because it has afforded equal opportunity of religious worship to all faiths, the large and the small, including those of unpopular or unconventional approach.

Indeed, Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion. So be it. And let Congress make no law favoring prayers or ritualistic religious observance in the public schools.

I would like to close my remarks, Mr. Chairman, with one or two brief observations. My interest is that of a schoolman, who knows the difficulties of implementing such things in the classroom. Religious differences have no equals that I know of in terms of havoc that can be wreaked in otherwise peacefully cooperating communities. I want only to shed light with reference to children and their parents and their concerns. To be nondenominational a prayer would have to be collaborated upon carefully. Would not a prayer composed by a process of collaboration automatically become an official prayer? You gentlemen have a difficult task. You will be castigated by some no matter what your decision. Some of you have made serious studies of the problem of separation of church and state. As a long-time schoolman I say that I cannot honestly conceive of a valid measure that could be devised that would accomplish the ends sought here, which I take to be allowing freedom of expression to a possible majority without offense or embarrassment in any form to a minority.

Much has been said in the discussions these past 2 days about the question of going back to the way things were earlier. They were in fact not so idyllic as some have thought. That is why at long last after a number of small eruptions down through the years the grievances finally surfaced dramatically in the form of the test case of the New York State Regents' Prayer. The question did not arise in the homogeneous community of my South Carolina childhood. But these questions do arise in the heterogeneous community of my little granddaughter's kindergarten. Her class includes one child from Japan, one from Nigeria, and two from Turkey. Her teacher is Jewish as are possibly a fourth or a fifth of the pupils in her room. Some children are Catholic, some children are Protestant of a whole variety of denominations. Even in the old homogeneous community how clumsy we must have been and how thoughtless. What heartaches and secret embarrassments we must have caused. How unbelievably patient some of our Jewish friends have been over the years. So let us not go back.

The wisdom of our Founding Fathers is something to be constantly marveled at. They could not have conceived of our present complexity of population. Yet they provided for it with an uncanny sureness of touch. Surely God must have guided these men to have enabled them to provide so wisely. It was the missionary Schweitzer who said that example is not the main thing in teaching others—it is the only thing. In the final analysis it is truly the only thing. So must any religion we have be communicated.

As automation provides us with more time outside our daily work, religion is one field toward which man may properly turn his interests.

Thank you very much, sir.

THE PESHTIGO FIRE

HON. JOHN W. BYRNES

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 7, 1971

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow will mark the 100th anniversary of the Peshtigo Fire, the most disastrous forest fire in our Nation's history. On October 8, 1871, a fire killed over 1,200 people and devastated over 900 square miles on both sides of the waters of Green Bay in Wisconsin, completely destroying the town of Peshtigo and other communities.

Over 800 lives were lost in the town of Peshtigo and several hundred more perished in other areas including the Door County peninsula. Over 2 billion trees were destroyed and property damage was estimated at over \$5 million in 1871.

Fate decreed that the Peshtigo Fire fell on the same day as the "Great Chicago Fire" which claimed 250 lives in that city. The devastating nature of both fires was probably due to the same climatic factor. From June to October of that year only occasional rains fell in the Midwest. Both forests and buildings were ideally prepared to feed the flames.

On the west side of Green Bay the fire swept through an area 40 miles long and 10 miles wide in 4 hours, completely destroying the town of Peshtigo in less than 1 hour.

The citizens of the city of Peshtigo of today will be commemorating this great holocaust for the next 3 days, including a ceremony at a mass grave, where over 300 unidentified victims of the fire are buried.

The tremendous effects of this fire are well described in the following recent article by Dave Devenport of the Green Bay Press-Gazette, which I include as part of my remarks:

PESHTIGO REMEMBERS THE FIRE

(By Dave Devenport)

PESHTIGO.—Framed and hanging on the wall in a prominent spot at the Peshtigo Historical Museum is a yellowed copy of a newspaper, 100 years old and describing the horrors of a hissing hell.

It reads:

"There is little heart to write tales of these sad and fearful times. Eyewitnesses cannot describe them by word. The pen can only give an idea and hardly even that of the woe, the weeping, the wailing, the homes ruined, the lives lost . . .

"We say we cannot describe the scenes; we

cannot. Infants clasped in mothers' last embrace; actual lines of dead from the once happy farm house to the adjoining creek, charred groups, blackened corpses, crumbling bones, lacerated and torn members; the smiling babyhood a few hours past, the adolescent, the old, in the horrid heap of death, is all that is left of the country traveled over.

"The roads are strewn with dead horses, oxen, cows, swine, fowl. Even the untamed of the forest flew towards civilization for relief, only to find death in their flight . . ."

The words were a first-hand report in a semi-weekly newspaper The Oconto Lumberman. It was written by a reporter who visited the Peshtigo area on Oct. 9, 1871—the day after over 800 persons were burned to death in flames that resulted in the greatest loss of human life from a fire in American history.

Oct. 8, 1871, was a Sunday. The air hung heavy over the community that morning and a copper sun hovered above. It was dry. Nearly every day that summer was dry because 1871 was one of the most parched in the memory of northern Wisconsin settlers.

Only a shower in July and a drizzle in September had interrupted the drought that dried out the entire countryside. People went to church and went about their usual Sunday business and activities. Families settled down to Sunday dinners, others sat in saloons, drinking and playing cards.

By late afternoon, white ashes drifted into town. Because fires had spread in other areas, the people of Peshtigo knew what was coming. About 9 p.m., a red glow appeared over the tree tops. Then a rumble, a brisk wind, then flames.

Pine sidewalks were suddenly ablaze, buildings flashed into flames, housetops were torn away by the wind, marsh gas exploded—and people burned to death.

Over 800 lost their lives in the Peshtigo area alone. Men sought to save their families in homes and perished. Mothers ran with their babies, many of them collapsing in the streets to be engulfed by flames. Children were separated from their parents and were trampled by the fleeing crowd. Others simply sat down and waited to die, all hope abandoned.

But many ran for the Peshtigo River, which separated the east and west sides of town. Thinking the bridge over the river would provide safety to the other side, people from both sides clamored onto the structure, only to meet each other.

The bridge collapsed, killing many while others drowned. A girl's hair caught fire and she was turned into a living torch. One man carried his injured wife to the river, jumped in, turned and lifted whom he thought to be his wife into the water. He began to scream insanely when he found he had rescued another woman and his wife had burned to death.

Many who could not reach the river committed suicide. There was one report that a father slashed the throats of his wife and three children, then killed himself.

Those who reached the river crowded in with cattle and other animals. They dodged burning logs and bobbed their heads under water when their hair caught fire.

A woodenware factory was struck by a gust of wind and exploded, raining thousands of tubs, buckets, broom handles and other items into the river, steaming the water and burning dozens who thought they were safe.

People who lived in neighboring Sugar Bush also suffered, with over 100 lives lost. In an hour's time, nearly all of Peshtigo and Sugar Bush were leveled. The fire raged north and east, razed the tiny village of Birch Creek, Mich., but touched only the outskirts of Marquette and Menominee, Mich.

The fire raced toward Green Bay, destroying 68 buildings there. Flames, swept by the winds, devastated the peninsula, destroying

all or most of Robinsonville, New Franken, Williamsonville, Brussels and Little Sturgeon.

Finally, it was dawn. Fires began to die down and an autumn chill moved in. Some who spent the night in the Peshtigo River died of fever and shock. But 150 persons made their way out of the water. Some slumped to the ground, others walked slowly into what had been their town. They found black posts, trunks of giant trees reduced to cinders, twisted iron railroad tracks, blackened bodies, charred remains of animals.

Some of the survivors told about a man named "Big John" Mulligan, a lumber gang foreman, who walked six miles to Marinette to shock the citizens there in telling them what had happened. Wagons filled with supplies were dispatched to Peshtigo and rescue teams began to collect and bury the bodies.

About 24 hours later, it rained.

When the toll of dead was finally tallied, 855 were dead in the Peshtigo-Sugar Bush area, 75 in the peninsula (Door-Kewaunee Counties), 22 at Birch Creek, and over 200 at logging camps and isolated homes scattered over the countryside.

There are many accounts of what happened that day. Mollie and Nellie Anderson were granddaughters of August Jacobson, who moved his family to Peshtigo from Sweden in 1870. The Jacobsons moved in with the Lars Hansen family, sharing a double house.

Mollie and Nellie wrote down what their mother had told them and their story has been printed and framed in another niche of the Peshtigo museum. They remember the men and boys fighting the fires day and night, the fierce wind whipping the flames, before their grandfather finally shouted, "Fire, fire, gather your family and run for the river!"

Hilma Jacobson, who was 13 then and later was to be the mother of Mollie and Nellie, took the hand of 5-year old Aagot Hansen and they ran for the water, only to fall into a train table. They were pulled out by other members of the two families.

Hilma's mother tied her wedding ring in the corner of her shawl, but lost the shawl as she ran. Two sons, Charlie and Gus, were believed lost, but were found the next morning floating on a log.

Both families survived. As Mrs. Jacobson walked to the ruins of her home, she found the remains of her scorched shawl. The ring was still inside, but the gold had been damaged by the heat. The ring is on display at the museum.

Mrs. Cecil Engels, Marinette, also remembers hearing the story several times from her mother, Katherine Hale LeBlond, who was the daughter of Levi and Hannah Hale.

"The town was almost encircled by forests, and the men in the town had been concerned for some time with the small bonfires left by picnickers and maintenance men on the railroad . . . For some time the fire, coming in their direction, had worried the men of Peshtigo.

"Finally, they plowed a wide strip of land all around the town. They thought the fire could not burn the freshly turned soil, and any place where it might get a foothold could be controlled . . . They had not taken into account winds of hurricane force."

Mrs. Engels said the family was eating their evening meal "when Grandpa excused himself, saying he was going upstairs and take a look out of the west window at the fire. He said quietly to Grandma that she should pack anything precious she wanted to save right away as he feared there might be trouble before morning. He then left and went out to the barns.

"But by this time Grandpa was not calling, but yelling to drop everything and get to the creek or be burned . . . Fire was everywhere." According to Mrs. Engels, they grabbed some large pans to keep their faces and hair wet.

"At last morning came, and they emerged

from their all night bath, wet, cold and hungry. They went across to the stone basement of what had been their home. It was built into the side of a little hill, and the upper portion of the house had been entirely blown or burned away.

"According to Mother, Grandpa then built a bonfire from the remains of the back fence and the wood pile, and they dried their wet clothes. While their clothes were drying, Grandpa was anxious to see what happened in the town and went down there.

"When he returned, he came and put his arm around Grandma and said, 'Hannah, everything that we have worked for and saved for years is gone, but every person I have talked to downtown has lost at least some loved one, some three or more. We must never complain, we are rich indeed. We have each other and our two girls.'"

Mrs. Engels said her mother told her that even though she was only a little girl, she would always remember her father's story of devastation downtown—weeping mothers, crying babies, no place to go and nothing to eat.

Peshtigo will commemorate the tragedy with a centennial Oct. 8-9-10. Several activities will be included, and church bells will toll for five minutes before a procession starts from the Chollette Hotel late Friday afternoon to the mass grave and monument. Over 300 unidentified bodies were buried there.

WACL CONDEMNS TRIP TO PEKING

HON. JOHN G. SCHMITZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 7, 1971

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, the fifth conference of the World Anti-Communist League was held in the Philippines from July 22 to 25, 1971. Attended by 251 delegates from 44 countries, the conference passed a number of resolutions, one of which I include in the Record for the edification of my colleagues:

CONDEMNING THE PROPOSED TRIP OF PRESIDENT RICHARD M. NIXON TO COMMUNIST CHINA

Whereas, the projected trip of President Richard M. Nixon of the United States to Red China will surely undermine our purposes and ideals as an organization;

Whereas, it is not our purpose in registering this objection to interfere with the internal government of the United States;

Whereas, we believe that as citizens of Latin America and of the entire free world it is our duty to inform President Nixon of the catastrophe that will certainly engulf the whole free world if he carries on this trip on invitation of Mao Tse Tung;

Therefore, Be it Resolved:

1. That this resolution be issued by the WACL in its 5th Conference so that the whole world may know what dire consequences will follow in the event that President Nixon carries out this objective to visit Red China.

Be it further resolved that we register our protest to Mr. Nixon himself because of the following reasons:

1. It is well known that in accordance with our historical experience talks with the Communists have never produced beneficial results because the Communists have not been able, or have not wished to fulfill their own promises nor have the Communists observed solemn treaties like those of Potsdam, Yalta and other places, a fact which have enabled the Bolsheviks to subjugate the peoples of Central Europe, to imprison and enslave them in concentration camps within the Iron Curtain;

2. To extend a hand to Mao Tse-tung and

his cohorts of despots is tantamount to giving him an indemnity for his criminal treatment and aggression against millions of Chinese who have been deprived of liberty and human rights, making them victims of his crimes and acts of gangsterism, drowning them in seas of blood in what has been called the "Great Leap Forward" and the "Cultural Revolution";

3. That since President Nixon who has sought to get an invitation from Chou En-Lai gives the whole world the impression that the United States has capitulated in two world wars to Red China, once in Korea where a treaty has not been definitely concluded and in Indo-China with the result that the countries affected will have to think of the United States no longer as their defender and renouncing its role as a leader of the free world especially after the Second World War;

4. The proposed visit fortifies the policy by those who wish to have Red China admitted into the United Nations and the recognition of two Chinas is an absurd policy since the Charter of the United Nations accepts only one China in the Security Council and therefore if Red China is admitted it means the elimination of Free China which will also be abandoned forcing Generalissimo Chiang Kai-Shek who has always stood for liberty of the Chinese people who are now subjugated in Mainland China and also for the progress and welfare of humanity;

5. Because we are quite sure that this projected trip of President Nixon which will be disastrous to the Latin American Countries because it will strengthen the Cuba-Chile axis and because it will be the political purpose of unscrupulous leaders of Latin America who wish to be counted among the friends of Cuba to incorporate the O.E.A. with the sinister plans of Fidel Castro and his associate Salvador Allende in the internal plots of the "OLAS" which seeks to make new colonies of Bolshevik imperialism.

THE PROBLEMS OF ADJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 7, 1971

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, the President recently took drastic unilateral action in an attempt to deal with the problems facing the United States in International Trade. However, the imposition of the 10-percent import surcharge and requests for discriminatory tax legislation against capital goods from other countries are steps that create additional barriers to trade.

These steps are not the only ones that could have been taken by the administration. They have had a startling international impact. However, the very real employment problems, in part stemming from trade disruptions, were ignored. No direct assistance to meet the needs of the unemployed was proposed. It is apparent from the following three letters that the administration does not have a clear idea on how to deal with trade disruption. Over the past 5 months I have written to the Treasury Department, the Department of Commerce, and the Department of Labor. Simply stated, I wanted to know if it would be possible for workers to receive adjustment assistance during a "dumping" investigation under the Antidumping Act of 1921.

The Tariff Commission believes that to make this assistance available, Congress would have to pass a law. The Secretary of Commerce, chairman of the Inter-Agency Adjustment Assistance Advisory Board, believes a worker can apply for adjustment assistance during an antidumping investigation. The Board, however, apparently is not investigating this possibility. The Secretary of Labor in effect said adjustment assistance was a problem of the Tariff Commission.

The recent report submitted to the President by the Commission on International Trade and Investment Policy recommended significant changes to ease access to adjustment assistance. Also included is a recommendation to create an Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance to improve the administration of this expanded program. Careful thought must also be given to widening the availability for assistance to workers to include the Antidumping Act of 1921. The existing proliferation of agencies concerned with this problem has aggravated the situation and has stifled all administrative means for improvement. The letters referred to follow:

U.S. TARIFF COMMISSION,
Washington, D.C., June 23, 1971.

HON. DONALD M. FRASER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. FRASER: A copy of your letter of March 24, 1971, addressed to Mr. Eugene Rosides, Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, has been referred to us for comment on your inquiry as to what needs to be done to afford temporary Governmental assistance to workers who have become underemployed or unemployed ostensibly because of the effects of dumped foreign goods on the plant in which they worked. You propose such assistance be given during the period in which the Treasury Department makes its investigation of alleged sales at less than fair value.

Your question relates to a matter of legislative policy. In our field of experience the Congress has only granted assistance to underemployed and unemployed workers under specified circumstances. Proof of the existence of such circumstances must be established before the worker becomes eligible for the assistance. Until their eligibility is proven no relief has been granted, although it may be granted retroactively once eligibility is proven. For example, the adjustment assistance provisions of title III of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 work in this manner.

The Congress has not as a matter of policy provided for any form of direct assistance to workers who may be hurt by reason of dumped imports. The Antidumping Act, 1921, as amended, seeks to protect domestic industries from injury caused by dumped imports. In this respect, the workers' jobs are afforded a degree of protection. However, the Act affords no more protection than that arising as an incidence of the protection afforded to the industry. If legislation were to be enacted to afford assistance as proposed by you, it is believed that the legislation might appropriately be made a part of the Antidumping Act.

Sincerely yours,

GLENN W. SUTTON,
Presiding Commissioner.

THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,
Washington, D.C., July 23, 1971.

HON. DONALD M. FRASER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. FRASER: This is in response to your letter of June 22, 1971, suggesting that the Adjustment Assistance Advisory Board

investigate the possibility of revising the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 in order to expand the benefits provided under the adjustment assistance provisions to include the Anti-Dumping Law of 1921 as amended.

At the present time it is possible for workers to apply for adjustment assistance at any time, including the period during which an antidumping investigation is underway by the Treasury Department. Under existing law, so long as the workers in a plant meet the tests of the statute as to imports being the major cause or threat of injury resulting in unemployment, adjustment assistance may be granted.

It would seem, therefore, that two objectives underlie your suggestion: first, to make it easier for workers to qualify for adjustment assistance; and second, to increase the benefits to unemployed workers determined to be eligible for adjustment assistance. The Administration, in last year's Trade Bill, proposed precisely to do this. However, the bill, after passing the House, failed in the Senate.

As you know, there are two major aspects to adjustment assistance—relating to industry and to workers. Commerce is mainly concerned with the former and the Labor Department with the latter. Both Departments have studies underway to come up with proposals to improve adjustment assistance policies and operations subject to their jurisdiction. I suggest that you may wish to write to Secretary of Labor Hodgson to learn at first hand what the Labor Department has in mind respecting adjustment assistance for workers.

Sincerely,

MAURICE H. STANS,
Secretary of Commerce.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, September 2, 1971.

HON. DONALD M. FRASER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FRASER: In your letter of August 12 you raised questions concerning our activity in publicizing the adjustment assistance program and about steps we are engaged in that would lead to a liberalization of the adjustment assistance criteria.

With respect to the problem of easing the adjustment assistance criteria, you are aware that the Administration proposed legislation in the last Congress (The Trade Act of 1969) that would have significantly eased the criteria whereby workers gain access to the adjustment assistance program. This legislation failed to become law and new legislation has not yet been submitted. The Labor Department actively participated in the drafting of the Administration bill especially in the sections dealing with adjustment assistance and we are currently engaged in a thorough review of all aspects of the adjustment assistance program in preparation for the time that the President decides to propose new trade legislation.

On the matter of providing workers with information about the program, my adjustment assistance staff under the sponsorship of the Manpower Administration recently conducted a series of regional conferences to explain the program to federal regional Manpower Administration officials, State Employment Security Administrators, representatives from organized labor and representatives of the business community. Prior to that, we participated in a special conference of the Industrial Union Department (IUD) of the AFL-CIO which was devoted solely to the adjustment assistance program.

Other Departmental actions which increase the public's awareness of the adjustment assistance program include the issuance of press releases whenever an adjustment assistance certification is issued and the provision to all local employment se-

curity agencies of current reports on adjustment assistance activity.

In addition, we routinely communicate with unions and workers to provide them with information and assistance on the filing of adjustment assistance petitions with the Tariff Commission.

I also want to respond further to your concern about the ability of workers to file for adjustment assistance while an anti-dumping investigation is in progress. You should understand that the Anti-Dumping Law of 1921 does not provide for adjustment assistance. Workers seeking adjustment assistance who might have a stake in the outcome of anti-dumping proceedings would still be required to petition the Tariff Commission under the provisions of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962.

The Tariff Commission, if it accepted the petition, would conduct an investigation of the workers' situation to determine whether the criteria of the Trade Expansion Act have been satisfied. This procedure would follow regardless of the outcome or progress of an anti-dumping investigation.

Please let me know if I can be of further assistance.

Sincerely,

JAMES D. HODGSON,
Secretary of Labor.

THE AUTO INDUSTRY'S FUTURE

HON. JAMES HARVEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 7, 1971

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, the U.S. automobile industry, reaching into every one of our 50 States and practically throughout the world, is facing a critical point in its history. I believe John J. Green, Sunday magazine writer, for the Sunday News magazine, a supplement produced by the Detroit News, Detroit, Mich., has authored what I consider an excellent article entitled "The Auto Industry—A Giant Besieged." He has presented an extremely fair appraisal of an industry in which 700,000 citizens are employed—one out of six Americans are directly or indirectly associated with this industry.

One of his revealing points centers on the impact of the import of foreign cars into the United States. He wrote:

It is estimated that for every percentage point of imported car sales in this country, there is a corresponding loss of from 20,000 to 25,000 U.S. automotive jobs. Last year the imports reached 15 percent.

I bring this fine article to the attention of all Members not in defense of the auto companies and their hundreds of thousands of workers throughout this land—for they need no defense. I do so only to provide information to all Members of an extremely serious situation and the unusual circumstances that have and may continue to confront this industry:

THE AUTO INDUSTRY—A GIANT BESIEGED

(By John J. Green)

Until the announcement of President Nixon's new economic policy in August, most economists in and out of the auto industry agreed that the deck of cards had been stacked against Detroit.

High tariffs abroad for U.S. auto exports were matched by low tariffs at home for growing foreign imports. New and costly

safety regulations issued by the government and demands for equally costly emission controls added to the enigma.

Ross J. Wilhelm, a University of Michigan economist, sees the 1970's as a decade in which the American automobile industry will be engaged in "one of the great competitive battles of the century."

"The enormous competitive battle which is shaping up in the industry will decide how many cars are produced in the United States 10 years from now.

"If the American firms lose, there will be far fewer jobs here building cars. It is obvious that the auto companies are preparing for the battle of their lives. One wonders how long it will take unions and the federal government to realize what's at stake, how long before they begin to support instead of fight the manufacturers," said Wilhelm.

This was before the Nixon economic message to the nation in August.

Under almost constant attack from consumer advocate Ralph Nader, public sensitivity to defects mounted and costly callbacks followed costly callbacks.

Stockholders meetings were beset by contentious groups seeking new concessions on such things as the companies' investments in apartheid South Africa or pollution of the environment from the belching smokestacks that in earlier years were considered the symbol of economic well-being. Ford's investment in plant emissions alone over the last decade has totaled more than \$130 million, one of a dozen new cost items that in other years would not have been figured into the costs of doing business.

Threatened by class action owners' suits, unnerved by changing markets, stung by a multitude of incidents, including the actual "burial" of a new car by a West Coast ecology group, the industry was dazed as it entered the 1970's.

In mid-September as the '72 model introductions began, "Wheels," a best selling book, hit the bookstands. Its impact has been to heap more criticism on the industry, even impugning the basic ethics of its leading executives. At one point the author advises the public not to buy a car unless it's made on Tuesday, Wednesday or Thursday, implying that workmanship on other days is poor because of high absenteeism for long weekends.

Until President Nixon acted, placing the 10 percent surcharge on imports and eliminating the 7 percent domestic excise tax on new car sales, 1972 was beginning to look like the industry's "last stand."

The Wall Street Journal observed that "Detroit's money machine is out of whack!" It was, and, in the eyes of close observers, it still is.

"It's an industry in confusion," said one Ford official.

The Nixon game plan for the dollar may have purchased import time for the industry to clear its decks for the coming economic battle for world car sales, but it did little to bring order back to an industry that, above all else, prided itself on efficiency, flawless assessment (with the exception of an Edsel here and there) of trends and predictable profits.

Even as late as the early 1960's, the industry felt confident as ever, having beaten back decisively the "first invasion" of foreign compact cars with GM's Corvair, Ford's Falcon, Chrysler's Valiant, and American Motors Rambler. But confidence bred defiance and the U.S. firms got out of "Smallville" as quickly as they had gotten into it. By 1971, the small car phenomenon had grown into much more than that.

This year, after frantic restyling efforts with attendant huge costs, the industry is on its way to slowing down the second invasion of small cars with its three subcompact entries. The Nixon policies will help, spokesmen say.

It is at home where the industry is living

a kind of schizophrenic existence, wavering precariously between rising pressures of labor and materials costs and the increasing demands of its critics in and out of the government.

In the middle of the controversies is the 700,000-man army of U.S. workers who rely on the health of Detroit for their bread and butter.

The import growth may have already taken its toll.

It's estimated that for every percentage point of imported car sales in this country, there is a corresponding loss of from 20,000 to 25,000 U.S. automotive jobs. Last year the imports reached 15 percent.

GM's vice-chairman Richard C. Gerstenberg says the problem of Foreign competition is not limited to the auto industry, but extends to others including steel, shoes, textiles and electronics.

"The movement of important industries away from the United States should seriously concern every segment of our society.

"You would expect the reaction to be one of alarm.

"Our people don't view the problem with the sense of urgency it should command."

Ford president Lee A. Iacocca, presents a stripped-down assessment of what an unchecked foreign invasion could mean.

"The experience of the U.S. home radio industry in the 1960's suggests the direction in which the U.S. auto industry may be moving in the 1970's," he told an industry meeting.

In the '60's, sales of home radio sets in this country doubled. But by 1969, more than 90 percent of them bore Japanese labels.

In Michigan, where, according to the Automobile Manufacturers Association, one of every three domestic passenger cars on American roads is made, even a partial fulfillment of such a development would be disastrous.

Foreign competition is but one of the new pressures.

For the last two decades, there has been little in the way of good news for the executive board rooms at GM's headquarters in Detroit's New Center area or for those at Ford's "Glass House" in Dearborn.

The industry feels it has become a whipping boy for all that's wrong with the nation and the world. "Holding the industry's feet to the flame," is the way Henry Ford II, puts it.

Such feelings are widespread among the executives who have adopted a "what can come next" attitude toward the fast-moving pace of social and economic change. Ford, besides publishing a daily in-house news clipping service detailing what the world is saying and doing about automobiles, runs its own videotape television network beaming newscasts and flashes of latest production statistics throughout its World Headquarters building in Dearborn.

Government controls in safety and ecology have been costly. Ford's Iacocca has suggested the possibility of a \$3,000 Pinto by 1975, if all the regulations are to be met.

The \$1,000 price increase, says Henry Ford II, would include \$600 for compliance with safety and emission standards, \$200 for passive restraint systems and \$100 for bumper regulations. In the marketplace, this could add a \$10 billion addition to car price tags.

"After that, said Iacocca in his oft-quoted remark, "they won't have the automobile to kick around anymore." He meant it wouldn't be here.

The industry questions the creation of standards that car owners are reluctant to accept—seat belts with 30 percent use and shoulder straps with but four percent useage, according to surveys. The final irony, in the opinion of industry spokesmen, is the new demand for the passive restraints by 1974 that could force the driver to pay for air bags with doubtful effectiveness.

Henry Ford complains that such uncertainties not only commit the industry to hasty and expensive styling, but raise the prospect of annual restylings to accommodate restraint mechanisms and other government-mandated changes.

"This," he says, "at a time when we are trying to cut costs by reducing annual changes."

Everywhere new pronouncements issue forth.

The industry reasons it has been placed in the position of absorbing the costs of the human carelessness of its customers with bumpers that must withstand collisions to cut down on the repair costs of owning an automobile. By 1973, the new bumpers must withstand at least a five-mile-an-hour barrier collision. While tooling up for this, the industry is next informed that by 1976, the bumpers must withstand 30-mile-an-hour crashes.

Most cars, already 90 percent home in compliance with earlier emission standards were confronted with new, more stringent standards to reduce emissions by 90 percent from 1970 to 1975.

The industry feels the final few percentage points of emission control are unnecessary and too costly a burden.

Of the new emission standards, GM's Gerstenberg says:

"The last short step toward perfection will be very difficult. As every mountain climber knows, the last 10 percent is always the hardest.

"Perhaps the cost will be more than the individual American will feel it's worth."

"You'll be able to get down and breathe the exhaust right from the pipe," said one Ford official.

"What has been going on in the industry is one of the greatest acquiescences of all time, and still they're needing the hell out of us," he said.

Each facet affects overall styling and engineering budgets to the detriment of traditional model changeover and, for an industry that cut its teeth on changeovers, the effect was traumatic.

But the industry is not at all sure these days just what part cosmetic styling plays today or will play in the future of sales.

While critics of "planned obsolescence" applaud, marketing people wonder what it means in annual sales.

While sinking vast sums into compliance with standards, the industry has diverted enormous portions of its estimated \$1.5 billion annual tooling costs to meet the apparent high demand for smaller cars.

Meanwhile, wages have soared beyond productivity increases at home and in the face of increased productivity of workers abroad. So have wages in other industries, such as steel, adding to costs of materials that go into a car.

"A car bumper," said Ford economist James W. Ford, "doesn't care where it's installed or how much it costs, whether at \$1.50 an hour in Japan or \$6.50 an hour in the United States."

Neither does the buyer. And in an international industry, the difference to the producer in the marketplace can be disastrous.

Less obvious pressures have beset the industry in the last decade. The move to the suburbs added new, unexpected costs—such things as the shift of dealerships out of central city areas. Ford alone spent several hundred million dollars in moves in just a few years.

The prospect for the industry has been that of turning out a product that cost more to build for less per unit profit margin.

According to Iacocca, profits in the industry have been "cut to the bone."

In other years, industry complaining might have been dismissed as poor-mouthing, but in 1971 the telltale downward lines on performance charts grew alarming.

In the five years from 1965 to 1970, GM slipped from 10.3 percent net profit on sales to 7 percent, Ford from 6.2 percent to 3.5 and Chrysler from 5.4 percent to a red ink year. AMC saw three consecutive red ink years before it managed a less than 1 percent profit margin.

As automotive company profit margins shrink, the stocks become less attractive to blue chip investors. For an industry once all but impervious to day to day effects of the economy, things such as a new styling demand, a strike or the failure of a model in the marketplace can scare investors away.

Arvid Jouppi, an investment analyst with Detroit's William C. Roney & Co., has kept close books on the automotive scene. He sees GM's 7 percent margin as a rock bottom for the company if the industry as a whole is to remain healthy. GM is the traditional industry leader and a dip in GM's profit margin below this level could mean trouble, not only for GM but for the other car makers, he says.

Operating in the same economic limits, all must follow the leader in pricing and in pegging profits. Should GM decide to live with less than 7 percent, the others would have to follow to hold their share of sales. Economists believe the smallest, AMC, would find it difficult to survive with even a 1 percent drop in its profit margin.

As cost pressures increased at home, the Big Three began investing abroad, a point of great concern to people such as Irving Bluestone, a United Auto Workers Union executive.

"They should be investing at home where the unemployment is," says Bluestone.

Bluestone believes the U.S. industry "goofed" badly by abdicating its small car lead during the mid-'60's, and an air of recrimination pervades Solidarity House over this issue. Bluestone says an item gaining prominence on his union's legislative agenda is that of a watchdog agency to monitor foreign investment.

Auto industry spokesmen say limiting foreign investment would be self defeating. "It wouldn't create any new jobs at home," said one.

Rather, says the industry, foreign investment has made possible economic survival during the past high pressure years. Returns of foreign investments are becoming bigger and bigger factors in year end profit columns.

Prof. C. C. Killingsworth, Michigan State University manpower expert, feels the national trend will be toward a leveling off of employment in the industry.

"It happens," he said, "when productivity gets out of balance with growth in sales. It dictates a decrease in total employment. Look at the farm situation when productivity became two or three times the growth in sales."

In his view, the U.S. industry is not "going to crumble before your eyes, but it's going to change."

Unions are acutely aware of what is happening to the domestic work force.

UAW membership has slipped to 150,000 below a peak of three years ago.

From a relatively small number a couple of decades ago, Big Three foreign employment ranks have swelled to the point where the industry is close to a one-to-one proportion between foreign and domestic workers. In 1970, GM's U.S. employment was 349,000. It employed 340,000 abroad. Ford employed 299,000 at home, 192,000 abroad. Chrysler employed 129,000 American workers and 99,000 abroad. At the current rate of growth, foreign employment by GM and Ford could pass domestic employment figures in five years.

So job losses at home can be extrapolated, not only from the foreign import figures of foreign producers but from cars and car parts shipped in by subsidiaries of the Big Three. About 10 percent of all the imports are made by such foreign subsidiaries, says Bluestone.

Now consider Lordstown, Ohio, where GM has built a \$100 million assembly plant for its Vega. The total Lordstown investment has been estimated at close to \$200 million.

"Lordstown is the wave of the future," says one GM economist.

If it is, then even more automotive jobs are facing the ax.

At Lordstown, a highly automated facility, even bumpers are installed by robots. Hoped-for production savings run to 10 percent. Its 100-car-per-hour capacity makes once-vaunted industry claims of 60-car-an-hour assembly lines seem modest.

The industry, in economic jargon, has become "capital intensive" rather than "people intensive."

What this means is fewer jobs. Cost-cutting is the watchword throughout the industry.

There are about 40 fewer models this year in the industry's showroom array than there were last year. The result: lower tooling costs. A Ford move toward "back-to-back" production launch of its cars (running one year's model run up to the next year's with a week-end halt) cuts costs too—and jobs—both inside and outside the actual car manufacturing business.

Parts suppliers have been hurt badly. One Detroit plant doing plating work cut out an entire shift of workers, a direct result of the tooling economy waves.

"During the next decade," says GM's President Edward N. Cole, "we can expect significant changes in products, in design, manufacturing, in marketing and in management . . . and they will be at a faster pace than in the past."

Already, in just a few years, GM has pared nearly 50,000 parts from its total inventory. Each of those parts in some way provided somebody's weekly paycheck.

The suppliers have been going through their own special agonies during the decade of automotive revolution.

Gilbert F. Richards, president of the Budd Company, a major parts supplier, is angry about foreign content provisions around the world.

Foreign investors welcome U.S. know-how, but they insist that a high percentage (as high as 50 percent in some countries) of the content of cars assembled there be fabricated in their country.

For Budd, which must respond to the auto manufacturers' needs, it can mean building expensive new parts plants abroad, far from the vital, highly skilled work forces at home.

Richards would like to see the United States impose similar content provisions on importers of cars here.

The slippage of automotive jobs from the U.S. scene is troubling.

The only balm the industry can offer is that the jobs left will be better jobs requiring higher skills. If the industry has made the correct decisions and is able to pick off some of the rich new car markets abroad in the years ahead, says Jouppi, then Detroit and Michigan, still the richest store of such skills, could experience a new car wealth boom.

According to Gerstenberg and others, productivity is the key. "If we achieve it," says Gerstenberg, "we will open up opportunity."

It is the ifs that nag the Fords, Riccardos, Chaplins and Roches, for in a fast-moving economy, they cannot be certain.

Jouppi feels that foreign imports will be beaten back by the U.S. generation of sub-compacts (Vega, Pinto and Gremlin) leaving the imports at about 12 percent.

Most observers feel now that what the industry needs is time and some breaks from its critics.

The Nixon policy pronouncements of August provide some time.

From all indications, the additional import tax is having the desired effect of mak-

ing U.S. cars more price competitive at home and abroad at the same stroke.

Jouppi sees the small car accounting for 50 percent of all new car sales by 1976. Translated, this would mean that in a 12 million car year, 6 million would be small cars. But Jouppi sees the U.S. makers supplying 75 percent of the small cars, leaving 25 percent for the foreign importers.

Yet the future holds great uncertainties. In plunging into the small car field is Detroit leaving its traditional big car flanks exposed? There are indications that European car makers are learning things about "market segmentation" and rising costs that Detroit learned in the 1920's.

Despite favored company status in their own countries, there are serious problems emerging, including skyrocketing wages.

Volkswagen is under pressure to stem the tide of Italian Fiats entering Germany and in Italy, the Fiat has been forced to upgrade its products which are getting as large as the old U.S. compacts of the 1950's.

Rising affluence may work the same pressures on foreign makers to build fancier cars and charge more.

The U.S. industry could gain from this.—If.

"If," says Godfrey E. Briefs, a GM economist, "we lick our inflation while they (other nations) take a bath in their own."

Detroit cannot afford to abandon the position of style maker of the car world anymore than Paris can afford to abdicate as the maker of clothing fashions.

"There is a fear in Detroit arising from the longer body style cycles . . . The sharpest people are concerned that the domestic producers will get locked into high-cost automation and Japan and Germany will take up the fashion part of the automobile industry—introducing annual changes into their cars," says Jouppi.

Said Briefs: "We started out competing in the small car field. Now, as we add onto the small end of our lineups, they are adding onto the big end of theirs. Maybe, the final competition will be in the overlapping areas."

How it will end, few know and none will say.

"The company to watch," said Jouppi, "is GM. A graph of GM profits is a history of this business. If GM can't make it, then nobody can. And that's like saying that if IBM can't make it in computers, then nobody can."

Maybe what they're trying to say is that Charlie Wilson was right.

EQUAL RIGHTS AMENDMENT—RARICK REPORTS TO HIS PEOPLE

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 7, 1971

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, I recently reported to my people on the equal rights amendment. I insert my report in the RECORD at this point:

RARICK REPORTS TO HIS PEOPLE ON THE EQUAL RIGHTS AMENDMENT

In recent telecasts, I indicated that busing of school children to achieve some distorted racial balance formula was illegal under our Constitution and but a training exercise to prepare parents for future things to come, conditioning parents to accept more controls over the rearing of their children through so-called child day care centers, child advocates and other child development proposals. I expressed to you my fear that we face a real and present threat of growing federal control of rearing children making them, in ef-

fect, political children, that we are training them for a planned collectivist society—the opposite of life in America as we have known it.

On September 30th, the House of Representatives by a vote of 186-183 passed the Comprehensive Child Development Act amendment to the OEO bill. September 30th was a dark day for America. The Orwellian nightmare of 1984 is fast becoming a reality in America of 1971. The Federal government is on the verge of being authorized to take over our children.

Similar child development legislation was passed by the Senate on September 9th. There are small differences to be worked out in the two bills. The matter has now gone to a conference committee. There is a possibility that the bill may be returned to the House and Senate for another vote. However, the House version of the bill could be accepted and sent to the President for signing into law as is.

Today, I thought we'd talk about another legislative proposal which if enacted in its original form would further destroy the traditional family unit which has for 1900 years served as a pillar of Western civilization. The House will be considering soon the so-called "Equal Rights Amendment" the effect of which would destroy any distinction at law or custom between men and women.

The Amendment to the Constitution provides simply that "Equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex."

And believe it or not if you do not support full integration of the sexes you are called a "sexist."

The Judiciary Committee by a close vote of 19 to 16 amended the bill by adding:

Section 2—"This article shall not impair the validity of any law of the United States which exempts a person from compulsory military service or any other law of the United States or of any State which reasonably promotes the health and safety of the people."

The purpose of the added section is to make it clear that Congress can exempt women from compulsory military service and that Congress and the State legislatures can make allowances for differences between the sexes in enacting laws which reasonably promote the health and safety of the people for example separate but equal rest room facilities.

The purpose of the Equal Rights Amendment with the added Section 2 would be to prevent discrimination between women and men under the equal protection clause of the United States and of the States. It would also remove the likelihood of judicial chaos in the courts should the original resolution ever be adopted.

It is argued that the word "equality" in the original amendment is intended to assure that men and women are extended "identical" legal treatment. That would mean that the courts would be compelled to interpret the amendment as a mandate—an order—to eliminate all statutory sex distinctions. The courts would be forced to follow this line of reasoning and many revolutionary and undesirable results could be produced. For example, women, including mothers, would be subject to the draft, and the military would have to assign women alongside men in combat units. In fact, the backers of the original resolution say this is a sought after freedom—that women should have the opportunity to fight and die for their country. We can suppose they refer to someone else's daughters not theirs. The effect of requiring women in combat would be devastating to the military. Every citizen should ask himself: "If the military must assign all personnel to combat and support unit, without discrimination on the basis of sex, and if separate facilities are not permitted for men and women, will the

military be able to discharge its function of providing for the defense of this nation?"

This same interpretation by the courts would invalidate protective work laws reasonably designed to protect the health and safety of women, or it might relieve the father of the responsibility of support of his children and their mother and place in doubt the legality of the many support decrees presently in existence.

Proponents of the original amendment are fighting the added Section 2 saying it defeats any effective constitutional amendment to provide equal rights for men and women.

The basic idea of the Equal Rights Amendment seems to be that sex must not be thought of as a factor in determining the legal and social rights of women or of men. Consequently, the treatment of any person by law should not be based upon the sex of the person. There would no longer be men and women, only persons.

Article IX and X of the U.S. Constitution have traditionally left control of education and the regulation of health and safety of citizens up to the individual states. However, as a result of thousands of law suits encouraged by the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and similar legislation the federal government has usurped state powers in an effort to break down the so-called color barrier. If the Equal Rights Amendment is passed in its original form, we can look forward to a great deal of litigation which could be expected to further weaken State sovereignty by a federal attempt to break down the sexual barrier.

The recommendation made by President Nixon's White House Conference concerning the family is an indication of this. The traditional family relationship of father and mother living in the same home with their children, a normal home, is referred to as a "nuclear" family. But because of the changes which conventional moral standards are undergoing, the typical home family alone was regarded by the "family experts" as not sufficient. So, the Conference recommended legal approval of a commune family, group marriage where adults and offspring are known as one family in which all individuals are married to each other and all are parents to the children. Still another type family would be the homosexual couple and child family.

In view of the arbitrary decisions of federal judges these days, there is a likelihood that numerous unusual situations might arise from adoption of the Equal Rights Amendment. Let's take a look at only a few.

The jobs of collecting garbage, ditch digging, and of delivering mail have traditionally been done by men because men are better equipped physically to do these jobs. But with the original Equal Rights Amendment in effect, we can expect the American Civil Liberties Union or the Legal Aid Society to bring suit on behalf of a few women demanding that women get their proportionate share of these jobs. And we can expect the Supreme Court to rule after all legal appeals have been exhausted, that the local sanitation department, labor unions, and the U.S. Postal Service must hire such a percentage of women as the total number of women is to the total population.

The same situation could apply to school faculties and even to the student body makeup. We might even see busing of women to overcome sexual imbalance.

In general, labor laws which confer special benefits upon women would have to be extended to men or be invalidated.

The States have traditionally legislated regarding the minimum age of marriage. In every state the age of consent for marriage differs. Then too we have an age discrimination between young men and women for insurance rates. The ultimate effect of the amendment would be that the States must set the same age for both men and women—a further erosion of State sovereignty.

The Equal Rights Amendment would likely necessitate changes in State laws regarding family support, rights of husbands and wives, ownership of property, community property, grounds for divorce, alimony, and custody of children.

If it is natural that the social and economic conditions of women should in some way be altered on account of socialistic changes being forced on the world of the Twentieth Century then why by shot gun approach? The government should adapt the civil rights of women to modern needs and requirements, taking into account the natural disposition and temperament of the female sex, good morality, and the family welfare; or better yet, let the states make any changes their people desire.

The original Equal Rights Amendment as the comprehensive Child Development Act if implemented would weaken and eventually destroy the traditional family unit and hasten the planned socialistic society. In many respects these two bills are companions—one supplementing the other.

Total socialism is communism. Under communism the emancipation of women is proclaimed as a basic principle. The woman is withdrawn from the family and the care of her children and is thrust into public life and collective production under the same conditions as a man. The collectivity or commune looks after the children. Also, the right and responsibility for education of children is denied to parents and becomes the exclusive prerogative of the community under state control.

Based on such materialistic foreign and alien philosophies, human society would become a collectivity with the economic system supreme. Its one mission would be the production of material goods by collective labor so that the goods of the world might be enjoyed in a utopia where each would give according to his capacities and would receive according to his needs.

Both the comprehensive child development programs and the original Equal Rights Amendment should be soundly rejected.

We should do more to strengthen the traditional family where the mother and father live together with their children with the father as the head of the family and the mother its heart—a family in which parents bring up their children in the "nurture and admonition of the Lord" and in which children are taught to honor their father and mother. This is the Biblical concept of the family. What happens to a family that loses the strong hand of a father?

George Washington, the father of our country, declared, "True religion affords government its surest support. The perpetuity of this nation depends upon the religious training of the youth. It is impossible to govern the world without the Bible."

STRIP MINING AND THE ENVIRONMENT

HON. ABNER J. MIKVA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 7, 1971

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, technology has worked wonders for this country. It has made us the most prosperous people in the world with the highest standard of living. However, that technical progress has not been without a high price, and the bill too often has been paid at the expense of the environment.

There are many examples of that—strip mining is one of the best. It is an inexpensive and effective method of

harvesting coal from the earth. It has made power and electricity cheaper for millions of people across the country but, in the process, it is destroying part of our land. Lighting the lights of the cities more economically is sending the environment into bankruptcy.

Strip mining chews up acres of land, and the power shovels leave a landscape distorted and twisted with jagged rock, deep trenches, and mountains of raw earth spoil banks. The ugliness of strip mining is more than just skin deep though. It generates water pollution and can irrevocably damage the future productivity of the land.

Many mine operators have taken steps to "reclaim" the land they strip mine. Several States, including my own, now have strict laws that set strict standards for reclamation. However, we have passed the point when reclamation was enough. Thousands of acres of ravaged land have not been reclaimed at all—thousands of other acres have been reclaimed in name only.

Strip mining should be stopped so that the land can be saved and not just "reclaimed." I have supported legislation, introduced by the gentlemen from West Virginia (Mr. HECHLER), that would ban new strip mining and strictly regulate current mining operations. It might mean the price of electricity would go up a few cents more a month, but that expense is far cheaper than the loss of the land.

An article by Ernest B. Ferguson in the Washington Daily News outlines some of the reasons for the legislation, and some of the opposition that it is encountering. I think my colleagues might find it of interest. The text of the article is as follows:

A SERIOUS BILL

(By Ernest B. Ferguson)

If the gentleman from West Virginia were a less stubborn sort, he might have been discouraged by the chairman's compliment.

Ken Hechler, who represents 10 counties in that part of the world where the strip miner is king, had just finished testifying on behalf of his bill to abolish that hopelessly destructive kind of mining.

He made the point that up to 1965, an area of the United States equal to the entire state of Delaware had been ravaged by stripping for coal. Since then, enough additional square miles to cover all of Rhode Island have been stripped. And by the time all the strippable coal under the surface of our country is torn out to feed our much-trumpeted "energy crisis" the devastated area will equal Pennsylvania and West Virginia put together.

The congressman went on for 26 legal-size pages explaining why his bill is urgently needed and the one proposed by the Administration for control of stripping would be laughably ineffective, if anyone had the nerve to laugh about it.

When he was thru, the chairman of the mining subcommittee of the Interior Committee, Rep. Ed Edmondson of Oklahoma, thanked him and praised him for his "sincerity and dedication to his cause."

Not "our cause," although many acres of Oklahoma, too, have been destroyed by stripping. Not even "the cause." But "his cause." You don't have to speak congressionalese to get the nuance in that.

But Mr. Hechler has started out in the minority and persisted and ended up in the majority before. For example, on the mine safety bill that finally passed, with teeth in it, in late 1969.

This time, his bill (H.R. 4556) has 80 cosponsors in the House, and the beginnings of some influential support at the other end of the Capitol. But there is none at the other end of Pennsylvania-av. The White House, in line with the strip-mine operators, favors a measure designed to appease growing public concern about stripping without imposing any serious handicap on the operators—or providing any serious protection for the land.

Among its many other shortcomings, the Administration bill would put enforcement under the Interior Dept., which is committed formally to encouraging development of mineral output, rather than under the Environmental Protection Agency, whose function is just what its title says.

Even the operators are reluctantly willing to live with this weak version. They are pushing a campaign to change their image, blaming all the destruction wrought by stripping on earlier "irresponsible" operators, and contending that they themselves are much more public-spirited and careful—albeit in fact their giant machines, which can tear out as much as 220 cubic yards of earth at a bite, cause far greater disruption of the earth than the picks, shovels and old-fashioned bulldozers of the past.

They make a great pitch about "reclamation," which in practice means backfilling the stripped land and planting fast-growing ground cover, which sometimes grows and sometimes does not. But reclamation is a misnomer; a Corps of Engineers forester and a West Virginia University specialist both estimate it would take 400 years or longer to restore the ravaged land and trees.

Nevertheless, the operators are spending many thousands to sell the public on the idea that reclamation works. The main thrust of the Administration's stripping bill is to require reclamation. But it is a mere threat of a mere slap on the wrist.

THE NORTHERN IRELAND SITUATION: A REPORT—NO. 10

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 7, 1971

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, more and more interest is being expressed in America concerning the problems in Northern Ireland. Several of my colleagues have introduced resolutions along with mine dealing with the question of a united Ireland. The American press is giving greater attention to the atrocities of the Special Powers Act.

However, all too frequently the true stories of these atrocities never reach the public. Too often, the heartbreaking stories of killings and abuses escape the American reporter who may be analyzing the situation from a safe refuge in Belfast or Dublin.

To further enlighten the American public and my colleagues, I will include in the RECORD today an article from the Tribune, a weekly in Great Britain, which describes the terrible conditions as a result of the occupation of Northern Ireland by British troops:

DEATH IN BELFAST: WHEN THE PARATROOPERS FIRED ON A MAN CARRYING A WHITE FLAG

(By Michael Walsh)

Patrick McCarthy died in Ballymurphy on August 11. He wasn't a terrorist, he wasn't even born in Ireland, and he died of "natural causes"—a heart attack. Yet Patrick Mc-

Carthy can be counted as one of the victims of a terror that officially never took place.

For Patrick McCarthy, the 45-year-old social worker who had come from England to organize the Ballymurphy Community Association, the terror began on Monday, August 9, as news of internment prompted demonstrations and the British army began to move into the area. At midnight he telephoned his sister in London asking if help could be sent to the community centre which had evacuated 220 children that day and expected to deal with at least as many more the following day.

WITNESSES

The subsequent facts are drawn from a statement made by Patrick McCarthy's mother after talks with witnesses, among them Joseph Camplisson of the Northern Ireland Community Relations Commission, Mrs. McMullen, Presbyterian chairman of the community association, and Sister Vincentia.

According to the statement, "troops came back into the area" shortly after 3:30 a.m. on Wednesday, although there had been no disturbance and other communities in the city were being refused the protection they requested. (This fact is verified by both Catholic and Protestant witnesses interviewed by *Tribune*).

"At 4 a.m.," says the statement, "the paratroops bombarded the centre from three angles—the walls began to ooze water—and this went on until about 6 a.m. Mr. Camplisson and Pat (McCarthy) tried to get a cease-fire order from the commanding officer so that the children could be safely ferried across the road.

"Pat was very concerned that the children might be hurt by ricochets, and he decided to go out with a white flag with red cross, which was tied to a broom. He had only walked about 20 feet when the flag was shot off the stick and a jagged splinter about 8 inches long was torn off, ripping across Pat's wrist, which bled profusely.

"He went back into the centre and said . . . 'even the Jerries respected the white flag.' He was given some sweet tea. Eventually there was a cease fire, the children were got away and Pat, Sister Valentinia and three boys started loading a van with beds and blankets. Pat was in a very shaken state—he had had no rest since Monday.

"Knowing that no milk deliveries had been made locally . . . he loaded three crates of milk bottles on a trolley and went across to the opposite streets calling 'milk for babies.' Witnesses saw two paratroopers in Glinalina Crescent. Pat was told to get back. He explained that he was getting milk out for babies."

BACKWARDS

"One paratrooper pointed his gun at Pat's head while the other deliberately kicked a crate off the trolley, breaking some bottles. Pat bent down, replaced the crate and went on, walking backwards. 'If you are going to shoot me you are going to shoot me from the front.'

"He called out to householders who were there, asking if they needed any milk. He then went into a small cul de sac where he had a heart attack. Some women ran across and said "this man is dying" and were roughly told by the paratroopers to clear off.

"One of them tried heart massage and Pat was taken into a nearby house and later to hospital, where he died during the morning. One of the paratroopers, seeing the trolley with the remaining milk bottles lifted the crate and smashed every bottle, while women stood weeping in their doorways."

COLLEAGUE

A former colleague of Pat McCarthy's—Derek Loman of the London Council of Social Service—told *Tribune* that Pat "liked to have a challenge. He launched one of the first detached work projects in London in the

Portabello Road area, walking the streets, talking, standing on street corners, working terribly hard until he and the lads from the area built up their own cafe—it wasn't really to sell coffee."

And Pat's mother who attended his funeral said this of the people she met in Ballymurphy "I met with exquisite courtesy . . . The mother of the young shot boy who was buried a few hours before my son, is a deeply rooted Catholic while I am a humanist. But we met on common ground of grief and pity for the waste of promising young lives, including the unhappiness and

corruption of young English soldiers—many must be ashamed of their role."

"She is now back in London trying to persuade the Labour Party politicians and trade unionists to support her over the issue. With her she brings the broom her son used to wave the white flag and the mark of the bullet on it.

Her immediate task, she says, is to get the white flag recognised by the army. For, as she points out, the priest shot last week, Father Mullen, was killed as he bent over a dying man to administer the last rites. The priest was carrying a white flag.

EMPLOYMENT

She adds: "It is not a policy of ruthless oppression or a course in religious toleration that is necessary in Ballymurphy. It is a need for employment, for hope for a life with some stability and opportunity for young people to work constructively. Forty-seven per cent of the men are out of work, and many have not had a job for years—some young people have not even had a job. The estate is steeped in poverty and sorrow. It is a political and social solution not a military one, which is needed."

SENATE—Friday, October 8, 1971

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. ELLENDER).

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty and everlasting God, in whom we live and move and have our being, we thank Thee for Thy providence which has watched over us and brought us to this new day. Direct us now in the work of this day as we fulfill our several vocations. Supplement our limited wisdom by divine wisdom. To our natural power add Thy supernatural power. Give us grace to be considerate and patient with others, obedient to conscience, teachable as little children, and trustful as the saints of old. According to our abilities help us to do good to all men that this Nation and the world may be well served. Guard us amid all dangers and watch over us in our journeying.

In Thy holy name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, October 7, 1971, be dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL TUESDAY, OCTOBER 12, 1971

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, has an order been entered that when the Senate adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 12 o'clock noon on Tuesday next?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. No.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I make that unanimous-consent request at this time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate go into executive session to consider a nomination on the Executive Calendar under Federal Power Commission.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The nomination on the Executive Calendar, under Federal Power Commission, will be stated.

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

The second assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Rush Moody, Jr., of Texas, to be a member of the Federal Power Commission for the term of 5 years expiring June 22, 1976.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is considered and confirmed; and, without objection, the President will be immediately notified of the confirmation of this nomination.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all committees may be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE UNITED STATES AND NATO; TROOP REDUCTION—XI

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD set No. XI of the commentaries, columns, articles, and editorials relative to the U.S. troop position in Europe in relation to NATO.

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

[From the Miles City (Mont.) Star, Sept. 5, 1971]

REDUCE FORCES IN EUROPE

Now that East and West are beginning to resolve some of their differences over Berlin, the way may have been opened for talks on another tough issue—the reduction of troops in Europe.

The West German government focused attention on the troop question by indicating it will propose guidelines for mutual and balanced troop cuts for discussion at a forth-

coming conference of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO).

The idea of military disengagement in Central Europe certainly has a lot more going for it now—as the West German interest implies—than it did just a few short months ago when Senate majority leader Mike Mansfield called for a unilateral cut-back of American troop strength in Europe from 300,000 to 150,000.

At that time, the Berlin question—which has contributed so often in the past to a heightening of East-West tensions—was considered a major sticking point.

It is appropriate that the initiative for the troop reduction talks should come from Bonn, which in the past has opposed reduction of the U.S. military presence in Europe.

The fact is that all the nations involved could gain from an end to the costly troop concentrations in Europe. A balanced mutual reduction of these forces—looking ahead to the day perhaps when the need for such forces could be eliminated altogether—would release sizable resources and funds for peaceful purposes.

In our own case, the cost of maintaining American troops in Europe has been more than a dutiful, expensive burden. It has also contributed to our balance of payments difficulties, has weakened the dollar abroad, and, as a consequence, has helped bring on monetary crises of the sort we are now grappling with.

The Soviet Union's leaders—notably Communist party chief Leonid Brezhnev and Premier Alexei Kosygin—have expressed interest in mutual reduction of NATO and Warsaw Pact nation forces.

It would clearly be to our advantage and that of our NATO allies to test out fully the intentions of Moscow on military disengagement.

[From the Portland Oregonian, Sept. 19, 1971]

MAKING THE DOLLAR—NATO CLOSES EYES TO U.S. TROOP CUTS

(By Gerry Pratt)

BRUSSELS.—The people of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, generals and diplomats, Italians, Germans and Americans, British and French—yes the French are evident though their troops are not—live in a world of their own.

And like people of any world, the world of arts, or journalism or science, they have developed their own language and the habit of speaking almost exclusively to one another in words and abbreviations and ideas belonging almost exclusively to NATO.

So it comes as a shock to an outsider to hear them suggest that it would be impossible for the Europeans to take up any slack in the NATO forces because of the booming prosperity and tight budgets of the European member countries. Yet that is exactly what one German general attached to