

Hébert, chairman, Committee on Armed Services; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BLATNIK:

H. Res. 649. Resolution to authorize additional investigative authority to the Committee on Public Works; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H. Res. 650. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and

study of all aspects of crime affecting the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 651. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of the care of the aged in the United States and the effects of Federal laws and programs on the availability and quality of care; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 652. Resolution expressing the sense of the House with respect to disclosure of the results of the national nutrition

survey; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause of rule XXII,

Mr. ABOUREZK introduced a bill (H.R. 11346) for the relief of Ernesto Espino, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

ENERGY AND ECONOMY PROBLEMS ARE COMPLICATED BY COAL STRIKE CRISIS, SENATOR RANDOLPH ASSERTS IN URGENT MESSAGE TO PRESIDENT NIXON

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 19, 1971

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, it is my observation that the September 30, 1971, end of the prior-negotiated contract between the Bituminous Coal Operators Association and the United Mine Workers of America came at a most unfortunate time. In view of the fact that management and labor had not negotiated and signed a new contract, either prior to the wage-price freeze imposed by order of the President of the United States at mid-August or prior to the September 30 contract termination, it meant that the UMWA went out on strike October 1 under its traditional no contract-no work policy. Negotiations thereafter under strike conditions were also under the unusual circumstances of being conducted during a time of Government exercise of controls over the Nation's economy. Even worse, the negotiating parties know little, if anything, concerning the terms the Government will set for the so-called phase II of the controlled economy following the end of the wage-price freeze in mid-November.

The economy is being damaged severely—especially the economy of the principal coal-producing States. Unemployment goes up—reaching far beyond the UMWA striking miners and appearing in the form of furloughs for railroad workers and layoffs or absolute loss of jobs for many other persons employed in other industries or commercial ventures in the coal producing areas.

And the Nation cannot really afford the almost total shutoff of coal production and the impact of this condition on both domestic and export markets. If it goes on much longer the cost in winter-time power failures and other results will be catastrophic.

For the reasons I have cited, I sent to the President of the United States on Thursday, October 14, 1971, a telegraphic message in which I urged special attention to the problems of the coal strike and the difficulties of negotiating a new contract under existing economic "freeze" conditions and an upcoming phase II of the controlled economy which continues to be quite nebulous.

I emphasize, Mr. President, the last paragraph of my message to the White

House in which I declared that contract negotiations under existing controlled economy conditions seem to me to require more than mere liaison between the Government managing the controlled economy and the negotiating parties so that their negotiations can be meaningful and within guidelines.

Frankly, I believe it is time for the executive branch to move into action to help end the coal stalemate. The negotiating parties—under the extremely unusual conditions which prevail—need guidance and guidelines. More—much more—will be needed subsequently in the way of Government actions if guidance and guidelines are not forthcoming from the executive branch at once.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the text of my message to the President and the acknowledgment received from the White House in a letter from an assistant to the President, William E. Timmons. Also, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Crisis With Coal," published in the Friday, October 15, 1971, Wheeling (W. Va.) News-Register. The editorial discusses a statement made by Herbert F. Richey of Cleveland, Ohio, president of the Valley Camp Coal Co. and chairman of the National Coal Association—a statement made prior to the coal strike concerning certain basic conditions which have been prevailing in the coal industry.

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

TELEGRAM

OCTOBER 14, 1971.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The continuing work and production stoppages which plague the country's coal industry accentuate the nation's fuel shortages and threaten to deepen the energy crisis in an acute degree.

In the states and areas of states where coal mining dominates the economy—especially in West Virginia and neighboring Appalachian states—the economic and unemployment situation grows ever more severe.

The over-all effect of the still prevailing no-contract-no-work situation is growing more devastating daily as men and women in other industrial and commercial enterprises besides coal are being furloughed from their jobs. And our country's balance of payments status is being further damaged by the interruption of coal exports.

In light of these conditions and with the difficulty of keeping collective bargaining effective in the case of the Bituminous Coal Operators and the United Mine Workers of America, in this time of controlled national economy, I urge special attention to these problems by you and the appropriate executive branch officials of the Administration which you head.

Contract negotiations under existing controlled economy conditions seem to me to require more than mere liaison between the Government managing the controlled economy and the negotiating parties so that their negotiations can be meaningful and within guidelines.

JENNINGS RANDOLPH,
U.S. Senator.

THE WHITE HOUSE,

Washington, D.C., October 15, 1971.

DEAR SENATOR RANDOLPH: I would like to acknowledge receipt of your October 14 telegram to the President regarding the impact of the current work and production stoppage in the coal industry and its threat to the nation's fuel and energy supplies. You may be assured your views regarding this situation will be brought to the President's attention at the earliest opportunity and also shared with those who are keeping the situation under close observation.

With cordial regards,
Sincerely,

WILLIAM E. TIMMONS,
Assistant to the President.

[From the Wheeling (W. Va.) News-Register, Oct. 15, 1971]

THE CRISIS WITH COAL

"Safety, labor, financial and production problems beset the coal energy industry at its moment of greatest opportunity," Mr. Herb Richey, president of the Valley Camp Coal Company told the National Energy Forum in Washington, D.C. last month.

Both labor and management seem to agree on the industry problems, but are miles apart on the solutions. Mr. Richey's views expressing the concern of coal owners and management are timely and interesting especially when viewed in the light of what promises to be a lengthy strike called since his appearance in Washington.

Mr. Richey's remarks were amplified by a local spokesman for Valley Camp who said that the company employs over 1,200 people with an annual payroll in excess of \$10 million and "unless the many problems facing the industry are solved and unless certain factors change, the Wheeling area could suffer a loss of this economic asset."

In his address, Mr. Richey welcomed the recognition by the group of coal's leading role in the national energy picture, as it represents 88 per cent of the bulk of the national energy reserves, and said, "Too often the need for coal is stressed, rather than incentive and capability to produce it."

Using statistics of a West Virginia mine owned by Valley Camp, Mr. Richey told the forum that during the first half of this year productivity fell 23 per cent and the mine lost money. "Production has been in a steady slide from 1.5 million tons in 1967 to 1.1 million tons in 1970, to less than a projected million tons this year. Operating costs, meanwhile, have gone the other way—from about \$4.20 a ton in 1967 to \$6.61 in 1970, and to \$8.71 in the first six months of this year. No company can absorb such operating cost increases and resulting financial losses, and

closing the operation is under serious consideration," Mr. Richey explained.

The mine cited is not an isolated case as he pointed out that productivity which rose steadily in the coal industry for twenty years, during the last three has recorded an alarming turnaround. Man-day production figures compiled by the Ohio Coal Association for Eastern Ohio and the Northern Panhandle of West Virginia report an average drop from 20.5 tons in 1967 to 16.2 tons in 1970, a decrease of 21 per cent. The picture was even worse this year since by the second quarter, average production per man-day fell to 13.9 tons, compounding the productivity loss in 1967 to an alarming 32 per cent. Reports from West Virginia quoted by Mr. Richey show that underground productivity decreased 15.6 per cent and surface productivity 13.8 per cent.

Mr. Richey charged that dissension in the union has hit the coal industry with work stoppages that cripple production. "Existing labor contracts seem to stalemate orderly operation, resulting in wild cat strikes. Coupled with Union encouraged absenteeism, normal labor turnover, and the regulations of the new Mine, Health and Safety Law, both State and Federal, have put the deep mine segment of the coal industry through the wringer," he stated.

Safe production, at a high level of efficiency, must be considered in the new contract negotiations. Mr. Richey added, "If the coal industry doesn't get a sharp sustained increase in safety and production efficiency, we are not just in trouble—we are out of business, but fast."

The National Energy forum was convened to discuss methods for alleviating the nation's already critical shortage of energy, recognizable to the average citizen only when power shortages cause blackouts. The forum admitted the importance of coal in the national energy picture by making it the lead-off energy source discussed.

Mr. Richey told the group he anticipates deep trouble when the time comes that coal must be mined in increasing quantities to meet future energy demands of the nation unless we can cope with the problems now facing the industry. "We badly need a national energy policy to make sure we use all of our fuels in the public interest, not only for our own time, but generations to come," he averred.

Speaking of critics of "energy concentration" with the special target being oil company acquisitions of coal, Mr. Richey noted the most important thing about these unions is that the offspring has been more energy. The philosophy of avoiding over concentration of energy sources among a few big companies sounds good and noble but he added antitrust laws must be reappraised and brought up to date.

In concluding his statement in Washington, Mr. Richey asserted, "No energy policy is viable unless the UMWA solve its internal dissensions at the mines in fact, and not just in the minds of the occupants of its Washington office. A steady work force, supported and guided by a sincere Union management, will not only benefit the men at the mines, but will contribute materially to increased safety and reverse the decline in productivity."

OAKLAND TECH HIGH SCHOOL NURSE CHOSEN FOR NATIONAL AWARD

HON. RONALD V. DELLUMS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 19, 1971

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to note that Mrs. Bel Guber, R.N.,

who has served as school nurse at my alma mater, Oakland Tech High School, since 1965, has been named winner of the 1971 Schering-AAHPER School Nurse Award in the staff category.

The award is given annually by Schering Corp. and the American Association for Health, Physical Education, and Recreation.

The item follows:

OAKLAND, CALIF., SCHOOL NURSE

The award is given for a three-fold purpose:

To recognize outstanding contributions by nurses in the school nursing profession.

To encourage young women to take up careers in nursing schools and inspire those in the profession to enrich their careers.

To make the public aware of the high caliber of the country's school nurses and the role they play in maintaining the nation's health.

Mrs. Guber, a Berkeley resident, received her R.N. degree from the Mt. Sinai School of Nursing in Chicago in 1938. She received her Bachelor of Science degree from the University of Colorado and did postgraduate work at Syracuse University, the University of Chicago, and the University of California School of Public Health.

Her nursing career, before going to Oakland, included service with the U.S. Army, the Public Health Service in Denver and Chicago, in Industrial Nursing, with Planned Parenthood and with the Red Cross.

Mrs. Guber is married and has a 21-year-old son, Guy, a student at the University of California at Santa Cruz. He is a second-year student and is planning a career in vocational counseling or teaching blind students.

Mrs. Guber, who also serves on the Board of Directors of the Children's Vision Center in Oakland, is well known for her dedication in working with students to make their family lives more meaningful.

"Like inner-city high schools in other parts of the country," she has said, "we have a drug abuse problem, but with the help of several groups, including the Junior League of Oakland and the Berkeley Council for Drugs and Society, we are desperately trying to solve that problem."

She feels that boredom, curiosity, pressures, and prestige are the major reasons for the alarming increase in drug abuse among the nation's youth.

"For a long time youthful drug abuse was confined to lower-class delinquents. Now drug abuse has spread among young people from ages 10 to 25. I have met with youths in my school and in others. It is no longer a surprise to find that half the young people in high school and probably 20 to 30 per cent of those in junior high and grammar school have experimented with dangerous drugs."

Mrs. Guber has worked with both the Haight Asbury free clinic in San Francisco and the free clinic in Berkeley on the drug abuse problem. She also is author of a publication entitled "Management of Drug Abusers in High Schools" which was distributed by the California School Health Association.

Mrs. Lou Ann Thomason, Chairman of the Oakland Public Schools Nurses' Advisory Committee, who nominated Mrs. Guber for the award, said, "she is a dedicated and creative nurse, who has worked independently with individual students, many of whom were 'given up for lost' by parents and teachers, with remarkable results. She, along with Mrs. Mary Torrey, is well known in Oakland and Berkeley for their creative program, 'That's Life, Baby,' presented by and for students."

Mrs. Guber holds membership in many professional organizations, including the American Public Health Association and the American School Health Association.

WORLD INFLATION FACTORY

HON. J. GLENN BEALL, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 19, 1971

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, President Nixon, on September 9, spoke to a joint session of Congress and outlined the serious international monetary crisis that the country, indeed the world, faces at the present time.

The solution to these intricate and complicated problems will require a great deal of hard thought and planning. In this light, I recently read an article written by Henry Hazlitt and published in the Freeman of August 1971. The article analyzes our problems and suggests solutions in light of the 1949 world monetary crisis. Mr. Hazlitt is a noted authority in this field.

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

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

THE WORLD MONETARY EARTHQUAKE

(By Henry Hazlitt)

Within a single week 25 nations have deliberately slashed the values of their currencies. Nothing quite comparable with this has ever happened before in the history of the world.

This world monetary earthquake will carry many lessons. It ought to destroy forever the superstitious modern faith in the wisdom of governmental economic planners and monetary managers. This sudden and violent reversal proves that the monetary bureaucrats did not understand what they were doing in the preceding five years. Unfortunately, it gives no good ground for supposing that they understand what they are doing now.

This column has been insisting for years, with perhaps tiresome reiteration, on the evil consequences of overvalued currencies. On Dec. 18, 1946, the International Monetary Fund contended that the trade deficits of European countries "would not be appreciably narrowed by changes in their currency parities." I wrote in *Newsweek* of March 3, 1947: "It is precisely because their currencies are ridiculously overvalued that the imports of these countries are overencouraged and their export industries cannot get started." In the issue of Sept. 8, 1947, as well as in my book, *Will Dollars Save the World?* I wrote: "Nearly every currency in the world (with a few exceptions like the Swiss franc) is overvalued in terms of the dollar. It is precisely this overvaluation which brings about the so-called dollar scarcity."

Yet until Sept. 18 of this year the European bureaucrats continued to insist that their currencies were not overvalued and that even if they were this had nothing to do, or negligibly little to do, with their trade deficits and the "dollar shortage" that they continued to blame on America. And the tragedy was that former Secretary of State Marshall, the President, and Congress, completely misunderstanding the real situation, accepted this European theory and poured billions of the American taxpayers' dollars into the hands of European governments to finance the trade deficits that they themselves were bringing about by their socialism and exchange controls with overvalued currencies.

In time the managers of the Monetary Fund learned half the lesson. They recognized that most European currencies were overvalued. They recognized that this overvaluation was a real factor in causing the

so-called "dollar shortage" and unbalancing and choking world trade. But they proposed the wrong cure.

They did not ask for the simple abolition of exchange controls. (Their own organization in its very origin was tied up with the maintenance of exchange controls.) They proposed instead that official currency valuations be made "realistic." But the only "realistic" currency valuation (as long as a currency is not made freely convertible into a definite weight of gold) is the valuation that a free market would place upon it. Free-market rates are the only rates that keep demand and supply constantly in balance. They are the only rates that permit full and free convertibility of paper currencies into each other at all times.

Sir Stafford Cripps fought to the last against the idea that the rate of the pound had anything to do with the deepening British crisis. Trying to look and talk as much like God as possible, he dismissed all such contentions with celestial disdain. But at the eleventh hour he underwent an intellectual conversion that was almost appallingly complete. We "must try and create conditions," he said, "in which the sterling area is not prevented from earning the dollars we need. This change in the rate of exchange is one of those conditions and the most important one" (my italics). And on the theory that what's worth doing is worth overdoing, he slashed the par value of the pound overnight from \$4.03 to \$2.80.

There are strong reasons (which space does not permit me to spell out at this time) for concluding that the new pound parity he adopted was well below what the real free-market level of widely usable sterling was or would have been on the day he made the change. What he did, in other words, was not merely to adjust the pound to its market value as of Sept. 18 but to make a real devaluation.

The first consequence was to let loose a world scramble for competitive devaluation far beyond anything witnessed in the '30s. Most nations fixed new rates lower than their existing real price and cost levels called for. These countries, therefore, will now undergo still another epidemic of suppressed inflation. Their internal prices and living costs will start to soar. Unions will strike for higher wages. And if the past (or Sir Stafford's Sept. 18 talk) is any guide, the governments will try to combat this by more internal price-fixing and rationing, continued or increased food subsidies, unbalanced budgets, and wage fixing.

In this country, on the contrary, the tendency will be to drag down our price level somewhat by lowering the dollar price of imported commodities and forcing reductions in the dollar price of export commodities. This will increase our problems at a time when the unions are pressing for a wage increase in the camouflaged form of insurance-pension benefits.

It will be necessary to re-examine our whole foreign economic policy in the light of the new exchange rates. Marshall-plan aid with overvalued European currencies was largely futile; Marshall-plan aid with undervalued European currencies should be unnecessary. In fact, we may soon witness the reversal of the world flow of gold. For the first time since 1933 (if we omit the war years 1944 and 1945) gold may move away from, instead of toward, our shores.

But getting rid of overvalued currencies, even in the wrong way, is nonetheless a tremendous gain. The chief barrier that has held up a two-way flow of world trade in the last five years has at last been broken. The chief excuses for maintaining the strangling worldwide network of trade restrictions and controls have at last been destroyed. Were it not for the echoes of the atomic explosion in Russia, the outlook for world economic freedom would at last be brighter.

The best British comment I have read since

the devaluation comes from *The London Daily Express*: "Let every foreign country pay what it thinks the pound is worth . . . But the socialists will never consent to free the pound. It would mean abandonment of their system of controls. . . . If you set money free you set the people free."

EPILOG 1971

The prediction made in this 1949 piece, that the flow of gold would be reversed, proved correct. The deficit in our balance of payments, in fact, began in 1950. Our 1949 gold stock of nearly \$25 billion proved to be its high point. Thereafter it declined. The decline accelerated after 1957 when our balance-of-payments deficits started to reach major proportions.

But all this should not have been too difficult to predict. For on top of the great world realignment of currency values in 1949, our monetary authorities began to inflate our own currency at a greatly increased rate. The dollar "shortage" disappeared, and was soon succeeded by a dollar flood. What would otherwise have been a slight tendency for our prices to fall was offset by an expansion of our money supply. In September, 1947, two years before the 1949 crisis, the U.S. money stock (currency in the hands of the public plus demand bank deposits) was \$111.9 billion. In September, 1949, it was only \$110 billion. But by December 1950 it had reached \$115.2 billion, and by December, 1951, \$122 billion. The figure at the end of May, 1971, was \$225 billion.

It is important to remember that the present world monetary system is not a natural growth, like the old international gold standard, but an arbitrary scheme devised by a handful of monetary bureaucrats who did not even agree with each other. Some of them wanted inconvertible paper currencies free to fluctuate in the foreign exchange markets and "managed" by each country's own bureaucrats solely in accordance with "the needs of the domestic economy." Others wanted "exchange stability," which meant fixed values for each currency in relation to the others. But none of them wanted constant convertibility of his country's currency by any holder into a fixed weight of gold on demand. That had been the essence of the classic gold standard.

So a compromise was adopted. The American dollar alone was to be convertible into a fixed amount (one thirty-fifth of an ounce) of gold on demand. But only on the demand of official central banks, not of private holders of dollars. In fact, private citizens were forbidden to ask for or even to own gold. Then every other nation but the U.S. was to fix a "par value" of its currency unit in terms of the dollar; and it was to maintain this fixed value by agreeing to whatever extent necessary to maintain its currency in the market within 1 per cent of its parity.

THE BURDEN OF RESPONSIBILITY

Thus there was devised a system which appeared to "stabilize" all currencies by tying them up at fixed rates to each other—and even indirectly, through the dollar, tying them at a fixed ratio to gold. This system seemed to have also the great virtue of "economizing" gold. If you could not call it a gold standard, you could at least call it a gold-exchange standard, or a dollar-exchange standard.

But the system, precisely because it "economized reserves," also permitted an enormous inflationary expansion in the supply of nearly all currencies. Even this expansion might have had a definite limit if the U.S. monetary managers had constantly recognized the awesome burdens and responsibilities that the system put upon the dollar. Other countries could go on inflationary sprees without hurting anybody but themselves; but the new system assumed that the American managers, at least, must always stay sober. They would refrain from

anything but the most moderate expansion to keep the dollar constantly convertible into gold.

But the system was not such as to keep the managers responsible. Under the old gold standard, if a country overexpanded its money and credit and pushed down interest rates, it immediately began to lose gold. This forced it to raise interest rates again and contract its currency and credit. A "deficit in the balance of payments" was quickly and almost automatically corrected. The debtor country lost what the creditor country gained.

Just print another billion

But under the gold-exchange or dollar standard, the debtor country does not lose what the creditor country gains. If the U.S. owes \$1 billion to West Germany, it simply ships over a billion paper dollars. The U.S. loses nothing, because in effect it either prints the billion dollars or replaces those shipped by printing another billion dollars. The German Bundesbank then uses these paper dollars, these American I. O. U.'s, as "reserves" against which it can issue more D-marks.

This "gold-exchange" system began to grow up in 1920 and 1921. But the Bretton Woods agreements of 1944 made things much worse. Under these agreements each country pledged itself to accept other countries' currencies at par. When holders of dollars shipped them into Germany, the Bundesbank had to buy them up to any amount at par with D-marks. Germany could do this, in effect, by printing more paper marks to buy more paper dollars. The transaction increased both Germany's "reserves" and its domestic currency supply.

So while our monetary authorities were boasting that the American inflation was at least less than some inflations in Europe and elsewhere, they forgot that some of these foreign inflations were at least in part the result of our own inflation. Part of the dollars we were printing were not pushing up our own prices at home because they went abroad and pushed up prices abroad.

The IMF system, in brief, has been at least partly responsible for the world inflation of the last twenty-five years, with its increasingly ominous economic, political, and moral consequences.

What should be done now?

As long as the world's currencies continue to consist of inconvertible paper there is no point in setting new fixed parities for them. What is a "realistic" rate for any currency today (in terms of others) will be an unrealistic one tomorrow, because each country will be inflating at a different rate.

The first step to be taken is the one that West Germany and a few others have already taken. No country should any longer be obliged to keep its currency at par by the device of buying and selling the dollar or any other paper currency at par. Paper currencies should be allowed to "float," with their prices determined by supply and demand on the market. This will tend to keep them always "in equilibrium," and the market will daily show which currencies are getting stronger and which are getting weaker. The daily changes in prices will serve as early warning signals both to the nationals of each country and to its monetary managers.

Floating rates will be to some extent disorderly and unsettling; but they will be much less so in the long run than pegged rates supported by secret government buying and selling operations. Floating rates, would, moreover, most likely prove a transitional system. It is unlikely that the businessmen of any major nation will long tolerate a paper money fluctuating in value daily.

The next monetary reform step should be for the central banks of all countries to agree at least not to add further to their holdings of paper dollars, pounds, or other "reserve" currencies.

Let citizens own gold

The next step applies to the U.S. alone. There appears to be no alternative now to our government doing frankly and *de jure* what for the last three years it has been doing without acknowledgment but *de facto*: it should openly announce that it can no longer undertake to convert dollars into gold at \$35 an ounce. It owns only about \$1 in gold for every \$45 paper dollars outstanding. Its dollar obligations to foreign central banks alone are now more than twice its holdings of gold. If it really allowed free conversion it would be bailed out of its remaining gold holdings within a week.

The government should also announce that until further notice it will neither buy nor sell gold.

Simultaneously, however, the United States should repeal all prohibitions against its citizens owning, buying, selling, or making contracts in gold. This would mean the restoration of a really free gold market here. Incidentally, because of distrust of floating paper currencies, it would mean that international trade and investment would soon be increasingly conducted in terms of gold, with a weight of gold as the unit of account. Gold, even if not "monetized" by any government would become an international money, if not the international money. On the foreign-exchange markets national paper currencies would be quoted in terms of gold. Even if there were no formal international agreement, this would prepare the way for the return of national currencies, country by country, to a gold standard.

Stop the reckless Government spending that brings inflation

All this concerns technique. What chiefly matters is national economic and monetary policy. What is essential is that the inflation in the U.S. and elsewhere be brought to a halt. Government spending must be slashed; the budget must be consistently balanced; monetary managers as well as private banks must be deprived of the power of constantly and recklessly increasing the money supply.

Only abstention from inflating can make a gold standard workable; but a gold standard in turn, provides the indispensable discipline to enforce abstention from inflating.

David Ricardo summed up this reciprocal relation more than 160 years ago:

"Though it [paper money] has no intrinsic value, yet, by limiting its quantity, its value in exchange is as great as an equal denomination of coin, or bullion in that coin. . . .

"Experience, however, shows that neither a state nor a bank ever has had the unrestricted power of issuing paper money without abusing that power; in all states, therefore, the issue of paper money ought to be under some check and control; and none seems so proper for that purpose as that of subjecting the issuers of paper money to the obligation of paying their notes either in gold coin or bullion."

HANDS OFF THE CANAL

HON. JOHN J. DUNCAN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 19, 1971

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, for the past few years some Members of Congress have been wanting to give away the Panama Canal.

I have been opposed to such action, because it could lead to Communist control of the canal, and the United States and other free nations might be denied

use of it. Giving away the canal could be closing our access to vital trade routes.

The Nashville, Tenn., Banner of October 5 carried such a warning which I put in the RECORD at this point:

HANDS OFF THE CANAL

The time to checkmate any move inimical to a nation's best interests is before it occurs. And on precisely that ground security considerations dictate action now to block the reported effort of "liberals" in Congress to revive give-away designs on the Panama Canal.

Periodically the proposal is raised, usually heralded by rumbblings in the Republic of Panama—student demonstrations, or governmental statements, hostile to the fact of United States sovereignty founded in contract and law, and internationally recognized.

Among those most bitterly opposed to U.S. prerogatives there—inherent to them the controls authorized—are Communists inside and outside the hemisphere, who would like to see the stewardship relinquished for its practically assured relegation, if that occurred, to Communist hands. Should the United States move out, Fidel Castro or his equivalent, as tools of Soviet Russia, inevitably would move in.

As on the other side of the world, where the Suez, in Egypt's hands, came under domination by Soviet policies—such a turn of events in our own hemisphere would be exploited fully by the Communist apparatus. The United States cannot and must not permit that to happen.

True, the Panama Canal cannot handle some of the major surface craft of this day. It still is an essential artery of travel and communication. And it does not belong to any other nation, though the United States—in peacetime relationships—has not closed it to any.

By far most of those playing with the idea of forfeiting—or even diluting—U.S. stewardship there, have no memory of the facts in the case under which that Canal was constructed.

It was on Nov. 18, 1903, that the contract with Panama gave the United States full sovereignty in perpetuity over the Zone. Originally it called for payment of \$250,000 per year (in gold) to that land. In recent years it has been about \$2 million per year—liberally and voluntarily adjusted by this country.

The contract—by treaty—still says what it says; though again and again Panama interests have sought to disestablish U.S. authority there . . . an effort clearly magnified in the years of increasing Communist designs upon that part of the hemisphere—and from it everywhere.

There must be no surrender of U.S. jurisdiction; nor any diminishing of the authority which alone has kept that vital artery of security and commerce out of hostile hands.

The time to state that fact again clearly is now.

The time to block the inroads is now. The time to put the kibosh on eager-beaver advocates of surrender is now.

U.S. TRADE INITIATIVE

HON. JOHN V. TUNNEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 19, 1971

Mr. TUNNEY. Mr. President, I invite the attention of Senators to the perceptive remarks of Mr. David J. Steinberg.

At a time when protectionist sentiment is growing, it is important that the

concise views of a free trade exponent be carefully and fully considered.

Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that an article written by David Steinberg, and published from the Wall Street Journal of September 9, 1971, be printed in the RECORD and reviewed with care and attention.

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

FOR A U.S. TRADE INITIATIVE

(By David J. Steinberg)

Clouds of uncertainty had enveloped U.S. intentions, credibility and dependability in foreign-trade policy before announcement of the President's emergency economic program. They have now been darkened by the program's trade-restrictive measures, particularly the import surtax of 10%, and by the uncertainty that lies beyond the apparently limited purposes these traumatic, albeit temporary, measures are supposed to serve.

The main U.S. objectives in today's international economic emergency appear limited to (1) patching up the world monetary system with fairer exchange rates (but the same old system nonetheless), (2) getting Japan and the European Economic Community to remove some trade barriers (which are only symbols of a much broader and deeper problem, short and longer run), and (3) reducing the balance-of-payments deficit, chiefly by restoring an export surplus.

MUCH MORE REQUIRED

Monetary reform requires much more than artificial adjustments in the exchange rates of major currencies. Trade reform requires much more than Japan and the European Common Market removing trade barriers that are contrary to the international code, the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. And solution of the balance-of-payments problem—the problem of confidence in the dollar—requires much more than attempts to restore an export surplus. There will be no solution at all—the effect on the trade balance alone is imponderable—if these trade measures include import controls, such as retention of the import surtax for more than, say, 60 days.

This would hurt U.S. exports if other countries retaliate—some because of weak foreign-exchange positions, others out of an assortment of motives. Some governments might offset these extraordinary U.S. import restraints with emergency aid to their own exporters, as Canada is already doing.

The surtax could hurt U.S. exports in another way. By raising the cost of materials and equipment preferred or required from foreign sources for price, productivity or other reasons, the tax could weaken the competitiveness of many U.S. manufacturers at home and in export markets. The surtax, like import quotas, might possibly improve the short-run arithmetic of the trade balance, but it would definitely distort the equations of American economic progress in both the short and longer run.

Nor will the tax defuse protectionist pressures. It is more likely to fuel them. Advocates of trade controls will object to its removal, then demand quotas as a durable replacement. Turning to the import-control level with ease, indeed equanimity, the government has once again—this time dramatically—given respectability to import restriction as a policy option. The lesson will not be lost on import-control advocates in other countries.

The import surcharge was not necessary, even as an additional lever to get realignment of the major currencies. Cutting the dollar's mooring to gold, coupled with astute follow-up in the International Monetary Fund and the Organization for Economic

Cooperation and Development, would have been sufficient. The monetary action alone was enough to shake up the governments we considered un mindful of their international responsibilities.

We did not have to shake the whole structure of world trade to its foundations, with consequences not yet fully predictable. As a means of ensuring attention to the reforms we sought from several wayward governments, the surtax is an excessively high premium.

This is now water over the dam. It is done. The U.S. should proceed with urgently needed policy objectives calculated to redeem our earth-shaking tactics as a price worth paying.

The current crisis, shock treatment and all, should be used for bigger stakes than what our government seems to have in mind. The opportunity should be seized to move dramatically toward the only kind of trade policy that can:

Substantially dismantle the nontariff barriers and other trade distortions of the economically advanced countries;

Fully open the world's best markets to the exports of the developing countries;

Foster realistic currency relationships, and Spark comprehensive reforms in updating the rules of fair international competition and upgrading labor standards throughout the world trading system.

Now is the time for a "Marshall Plan" initiative in trade policy, inviting the initiatives of all the industrialized countries on how all of them, including the U.S., might chart a free-trade program.

It was this kind of invitation to other governments—in this instance an invitation to the governments of Europe to come forward with their own initiatives on the programming of postwar European reconstruction—that produced the Marshall Plan. The current crisis is different, but it is earth-shaking and equally demanding of the highest statesmanship.

RESTORING U.S. PRESTIGE

The administration should first, and quickly, remove the import surcharge—an introductory gesture that would also rescue U.S. prestige from further slippage, import-dependent businesses (many of them manufacturers) from financial damage and U.S. consumers from further loss of freedom to choose. It should move concurrently to rally all industrialized countries behind an initiative to program the free movement of goods, capital and exchange rates. And it should move at the same time to launch a full-employment, adjustment/conversion strategy in domestic policy to ensure the most productive adaptation of our resources to these and other changes in a rapidly changing and increasingly competitive world.

Such a policy, truly deserving to be called "the most comprehensive new economic policy to be undertaken in this nation in four decades," would go far toward strengthening world confidence in our money and our judgment. It would stimulate our resourcefulness and competitiveness, such as no other trade policy could ever do. It would stimulate our economy and that of the entire world—to the mutual advantage of all.

But the U.S. is not prepared for such initiatives in both foreign and domestic policy. It is not prepared for the economic statesmanship that befits America's position and America's needs in the eighth decade of the 20th century.

We resort instead to a get-tough policy abroad that borders on gunboat diplomacy. We threaten other countries (including small, underdeveloped economies) with import quotas—and maybe now with continuation of the import surtax—unless they restrict their exports of synthetic and wool textiles. We pressure them to cut their crucial export earning power, while we ourselves have no coherent policy of constructive aid to the industries for whose benefit such trade

controls are sought. We resort to import taxes (hurting innocent bystanders) as a bludgeon to force a few errant countries to do what we want them to do in monetary and trade matters, while we ourselves show little remorse over our own import controls that seriously restrict the earning power of other countries. We have yet to display convincing determination to join in a definitive, long-range program to phase-out the trade barriers of all the advanced countries—a program to achieve the true reciprocity that so concerns those who bemoan the past record of U.S. trade negotiations.

Reform in world trade and monetary affairs is long overdue. Our past efforts to get harmful Japanese and European barriers removed have been frustrating. But the choice is not between, on the one hand, more frustration from the old tactics and, on the other hand, shock treatment (blunderbuss measures applied indiscriminately to the whole world) to "shake up" the few countries whose practices have merited our most intense resentment. A major reason for our past failures at world trade and monetary reform is the ill-conceived manner in which these attempts have been made.

There is no coherent U.S. trade policy calculated to raise the world's sights to the far-reaching trade and monetary reforms that all the advanced countries should be seeking with deliberate speed. On the contrary, the U.S. has been talking "freer trade," particularly abhorring nontariff barriers, but at the same time demanding—often indelicately—that other countries impose nontariff barriers on their own export earnings. Our trade policy has been a mishmash of short-run and often short-sighted improvisations.

WHERE IS OUR POLICY

We could have made significant progress toward correcting the extraordinary inequities in trade and monetary relations if we had articulated a coherent free-trade policy calculated to appeal to the best instincts and best interests of all nations. We could only have done this if we had a coherent domestic-adjustment policy to backstop it politically and economically, with full employment an essential ingredient. But we had neither, and we still have neither.

Now is indeed the time to get tough in trade policy—not by rattling sabres, but by biting the bullet: facing up responsibly and constructively to our adjustment problems at home, and devising ways to get all the advanced countries onto the track of steady progress toward the freest movement of goods and capital and the fairest break for workers and consumers everywhere.

What we should now be planning as aftermath to the current trade and monetary crisis ought to be compellingly clear. But let's face it: When the U.S. dollar stops floating, U.S. trade policy will still be drifting.

A DEAR FRIEND HAS PASSED AWAY

HON. ELLA T. GRASSO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 19, 1971

Mrs. GRASSO. Mr. Speaker, a dear friend has passed away.

Mary Switzer was a noble woman—a woman of compassion and understanding. She devoted a lifetime to improving the health and welfare of people—to rehabilitating the disabled and giving them useful and fulfilling lives.

Her spirit and work were an inspiration to all who were blessed with her friendship.

Her memory will live on, a loving trib-

ute to one who gave so much warmth and hope where sorely needed.

Mr. Speaker, an article by Martin Weil, which appeared in the Washington Post on Sunday, October 17, 1971, recounts many high points of Mary Switzer's life.

The article follows:

MARY SWITZER, HEW OFFICIAL, DIES
(By Martin Weil)

Mary E. Switzer, 71, a retired federal administrator who brought vast expansion and sweeping changes to public programs for rehabilitating the disabled, died of cancer yesterday at George Washington University Hospital.

Miss Switzer ended a 48-year career of federal service when she retired in 1970 as administrator of the Social and Rehabilitation Service of the Department of Health Education and Welfare.

In that post, which she held for three years, she supervised \$8 billion in federal programs serving the needy, children and youth, and the aged, as well as the disabled.

Statistical contrasts are sharp between 1970 and 1950, the year in which Miss Switzer was first put in charge of the federal-state program for rehabilitation of the disabled.

For example: in 1950, the number of disabled persons who had been rehabilitated for useful work was 56,000.

By the year of Miss Switzer's retirement, the yearly figure had increased to more than 240,000.

One of the reasons was the tenacious battle Miss Switzer, a self-described "dedicated bureaucrat," waged within the government to raise the budget for her programs.

In 1950, the federal rehabilitation agency had a budget of only \$20.5 million. In 1970, it was more than \$500 million.

"We feel rehabilitated individuals have a right to work instead of to beg," Miss Switzer once explained in an interview. "We feel an individual is entitled to his place in the sun somehow."

She added: "I feel very deeply about the great loads of dependents on relief. We have a great economic argument for our work, and that is what it will cost the government if we don't rehabilitate."

It was estimated that for each dollar spent on rehabilitation, \$5 was returned in federal income taxes alone in the first five years after training.

Miss Switzer was regarded as a moving force behind the vocational rehabilitation act in 1954, which made possible significant expansions in such areas as rehabilitation research and the training of rehabilitation personnel.

She helped develop or expand programs to aid the blind, the deaf, the crippled and mentally retarded. In 1960, she helped establish an international rehabilitation research program.

Practicing what she preached, Miss Switzer, an Alexandria resident, worked on Saturday nights as a volunteer at Alexandria Hospital.

All of the eight Secretaries of HEW for whom she had worked hailed her either in person or through message at her retirement dinner Feb. 24, 1970.

Arthur S. Flemming, Secretary from 1958 to 1961, called her "one of the 10 career civil servants who has rendered the most to the nation throughout its entire history."

In a statement released yesterday, the current Secretary, Elliot L. Richardson, said: "Mary Switzer made a difference. Countless of the handicapped the world over lead fuller and more rewarding lives because of her. . . . Hers is an unforgettable spirit."

Born in Newton (Upper Falls), Mass., the daughter of immigrants from Ireland, Miss Switzer graduated from Radcliffe College, and began her government career in 1922 as a junior economist with the Treasury Department.

In 1936, her career shifted into its eventual course when she became assistant to the as-

sistant Treasury secretary in charge of the Public Health Service, then an arm of the Treasury.

In this capacity, she figured prominently in the creation in 1939 of the Federal Security Agency, an umbrella agency for health and welfare programs. She joined it as assistant to its administrator.

When she was named in 1950 to head the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation, the bureau was part of the FSA. The office became part of HEW when the new cabinet department was set up in 1953.

Miss Switzer assumed what was described as the largest administrative responsibility of any woman in government when she became head of HEW's social and rehabilitation service in 1967.

By the time of her retirement, she had accumulated at least 16 honorary degrees and more than 40 awards, including the Lasker Award and the National Civil Service Award.

Interviewers found her a warm, tough, sparkling-eyed woman with a firm belief in work.

"People shouldn't get something for nothing," she once said. "We made the biggest mistake when we saw the welfare load growing when we didn't emphasize work."

After retirement, she became a vice president of World Rehabilitation Fund, Inc.

FOREIGN IMPORTS—A GROWING THREAT TO AMERICAN INDUSTRY AND LABOR

HON. RICHARD S. SCHWEIKER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 19, 1971

Mr. SCHWEIKER. Mr. President, just recently several thousand workers came to Washington to express their serious concern about the continuing threat of foreign imports to their jobs. I met with a group of several hundred workers from Pennsylvania alone.

Over the past year I have also noticed a significant increase in the number of businessmen who have come to me about the import problem.

It is time for us to take action now to keep American business and labor strong. We cannot afford to wait any longer. If foreign countries refuse to remove inequitable trade barriers to American goods, we cannot continue to allow them free access to our markets.

Industry Week magazine for October 4, 1971, includes an interesting and informative special report on the problems facing U.S. industry in this area. I ask unanimous consent that this series of articles be printed in the RECORD.

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

IS THERE STILL TIME TO SAVE U.S. INDUSTRY?

(By Walter J. Campbell)

Like many Americans, we are feeling a deep and gnawing concern about your job survival—and ours. And about the livelihood of your children and grandchildren—and ours.

Many questions disturb us.
Are we watching the dimming of America?
Are we exporting too many jobs?
Are we going to blow our position as the No. 1 industrial power and our world-envied standard of living—all in one generation?

Are we about to become a vast warehouse for imported goods—goods we will be unable

to buy because we will lack the purchasing power?

Will U.S. industry be forced to continue to move to overseas locations to survive, causing a further loss of jobs for Americans?

Will our crumbling competitiveness in the world market erode the tax bases on which our governments depend for their revenues, and thus further disrupt both the public services we need and the means by which we hope to solve our great public problems?

Is the U.S. becoming an industrial dropout? These questions are raised by undeniable evidence that our position as a world economic power is slipping.

The U.S. share of world automobile production in 1950 was 76%; last year, it dropped to 33%. And the plunge is continuing.

Our share of world steel production was 47% in 1950. Last year, it was only 20%.

For decades, the U.S. was the No. 1 builder of machine tools—the master tools of industry. By the end of this year, we likely will be in fourth place—behind Russia, Japan, and West Germany.

Nearly half of the people in the U.S. each morning slip into shoes made abroad. More than half of our black and white TV sets are imported. Nine out of ten of us listen to the news on radios built in other countries. Every sixth new car on U.S. roads was built overseas.

THERE GO THE JOBS

Presumably, every imported car displaces an American-made auto. For every American car not produced, American labor loses \$2,400 in wages and benefits—in the auto-maker and partsmaker plants, in the steel, glass, and rubber factories, and in the mines, on the farms, and the shops of equipment builders and all the other suppliers of those materials and components which go into the finished automobile. Ironically, the loss in wages and benefits to U.S. workers may exceed the actual price of the imported autos.

Our real rate of growth, in comparison with that of other industrial countries, is declining. Since 1950, our average growth rate—measured by gross national product at market prices in constant dollars—has been the third lowest among 21 leading countries. Japan's growth outstrips ours by more than 3 to 1.

Facts like these raise the question: Is there still time to save U.S. industry? And the strength that a strong industry provides our country?

We feel the same concern that prompted President Nixon (at long last) to propose the drastic economic measures of his Aug. 15 message: a freeze on wages and prices to slow inflation; a tax on imports to stem the tide of foreign goods flowing into this country; tax relief to help the U.S. consumer buy the things he needs; and an investment tax credit to encourage use of the best tools available to U.S. industry.

Those measures may help—but they are not a cure.

The ultimate cure lies in this country once again becoming competitive with other producers in the world.

That means our productivity must be increased to help offset our higher hourly employment costs, which are now two and three times—and more—greater than those of the countries with which we compete.

That means our tariffs and trade rules must be made equitable with those of other countries.

That means we must abandon our policy of rewarding the looters and the moochers instead of those who work and produce.

That means we must stop playing giveaway checkers.

That means we must start making economic decisions on economic grounds—not from political motives.

That means that all sectors of our economy—industry, labor, and government—must unite in making this country competi-

tive in costs, competitive in quality, and competitive in service.

WHERE DID WE GO WRONG?

One answer is suggested in the poker analogy offered by President Nixon in his Sept. 9 message to Congress. At the end of World War II, the U.S. held most of the chips. We had to give some away if other countries were to be able to play. We did, and that probably was right and proper at the time.

But giveaway became a political habit.

If we were giving to other countries, why not give to our own people? This was a way to win votes, too. And so we mounted one of the greatest SFN (something or nothing) programs ever seen. SFN became a more dangerous drug than LSD, DMT, STP, or POT. Soon the demands accelerated to MFN (more for nothing). Militant pressure groups suggested new programs, and we developed a new estate—the voluntary and professional poor—to be supported by the working poor.

Development of the looter-and-moocher culture was, in itself, inflationary. Politicians happily wagged their tongues and voted away our substance for foreign aid, new welfare programs, food stamps for strikers: subsidies for all kinds of non-producers.

SFN became a progressively addictive drug—at home and abroad.

Labor laws became more lopsided, and union leaders naturally took full advantage. Wages and benefits spiraled. The will to work diminished—with academic and political encouragement. We artificially limited productivity. Repudiation of the "Protestant ethic" became popular. Too many people no longer wanted to produce useful goods and services. They wanted to organize into pressure groups.

So we arrive at the present—and the decision: are we to flounder or flourish?

The President has called a halt to our free giving permissiveness abroad and says the time has passed for the U.S. to compete with one hand tied behind its back.

That is what industrialists said a decade ago.

But no responsible public official yet has had the courage to say the equivalent about conditions at home. No one has mounted a drive to insist on a competitive day's work for a competitive day's pay. No one points the finger at our dwindling personal productivity, or the number of able-bodied people supported at public expense and producing nothing.

NEEDED: MILITANT MAJORITY

Is there still time?

Yes, if we clearly define and recognize our problem and firmly resolve to keep our country the No. 1 industrial power in the world—competent to supply the jobs American workers need and to maintain and improve our standard of living—by producing the goods and services needed by our people—and to provide the wherewithal to solve this country's huge public problems.

We will need a more militant majority—a majority that believes in working and producing. We will need militancy—not of the type that throws fire bombs—but of the type which will speak out clearly and insist on the kind of country we want.

We will take a lesson from our own past, or from the more recent experience of our overseas competitors, and work harder and smarter to achieve and insure a better quality of living for all Americans.

We will insist that we increase our national productivity and, in so doing, create more jobs for Americans.

We will insist that we will use the best tools that are at hand or that can be made available.

We will relate rewards to productivity; that will do much to curb inflation.

We will seek a better environment in which to live. We will set realistic goals, develop the needed technology, and achieve those goals at a price we can afford.

We will strive for a partnership of purpose among industry, government, and labor to achieve what must be a common goal: a growing and prosperous United States of America with jobs and sufficiency for all.

Because the editors of *Industry Week*, believe this country, as an economic power, may be heading toward its last crisis, we have explored in the following pages some of the problems which, we believe, created our predicament.

On Page S-32, we advance a Strategy for Survival. We commend those imperatives to all who shudder lest the bell tolls for U.S. industry.

RIISING IMPORTS SWAMP US

(By William H. Miller)

"Made in the U.S.A." is changing from fact to question in world markets.

Producer of 47% of the world's raw steel in 1950, last year the U.S. achieved only 20%.

Dominant in world automaking with 76% of the total in 1950, last year the U.S. built only 33%.

Virtually alone as a shipbuilder following World War II, last year the U.S. built only 2% of the world's merchant ships.

Consistently first among the world's machine tool builders year after year, the U.S. at the end of 1971 may rank fourth.

Worse still, not only is the "Made in U.S.A." label fading abroad, but it is also vanishing at home. Imports into the U.S. this year apparently will account for:

9 out of 10 home radios.

1 of every 6 new cars sold.

2 of every 5 pairs of shoes.

1 of every 2 black and white TV sets.

Hundreds of import inroads could be cited—96% of our motorcycles, 30% of ceramic tile, 90% of baseball gloves, 30% of bicycles, and 76% of tennis rackets—but taken together they add up to the threat of the first clear trade deficit for the U.S. since 1893.

"Clear" because "in fact the nation has been posting a deficit for several years in terms of private commercial trade," contends O. R. Strackbein, president of the Nationwide Committee on Import-Export Policy, Washington. "This unfavorable balance has been hidden by official reports," he believes.

"Why our government insists on reporting our trade balances on the basis of f.o.b. values of imports, and including government financed exports, to create the illusion that everything is rosy, I do not know," agrees Joseph S. Wright, chairman, Zenith Radio Corp., Chicago. "It results in our showing a \$13 billion trade surplus from 1966 to 1970 when in fact we really had a \$16 billion deficit if you deduct government financed exports and add 10% to imports to approximate actual landed cost."

But first in this century or not, a balance of trade deficit will be no fluke. "It looks like we will be running a trade deficit as a regular thing from now on," reports John Hein, international economist for the Conference Board Inc., New York. Mr. Hein's evaluation is based on studies of trade projections through the mid-1980s.

PLUMMETING PROFITS

Closer to the jugular vein of U.S. business is the unmistakable impact that market competition has had on profits.

Last year, profits dropped to an average of 4% per dollar of sales for all U.S. manufacturing corporations, as against 5.2% as recently as 1964. But the profit picture is even more dismal in industries more directly hit by imports.

Among textile mill product companies, profits tumbled from an average of 3.2% to 1.9% in the six-year span (1964-70). Motor vehicle and equipment makers experienced a slide from 6.9% to 2.4%. Primary metals producers dropped from 5.9% to 3%, while

primary iron and steel companies eroded from 5.5% to 2.5%.

The impact on employment has been equally severe. Admitting that his statistics are "only rough guesses," Andrew J. Biemiller, director of the AFL-CIO's Dept. of Legislation, Washington, estimates that "approximately 700,000 American jobs were lost directly as a result of foreign competition between 1966 and 1969 alone."

In the withering consumer electronics industry, Zenith's Mr. Wright believes that 47,000 jobs have been lost to imports. William Sheskey, president of Commonwealth Shoe & Leather Co. Inc., Whitman, Mass., and chairman of the National Affairs Committee, American Footwear Manufacturers Assn., says that imported footwear had wiped out 76,250 job opportunities in the U.S. by 1969 and that by 1975 the figure could reach 169,200.

"More than a quarter million textile and apparel jobs were displaced by the import volume of these products in 1969 alone," estimates Donald F. McCullough, president of Collins & Aikman Corp., New York, and head of the American Textile Manufacturers Institute (ATMI).

IMPORT TIDE RISES

Consumer electronics was one of the first industries to feel the import shock. Low-priced Japanese transistor radios began pouring into the U.S. in the late 1950s. By 1960 some 55% of all portable radios sold in this country were of Asiatic origin, and that figure has been at 95%—virtually wiping out the American industry—since 1968.

In 1962, Japanese imports had captured only 2.4% of the total black and white television market in the U.S. By 1970, these had risen to 51%, increasing their share of the U.S. market over 20 times in just eight years. In 1964, imports of Japanese color TV receivers were 2.6% of the total market, which was then about 2.6 million units. In 1970, imports accounted for almost 18% of the doubled 5.2 million U.S. color set market.

In May 1971, exports of Japanese color TV sets had increased 140% over May 1970, and most of those sets came to the U.S. By 1976, predicts Mr. Wright, imports will take 60% of the projected U.S. consumer electronics market.

In footwear, an industry hit swiftly by overseas competition, imports jumped from 22% of the U.S. market in 1967 to 32% last year. In 1971, forecasts the American Footwear Manufacturers Assn., they'll climb to 36% with shoes—the principal target—reaching 42%.

Apparel imports are rising at a rate of 12 to 15% a year, now accounting for 68% of all sweaters sold in the U.S., 42% of all men's and boy's woven dress and sport shirts, and 28% of women's and children's woven blouses, data from the American Apparel Manufacturers Assn. indicate.

In textiles, U.S. firms have been suffering a trade deficit since 1958, with a record \$1.6 billion gap last year says the ATMI. Most surprising and most worrisome is the trend in once U.S.-dominated manmade fibers. Imports have shot from less than 1 billion equivalent square yards in 1967 to an annual rate of nearly 4 billion through May of this year.

JUST THE OTHER GUY?

Some contend that "electronics, shoes, apparel, and textiles are labor-intensive and thus vulnerable to foreign competition." But capital-intensive American industries are feeling the competition as well.

In the steel industry, for instance, imports took only 4.75% of the U.S. market as recently as 1961, reports the American Iron & Steel Institute. But last year they had reached 13.8%, and climbed to 15.6% through July of this year.

But overall figures don't tell the whole story. During the first seven months of 1971, 45.2% of all nails and staples sold in the U.S. were imported, as were 36.9% of all

barbed wire and 43.9% of all wire rod. The menace from abroad is being felt in specialty steels in particular, with imports capturing 21% of the profitable stainless market in 1970.

Autos, also capital-intensive, watched imports exceed 20% of the U.S. market for the first time in August as buyers grabbed up presurtax units. Henry Ford II, chairman Ford Motor Co., has said, "I frankly don't see how we're going to meet the foreign competition. We've seen only the beginning. Wait until those Japanese [now selling strongly on the West Coast] get hold of the central part of the U.S."

Every imported car brings with it five foreign tires. The highly automated U.S. tire industry watched imports capture 10.6% of the U.S. tire market last year and expects further inroads due to increasing imports of foreign cars and the foreign lead in hot-selling radial tires.

NOTHING IS SAFE

One industry that observers have long felt would escape foreign competition is machinery. Besides being capital-intensive, it involves high shipping costs, which were expected to discourage imports.

The expectation proved false; machinery imports have tripled since 1964. Perhaps the most painful example is foreign textile machinery, now taking 37% of the U.S. market. Penetration already has reached 11% of the much larger metal cutting machine tool market. As related to exports, says the Machinery & Allied Products Institute, Washington, machinery imports have shot from 13% in 1961 to 40% in the first quarter of this year. In textile and leather machinery, the U.S. is running a deficit.

Consider home sewing machines, once produced by many U.S. companies. Now Singer Corp., New York, is the only domestic manufacturer; it builds all but its most expensive models in Italy.

WHO'S NEXT?

No U.S. industry is safe from import competition, asserts Mr. Strackbein. "The theory that only labor-intensive products are susceptible is wishful thinking. All products are labor-intensive if you take the process all the way back to the raw material stage."

Mr. Strackbein looks for computers and other high-technology products to be the next targets. The U.S. has led in such products, he believes, "because they're complex and because we got the jump on everybody else. But now the technology of other nations is catching up—partly because we've made patents available to them."

George C. Wells, vice president-international affairs, Union Carbide Corp., New York, thinks the chemical industry, which accounted for \$2.4 billion of the U.S. total \$2.7 billion trade surplus last year, could be hit. He notes the same symptoms in chemicals that affected the steel industry: imports rising faster than exports, and a declining share of the world market.

The aircraft industry is stirring uneasily, too, with joint venture aircraft projects underway in Europe, the Soviet Union actively seeking export sales, and Japan developing its first jet transport.

Industry leaders clearly are concerned. "Steel requires help—and needs it now," pleaded Roger S. Ahlbrandt, president and chief executive officer of Allegheny Ludlum Industries Inc., Pittsburgh, to a Senate subcommittee.

"The basic issue, in its simplest terms, is the very future of this industry," testified Donald McCullough for American textile manufacturers before a House committee studying the textile and apparel industries.

"If imports were to keep growing at this rate, they'd completely capture the domestic tire market by 1980," warned Russell DeYoung, chairman, Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co., Akron, at a national meeting of security analysts in Cleveland.

Week by week the evidence mounts that

modern American industry—for the first time—is in a fight for its very survival.

If we're losing out in the game of trade, are trade rules the problem?

TRADE RULES TIE OUR HANDS

(By Floyd G. Lawrence)

U.S. industries on their knees seemed as unlikely two decades ago as the prospect of men driving a car on the moon. Dominant in domestic and foreign markets, U.S. industrial technology and productivity were multiplying so furiously that our concern was with getting the world gainfully employed to buy.

It looks now as though we may have overdone it, particularly in the case of Japan. For the growing redness in the U.S. balance of trade is cast heavily by the Rising Sun.

Through the first half of 1971, the Japan-U.S. trade imbalance was running in Japan's favor—at a \$2.8 billion annual rate—while U.S. trade with the rest of the world was headed toward a \$1.3 billion surplus. Japan's official foreign exchange reserves during the period passed \$12.5 billion, exceeding for the first time those of the U.S. itself.

Seeking to build a strong economy in Asia, we have permitted Japan to deal with the U.S. like a less-developed nation. Raw materials to fuel Japanese industry, together with agricultural products, account for some 70% of Japan's imports from us. In contrast with the low technological and labor content of our products which Japan buys, about 90% of Japan's exports to this country are manufactured goods which compete vigorously with U.S. industry.

U.S. investment in Japan—one of the few ways through which our bilateral balance of payments might be improved—is calculatedly restricted. But more than 200 Japanese firms have already established themselves in the U.S., where no similar obstacles exist. Japanese companies have, for example, invested heavily in Alaska's natural resources and virtually dominate that state's forest products industry.

Japanese capital has come in considerable amounts from U.S. banks; long and short term loans totaled nearly \$6 billion in 1970. Yet capital borrowed here at high interest can reappear as low interest export credit through subsidy supported by the Japanese consumer and sheltered markets.

Of Japan's import restrictions on some 80 broad product categories, 40 affect U.S. business. But U.S. restrictions on some 67 commodities are primarily agricultural and of little concern to Japan. As a result, while Japan now captures some 5.3% of the 10 million U.S. car market, for example, U.S. automakers in 1970 achieved only about 0.6% of a 3 million car market in Japan.

NO YEN FOR \$5,000 PINTOS

Japanese cars entering this country face an import duty of 3.5% (which President Nixon proposes raising to 10%). U.S. cars going into Japan not only have long been subject to a 10% duty based on cost including freight, but also to a commodities tax based on engine displacement and wheelbase.

A Ford Pinto costing \$2,000 would demand a price of \$5,000 in Japan, say industry sources, and there are no takers. The few Japanese buyers of specialty cars like the Ford Mustang at \$8,300 or the Thunderbird at \$13,000 then face an annual road tax ranging up to \$250, again based on vehicle size.

A sheltered market is also provided by Japan for consumer electronics products, in which our 1970 deficit with Japan exceeded \$1 billion. But were the Japanese market open, color television receivers could be manufactured in the U.S. and sold in Japan at competitive prices, believes Joseph Wright, chairman, Zenith Radio Corp., Chicago.

"The Japanese Electronics Industry Assn. itself admits that large screen color TV receivers made in the U.S. could be delivered to a Japanese importer for a total cost of

about \$449, as against \$1,200 to \$1,600 for similar Japanese sets there," says Mr. Wright. "But Japanese regulations still block free entry of necessary repair parts, and the Japanese are notorious for applying what they call 'administrative guidance' to influence sales outlets in the handling of export goods."

Militating against other would-be traders is the Japanese system of import licenses and exchange controls. Plans for goods and material required by the Japanese economy are drawn up to cover commodities like iron ore, coking coal, or steel scrap. If there is no "need" to import, as in the case of steel mill products for example, there is no plan and hence no import license.

Japan arrays not only a good defense but a good offense as well. "In the area of export incentives, there is good reason to believe that the Japanese government provides a whole host of subsidies beginning with the remission of a commodity tax and including such things as export credits at cut-rate interest, subsidization of research and development, interest-free or low interest production loans, accelerated depreciation and a variety of other tax advantages, as well as insurance against loss in export," says Mr. Wright.

THE AMERICAN WAY

"Unfortunately we seem to have a peculiar American tendency to wind up with the short end in negotiating international trade agreements," believes Mr. Wright. "The fact is that while our general Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) arrangements have opened up the U.S. markets to imports on a large scale, we are still left with systematic discrimination against American consumer products throughout most of the world, with tariffs and a whole host of nontariff barriers to competition."

Since its inception in 1946, GATT has provided the legal framework for international commercial relations. Guided by the goals of most-favored nation treatment—that each member should apply to the products of all other members a duty no higher than it applies against the same goods from the "most favored nation"—and reciprocal tariff concessions through multilateral agreement, GATT has been instrumental in the remarkable acceleration of world economic growth and the rise in real income.

"In spite of these accomplishments," observes Nicholas E. Hollis, a member of the International Group, U.S. Chamber of Commerce, Washington, "the influence of GATT has been declining and the spirit of trade liberalization has ebbed markedly since the conclusion of the Kennedy Round of negotiations in 1967. GATT seems increasingly less able to cope with issues such as nontariff negotiations, export subsidies, impact on trade and investment of multinational corporations, spreading economic integration with preferential association arrangements, border tax adjustments, and agricultural support systems.

"More frustrating still," adds Mr. Hollis, "is the strong indication that contracting members are increasing their nontariff barriers in order to build a negotiating position. We have benefited tremendously from the accelerated development we facilitated in Japan and in the European Economic Community (EEC). But as we created strong markets we created strong competitors with their own market needs."

FROM POLITICS TO ECONOMICS

"We were sufficiently interested in the integration of Europe and the strength of Japan to look the other way when it came to specific problems in the trade field," explains Harold B. Malmgren, international adviser to the National Assn. of Manufacturers and a former White House official. "But we now rank second in world trade to the EEC we helped to strengthen, while the Japanese are rapidly becoming an economic superpower. Clearly, the U.S. is no longer in a position to pursue some vague political philosophy and expect

the rest of the world to follow wherever that whim leads.

"We need a new foreign economic policy that is pragmatic and businesslike," says Mr. Malmgren, "but you can't put together a new policy that involves government and industry alike unless you have a consensus to make it work. Government structure and bureaucratic inertia alone will be formidable obstacles in the path of change. But the crucial issue is how business interests can be factored in across the board and a consensus reached leading to movement rather than to stalemate."

ACTION OR REACTION?

The very pressures which make industry consensus imperative are today fostering "increasing and alarming polarization of industry views on U.S. trade policy," in the words of Lee L. Morgan, executive vice president, Caterpillar Tractor Co., Peoria, Ill. He agrees that an accommodation must be achieved.

"By accommodation I don't mean the kind of expedient compromise that says, 'If you'll tolerate my selfish interests, I'll tolerate yours.' I mean rather accommodating the legitimate needs of vital sectors of the U.S. economy to the needs of the nation as a whole."

If any consensus is yet emerging, it is growing agreement that reactions based on political expediency must be replaced by actions based on economic reason. Just as corporate planning spans the longer term—what businesses the company wants to be in, what its strengths and weaknesses are, where the resources will come from, and how return on investment will be achieved—so the U.S. and its industry must begin to plan carefully and cooperatively.

"In the U.S. government today there is no group at any level which even attempts to take a look at where the country will be or should be in 20 years," declares Mr. Malmgren. "Our nation lacks goals against which to measure its future requirements from the world in fundamental terms of energy and basic resources. The Japanese, in contrast, have very clear ideas of where they are going to be 30 years from now, with the resource needs to get them there fully laid out."

"The Administration action has created an opportunity. This is a time when government and industry together must think very hard and very fast about what we want to get and then make it clear to the other countries so a negotiating process can begin. With a proper exchange rate restructuring, we will have about two or three years. With the right kind of negotiations, everybody will be better off. But," warns Mr. Malmgren, "if we fail to act positively, there will be no gain."

Suppose we somehow can unite industries' views and muster sufficient leverage to bring more equitable rules to the game. We then must ask ourselves, "If American industry is to be saved, what will it take to field a competitive team?"

LABOR TRIUMPHS BRING DEFEAT

(By Stanley J. Modic and Dale W. Sommer)

"American workers still believe they're competing with guys around the corner. Until they realize they're competing with guys around the world—until we can achieve a competitive day's work for a competitive day's pay—we're all in trouble," summarizes one executive.

That trouble is deepening. For at the same time the U.S. is adding most to its wage bill, it's adding least to productivity to pay for it. Output of the American worker has grown only 35% since 1960, while that of the Japanese worker has soared 189%. Yet the gap between U.S. and Japanese hourly employment costs widened during the decade from \$2.43 to \$3.23 an hour.

Claims that "foreign wages are rising faster and will soon catch up" are disproven by

the facts. The dollar wage gap has continued to grow between the U.S. and Japan, Great Britain, Italy, France, and West Germany while the U.S. has slipped from first to last in productivity growth against these competitors.

"Unions have gone beserk," says Pierre A. Rinfret, president, Rinfret-Boston Associates Inc., New York. "They are exploiting their own position and the general situation."

Unions and government, in Mr. Rinfret's view, "have been working together to destroy industry's competitive strength. Labor has a monopolistic position. Workers go on strike and get food stamps and welfare. Management does not get strike compensation."

One solution, he says, is "to re-establish some competition within labor. Break open entry into labor. Use the antitrust laws. Take away unemployment compensation for strikers."

FIGHTS AND WINS

"U.S. companies do face a monopoly on the union side. There are antitrust laws prohibiting companies from merging and dominating the market. On the other hand, unions have that monopoly," agrees Wolfgang Jansen, president, Georgetown Steel Corp., Georgetown, S.C.—a firm controlled and managed by a German steelmaker, Willie Korf. Mr. Jansen came from Germany to set up and run the plant, a background providing him a binational view.

He started at Georgetown with a non-union shop. Before long the United Steelworkers of America was knocking at the door and won a representation election. Contract negotiations followed, leading "to a bitter fight and a six-month strike," Mr. Jansen relates.

"I can understand unions fighting for higher wages. But I can't understand the union fighting for featherbedding and restrictive work practices," he adds. His fight paid off in a four-year contract "retaining full management rights. We don't have any work rules imposed on us by the union."

"Had the union won its work rule changes, the entire company—and in turn the entire workforce—would have been disadvantaged," Mr. Jansen contends. He senses a glimmer of hope. "Unions are losing jobs to imports. Responsible union leaders are beginning to see—at least more so than before—that they have to work with management to protect the jobs of their memberships. The only way to reverse the trend is to make American goods more competitive, and you can't do it by using two people to do a one-man job."

"That's what is different in Germany and I think it's more important than the disparity in wage rates. Over here, in some plants, an electrician can't pick up a wrench. But in Germany, if one maintenance man is technically capable of handling the entire job, that's no problem. German workmen recognize improved productivity helps everybody," Mr. Jansen says.

SO, TOO, THE JAPANESE

Similar understanding is a big part of Japan's success in the world market. Low wages obviously give them an advantage, but the competitive edge cuts deeper.

"You operate in a Japanese factory without anything near the same level of routine interruption from grievance and work practices common to an American factory," says John Ong, president, B. F. Goodrich International Co., Akron. Goodrich, as a stockholder in a Japanese company with six plants, is active in improving the productivity of those plants. "We made great changes in their work practices and standards, yet selling them to the workers or to the union was no problem," Mr. Ong explains.

A Japanese manager for Nissan Motor Corp. of America (Datsun marketer) working on the West Coast explains that unions in Japan understand management's position, and vice versa. The two meet regularly and the union proposes ideas on how to increase sales or profits because it realizes

that if the company prospers, the union members can make more money.

"The unions in the U.S. seem to be fighting to get a raise regardless of the company's position or its future," he says. "In Japan, unions realize they may have to postpone a wage increase because wages can be increased only when the company grows."

SAGGING WILL TO WORK

Conversely, "the labor movement has tended to undermine, sometimes deliberately and sometimes not, the will to work and the productive capacity of this country," charges one company executive interviewed by *INDUSTRY WEEK*. Unions provide a defense for the worker who tries to avoid working at a reasonable production level. When, through a whole variety of pressures, they get the standard of output reduced, they have hurt the productive efficiency of the plant, the company, and the country. And they jeopardize the future of their own members by resisting strongly any real ability of management to reward the better performer by promotion or merit increase," he adds.

Construction unions are an oft-cited example. In the first nine months of 1970, construction settlements pushed first-year median wage increases to 90.4 cents an hour, compared with an all-industry median of 24.3 cents.

Roger Blough, chairman of the Construction Users Anti-Inflation Roundtable, presented those figures to the Joint Economic Committee of Congress early this year.

"But wages are only part of the growing problem," he added, pointing out the National Constructors Assn. "reports decreases in labor productivity of as much as 34%." Among the causes of sagging productivity he cited: "Plumbers who cut off threads and rethread the pipe on the job; carpenters who will not install prehung doors or sash; painters who limit the size of the brush or roller; bricklayers who will lay only 400 bricks a day compared with a normal 800 bricks a day on open-shop work; or electricians who require a skilled craftsman to install a new light bulb."

LABOR LAWS DON'T HELP

Part of the gulf between unions and management can be traced to a "pattern of government favoritism toward unions and labor," contends Edward A. McCabe, Washington attorney and executive director of the Labor Law Study Committee.

"The National Labor Relations Board (NLRB) was born in an era when its sole purpose seemed to be the furtherance of unions. If you're raised on that over the years, it's kind of hard to get out of the habit. Unions are grown up now. They don't need to be nursed along as they might have been during the early days," he feels.

The Labor Law Study Committee, an organization that grew out of the contacts of industrial relations executives at a dozen of the nation's big companies, details the "removal of the NLRB from unfair labor practice cases" as one of 23 "needed changes" in the labor law. It suggests two remedies: either transfer unfair labor practice cases to the U.S. District Courts, with the NLRB continuing to conduct union representation elections; or replace the NLRB with a 15-member Labor Court with each judge serving a 20-year term.

Even NLRB Chairman Edward Miller agrees that "somewhere along the line the board ought to be restructured so it can both look and act like a court," but he rejects both reform proposals.

Mr. Miller contends that a revamping of the NLRB into "an honest-to-goodness labor judiciary" would accomplish the same purpose more effectively. A change in the name might help remove the stigma of the pro-union label, he suggests, while giving the board members longer tenure—perhaps even for life—might dull the "political cast."

But he sees no changes coming "in the

near term. Any time you introduce even a relatively uncontroversial change, Congress is swamped with amendments and lobbyists pressing for their own interests. Finally, they just throw up their hands and say, 'Oh, hell, let's leave it alone.'"

But J. Wade Miller Jr., vice president—personnel and organization, B. F. Goodrich Co., Akron, feels it's "inconceivable that with the direction things are going in—in the bargaining area—that Congress can much longer sit on its hands. There are hundreds of bills . . . buried in committees chaired by individuals who for one reason or another don't want to face up to the problem."

PUBLIC CONCERN GROWS

If industry's plight won't move Congress, public opinion might. For there is also a growing awareness of the problem among the public. A public opinion survey conducted by Opinion Research Corp., Princeton, N. J., in late 1970 for the Labor Law Study Committee, shows that 56% (up from 45% a year earlier) of those surveyed agree that "wages paid in this country make it difficult for the U.S. to compete in world markets." Ironically, the highest recognition of the problem is among union members; 61% of the union members polled agreed with the statement.

"There is in the public mood today all the ingredients for an uprising against organized labor should there be a new round of crippling strikes and contract settlements that feed the inflationary spiral," states the survey report, compiled by Walter G. Barlow (he's now president of Research Strategies Corp., New York).

Some other findings of the latest survey (which has been conducted annually since 1966):

69% say labor unions "have grown enough or are too large now." Even 58% of those with a union affiliation feel the same way. 60% of the public and 53% of the union members polled believe that labor union leaders are basically unresponsive to the public interest, as well as to the interests of their members.

GOVERNMENT JUMPS IN

Beyond the NLRB and labor laws, industry points in dismay to federal intervention in specific negotiations. "Too often, the White House and Labor Dept. are a stage for private negotiations. When you begin to draw things into Washington that should be settled somewhere else, it's pretty much agreed that the government has been a partisan of the union," charges attorney McCabe.

People in government generally "have been more concerned with just getting a contract signed; to put pressure on labor or management or both just to get a settlement," says W. J. Usery, assistant secretary of labor, labor-management relations, and the man very much involved in the current railroad labor situation. Rather than calling government a fire-fighter, he sees it as a "catalyst—promoting sound management-union relations—spending time to get mutual trust out of the parties to develop a climate for improving productivity."

COMMUNICATIONS A HELP

His program, he believes, is a step in that direction. It's aimed at the problem that "too many company bargainers don't see their union representatives at all except during the heat of contract negotiations or arbitration hearings." It has been put to work in the aerospace industry. Mr. Usery explains the program this way:

In aerospace there are many peaks and valleys. Management can look ahead and gauge their impact. Local union leaders and workers can't. They lack management's insight into the business climate. To overcome this, a representative of the secretary of labor acts as a catalyst to set up an informal meeting between company and union well before any contract talks begin. Each plant is visited jointly. The visit may start with a plant tour,

followed by management talking honestly about what it sees over the next few years, and capped off with a dinner.

Result: the parties get to know each other under a more friendly atmosphere, and the union gets an insight into what's going on—when they sit down across the bargaining table, there are no surprises.

Understanding won't come overnight, but he is encouraged that awareness of the problem is growing among union leaders. He points to the charge of I. W. Abel (president of the United Steelworkers of America) to his membership at the last contract signing: that they have a responsibility to work toward improving productivity and the establishing of joint labor-management committees at each plant to explore the problems.

Labor and management need outside help to keep such dialog going, Mr. Usery warns. He has been promoting the idea that the parties jointly find a "catalyst"—he can be a minister or anyone who commands mutual respect—to get them together.

Company managers agree that they must share a responsibility for the communications gap. Their consensus: "Perhaps if we can more effectively tell it like it is, union leaders will do the same."

But there are, of course, other problems . . .

SEEDS OF WEALTH SQUANDERED

(By John H. Carson)

Forty acres and a mule once added up to a good living in America. Today they describe a rural pauper. The difference is modern tools.

More than 95% of our work is done with tools that have enabled us to make remarkable increases in productivity over the more laborious methods of a few decades ago. But increases in productivity—the reduction in production costs—create a saving that can be used to buy new tools, to reduce selling prices, or to increase wages.

As we have seen, largely because of the power of labor unions in America, we have been accentuating the third: increasing wages. Improved tools historically have been able to increase productivity—create a saving—at a rate of about 3% a year. Wage increases of that amount, assuming shareholders and customers were entitled to none of the benefit, would not force prices to increase.

But since World War II, wages have been rising about 4.5% each year, 50% faster than productivity. By 1969, wage increases reached a 7.5% rate, more than twice the productivity gain. We are in the grip of a price inflation resulting in part from the basic fact that unearned wage increases must be passed on to the customer.

But worse still, productivity since the mid-sixties has been increasing in the U.S. at less than 2% annually. While Japan has boosted its productivity more than four times as fast as we have ours and West Germany has improved at twice our rate, the U. S. has slipped to last place in the world productivity race.

Some take comfort in the fact that as a result of rebuilding following World War II, some foreign competitors have a "temporary" advantage in more modern facilities than those in this country. "Our high percentage of overage and obsolete equipment is merely a symptom of maturity, a condition other countries will reach in time," they contend.

MODERNIZATION GAP

But will they? In 1960-68, new investment in plant and equipment in Japan represented 33% of its gross national product. West Germany invested 25%, followed closely by Italy, France, and Sweden, with the United Kingdom (17%) and the U. S. (16%) bringing up the rear.

"It may astound many to learn that the Japanese can actually afford to scrap a seven- or eight-year-old mill in order to substitute a more efficient one," says Stewart S. Cort,

chairman, Bethlehem Steel Corp., Bethlehem, Pa.

U.S. industry leaders agree that poor capital recovery or "depreciation"—money made available for new tools—is the primary reason for the lack of investment. The U. S. government, recognizing the need for tool replacement, provides depreciation allowances which exempt certain funds from taxes for that purpose. The United Kingdom, losing out in productivity, revised its depreciation regulations last year to permit 80% writeoff at the time of installation. But the U.S., even worse off than the UK, is committed to such high levels of government spending that tax concessions for realistic tool replacement could not be made available.

Although 20% shorter guideline lives and improved first-year writeoffs were granted through the Asset Depreciation Ranges (ADR) program, the U.S. continues to have the poorest capital recovery system among the world's industrial nations. After seven years, the average total recovery is still only 76%, or 4 percentage points below the UK's first year writeoff.

Since less efficient equipment means lower productivity—which means higher prices, which means inflation—the problem is also self-expanding. "All figures on profits are fictitious because we're using depreciation rates on equipment at original prices," says Dr. Herbert W. Robinson, president, International Management Systems Corp., Washington. "If you really measured what you need to replace the capital, you'd have to reduce profits tremendously."

Because tax laws don't permit an allowance for inflation in depreciation, George Terborgh, consultant to the Machinery & Allied Products Institute, Washington, estimates that "underdepreciation in the U.S. resulting from inflation is \$10 billion a year, and probably more."

Mr. Terborgh believes the combination of ADR and the pending investment credit, if it's approved, would do little more than to wipe out this deficit. He would like to see the credit remain at 10%—instead of dropping to the proposed permanent level of 5% after one year—or at least drop no lower than 7%, the level of the 1962-69 credit.

Like other business experts; Mr. Terborgh would like to see the 1970 recommendation for 40% shorter guideline lives, made by the President's Task Force on Business Taxation, become law. However, he adds, "It's a question of realism. We'll be lucky to get ADR and the investment credit simultaneously."

Tax laws work against investment on another level, Dr. Robinson points out. With the ceiling on the tax on personal capital gains raised to 35% and local taxes added, "you're now paying about 40% in the higher income brackets on any capital gains."

Since both inflation and real gains are elements of capital gains and since the tax is paid even on "what's needed to stand still in terms of purchasing power, the capital gains tax is little more than confiscation," Dr. Robinson says. He believes that if the capital gains tax is not reduced or abolished, "the U.S. will embark on a time when the country is starved for the kind of investment needed just to keep productivity constant," a situation already grim when contrasted with that abroad.

Getting this problem of needed investment across to the public may in part be a matter of semantics, suggests Mr. Terborgh. Use of the term "job development program" in Mr. Nixon's investment credit proposal is one example. "The public and labor must be made to understand that tax concessions for new tools benefit all of us and not just the corporations. As they accelerate investment and technological progress, they benefit the consumer. Of equal importance, they provide the funds for new jobs for workers. That is the message we must begin to get across."

Another change in semantics was recommended by the task force: that "depreciation" be replaced with the more descriptive term, "capital cost recovery."

Tax attorney Joel Barlow, partner, Covington & Burling, Washington, is concerned that a large number of companies, in an effort to present the best picture of profits, aren't taking full advantage of current recovery regulations. He feels they should do so to aid the selling program, because their requests for better recovery laws would be more credible and because they could better show that good capital recovery programs can pay off for everyone.

Another barrier to productivity in the U.S. has been the resistance of labor, convinced as it is that automation means fewer jobs.

AUTOMATION IS THE KEYSTONE

Greater productivity through capital investment in automation built the U.S. into an industrial giant, and it is the most essential element in maintaining that status, says Clement E. Sutton Jr., vice president and group executive of General Electric Co.'s Industrial Group, Boston. He adds that this task won't be an easy one.

"For the U.S. to increase its productivity rapidly enough to offset the recent rounds of wage increases, we estimate that industry will have to double or even triple its investment in automation," he says.

"When labor represents 45 percent of your cost of production, and you're paying \$6 an hour while the other fellow is paying less than \$2, no technology in the world can possibly make up the difference," Bethlehem's Mr. Cort points out.

But it can help greatly, Mr. Sutton insists. He offers the following solution to the international challenge:

"We can step up our research and development to maintain our product and technology leadership. With automation, we can improve our productivity. With product volume, we have a cost-effectiveness leverage. And with high product quality and after-sale service, we can assure levels of reliable operation which make the U.S. product the best overall value to the user."

If we can solve some other new—and pressing—problems . . .

CONSTRAINTS ADD COSTS BEYOND BENEFITS

(By Floyd G. Lawrence)

Capital to invest in higher productivity is vital to the survival of U.S. industry. But capital is not easy to come by, as increased borrowing by industry makes clear. Yet 10 to 30% of capital spending in many industries is going, not into improving our threatened competitive position, but into nonproductive facilities to meet pollution control standards.

Public and private spending for air and water pollution alone from now through 1975, according to Environmental Protection Agency estimates, will total \$61.7 billion. Based on the Conference Board Inc. (New York) estimate of \$19,811 per employee invested by manufacturing, this \$61.7 billion, if it were invested in new plant and equipment, could create jobs for two-thirds of the nation's 4.8 million unemployed.

Put another way, this is an amount equal to the current book value of the plant and equipment of four complete American auto industries; 3.7 entire steel industries; or the chemicals, rubber, paper, lumber, aircraft, and nonferrous metals industries combined. And it is enough to lead Secretary of Commerce Maurice H. Stans to say: "What are our priorities? We need to weigh environmental goals against economic reality."

Environmental needs clearly are important. Secretary Stans and others are saying, and they cannot be ignored. But our society has other needs which a commitment of this size could do much to meet, as Industry Week illustrates. And, more basic still, a strong and viable industry is the key not only to the technological means of achieving our en-

environmental goals, but also to the economic strength demanded if we are to achieve our other goals as a society.

"The fact is," Secretary Stans adds, "that American companies will have increased their pollution control spending by almost 50% this year over last; industry will spend some \$18 billion over the next five years to meet the requisite standards."

AMAZEMENT FROM ABROAD

Foreign competitors have not yet assumed any such cost burden. Nor are there any signs that they imminently will, reports a government official closely involved in seeking international environmental goals. "There are honest differences between nations as to what constitutes a hazard to human health. Many abroad are frankly amazed by our views in this country and clearly regard our standards as unnecessarily extreme. Since it is standards that establish the level of control and determine cost, the disparity is likely to be long term rather than short."

Nor does he hold out much hope to those who expect things to even up as a result of the United Nations Conference on the Human Environment at Stockholm, Sweden, in June 1972. "There will be [representatives of] over 100 countries in attendance, of which some 75 or 80 will be less developed countries with objectives entirely different from ours.

"Many developing countries say frankly they would welcome pollution if it fostered their economic development and industrialization. Some are talking among themselves about opportunities as pollution havens as a result of environmental restrictions of the more developed countries," he reports.

Confronted with unwillingness to sacrifice economics for environment in many countries abroad, he indicates our government believes the most likely forum to seek positive results on environmental discrepancies is the Organization for Economic Cooperation & Development (OECD). "The membership not only consists of countries that account for 80% of Free World trade," he explains, "but also, these are the countries which have the most nearly similar interests and concerns about the environment.

"We are pushing to get agreement in the OECD that all member countries accept the principle that the polluter bears the cost of polluting," he says. "The importance of this is that if other countries subsidize pollution control for manufacturers, our industry will be at a competitive disadvantage because the costs will not be reflected directly in their products. But even if the polluter does pay in all developed countries," he cautions, "these costs still could differ substantially between countries because of differences in pollution standards."

And on that score he is not optimistic. "We have explored setting international standards for pollution control with other countries in the OECD and the general view seems to be that it's just not realistic because the circumstances are so different from country to country," he explains. "But that's not surprising when you realize that many of our own environmental experts question the economic sense of common standards throughout the U.S. itself."

POVERTY IS UGLY, TOO

Antonie T. Knoppers, chairman, U.S. Council of the International Chamber of Commerce, and president, Merck & Co., Rahway, N.J., told world business leaders at Vienna, Austria, that "industry and all other polluters could do more to keep our air and water resources cleaner than in the past, but always at a price. The question in its most brutal form is when does the price become too steep? Shutting down a polluting plant that would be uneconomic to renovate can cost jobs. "If pollution is ugly," observes Dr. Knoppers, "so is poverty."

Other countries less affluent than ourselves already understand that quite clearly. Un-

less we can somehow imbue them with our environmental idealism, we are likely to prove the point quite conclusively.

But important though the displacement of capital may be in itself, there are other implications in our actions that are perhaps more serious. Industry needs energy no less than it needs tools.

Within the last month, as a result of environmentalist pressures, the Atomic Energy Commission agreed to "review the thermal effects on the environment" of 106 nuclear powerplants, 15 of which are already in operation and could be shut down.

About 92 million megawatts of electrical energy, equal to 27% of the nation's present generating capacity, was to have been produced by the plants. Further delay alone will add cost, while a likely concession of added cooling towers to "protect the environment from hot water"—the effects of which are far from fully understood—would add more.

Other examples of crescendoing constraints on the development and utilization of resources might be cited, ranging from the well-known delay in the construction of the Alaska pipeline to continuing charges that the Reserve Mining Co. is "polluting" Lake Superior by dumping inert taconite tailings into a trench 900 ft deep—despite prior permits from both the state and federal governments.

MORE HARASSMENT AHEAD?

But if regulated cost disparities and growing restrictions of energy and resources insufficiently jeopardize American industry, attacks are now being mounted to undermine the American free market system itself.

"American business, from the perspective of the world, is plainly in trouble," says James M. Roche, chairman, General Motors Corp., Detroit. "Yet at a time when we must work together to bolster our ability to compete against others, our system is being criticized by many whose professed aim is to alter the role and influence of corporations and corporate management in and upon American society."

"Their ultimate aim is to alienate the American consumer from business," warns Mr. Roche. "If the consumer can be convinced that he really does not know what is good for him—and this is what the critics try to do—then freedom leaves free enterprise. For if the consumer cannot protect his own interest, then someone else must do it. That someone else will then dictate what can be made, what can be sold, and at what price."

Legislative proposals now pending before Congress illustrate the direction of the pressures Mr. Roche describes. One group of bills would create a statutory Office of Consumer Affairs with authority to act as advocate of consumer interests in agency and court proceedings. But as John Stuart, director of marketing for the National Assn. of Manufacturers (NAM), pointed out to members of the House Subcommittee on Legislation & Military Operations, defining the consumer interest is not always easy. "Two groups of public interest lawyers are sharply divided over the Alaska pipeline," Mr. Stuart noted, "one having sympathies for underprivileged Indians whose public interest was in jobs and a better living, while the other lawyers represented environmentalists who felt ecology was the greater public interest."

Product safety legislation, the subject of another group of bills pending, would cover new or existing products "customarily sold for household or personal consumption"—a categorization to which an exception would be hard to find. Stanley Groner, vice president-group services, AMP Inc., New York, told the Senate Commerce Committee on behalf of the NAM:

"We can report to you that industry broadly accepts the objectives of these bills. We have no illusions as to what this may mean. It may mean having to accept a dominant and oft-times harassing and costly government intrusion into our engineering,

our production processes, and our distribution. We must expect to cooperate with government in the burdensome keeping of records and gathering of technical data concerning thousands of products and countless components and their distribution and use.

"It means time and money spent by our executives and associations in the developing of new standards of performance... And, finally, we are keenly aware of the inevitability of loss of sales and jobs by adverse (and perhaps misinterpreted) publicity in the marketplace, or inaccurate information, or erroneous findings released by the administrator," said Mr. Groner.

Consumer class action bills comprise a third major area, permitting the consumers to band together to correct anything the other pieces of legislation may have failed to catch. Richard D. Godown, associate general counsel of the NAM, pointed out in testimony on these bills that "all manufacturers, and big concerns in particular, would fall prey to harassment and strike suits. It is small comfort to be told that plaintiffs have to prove their cases. The cost of defense is formidable enough so that it cannot be winked at by any U.S. company. And the public relations damage—the adverse publicity which flows from simply being named in such a suit—is costly in other terms."

"To the extent that new laws and new officials do protect the consumer against fraud and deception, and safeguard his health and safety," says Mr. Roche, "they are good. But too much of this new development is unnecessary, and does not deliver a value to the consumer commensurate with the potential higher cost in taxes and higher prices.

"Also to protect the consumer, it has been mandated that many of the products he buys be altered. In this way, too, consumer choice is sometimes unnecessarily reduced, and costs are added without equivalent increase in value," believes Mr. Roche.

"I am seriously concerned—deeply concerned—at what may prove to be an impossible burden on our company, the industry, and the consumer in the years immediately ahead," Henry Ford II, chairman, told shareholders attending the Ford Motor Co. annual meeting this year. "I am referring to the growing burden of sometimes arbitrary legislative and regulatory requirements that could paralyze this industry or price our products out of reach of many car buyers."

Mr. Ford estimates that "just to cover the cost of meeting emission control and vehicle safety standards between now and 1975, the suggested retail price of an average Ford car in this country might be as much as \$600 higher than the current price, without any added profit margin or return on our very substantial investment."

"Business does its job when it provides useful jobs at high wages, when it provides useful products at fair prices, when it provides economic growth that produces taxes for government and earnings for stockholders. These are the longstanding social responsibilities of business," believes Mr. Roche.

"Today our task is to achieve our national social objectives at the least possible cost to our society, to assure full value for the dollars that must be spent, to mount an efficient effort. This clearly," observes Mr. Roche, "is a job where business and businessmen have much to contribute."

It may well be that the very survival of our entire enterprise system may require a new "attack"...

SURVIVAL DEMANDS NEW "PARTNERSHIP OF PURPOSE"

(By Perry Pasarella and Joseph J. Fenley)
So what if American jobs are being priced out of existence? That's labor's problem.

So what if plants aren't being modernized fast enough? That's industry's problem.

So what if there were a decline in the

number of manufacturers and workers to tax? The politicians could find the money we need elsewhere.

Each of us fits into a group—with its own problem. With companies, industries, labor groups, and the public each serving self-interests, won't we achieve the best results for all?

The truth is, this "adversary system" has worked in good times but has been abandoned during wars and depressions while everyone worked toward a common goal.

In the world economic contest we have no common goal. But we still have time to establish one and apply ourselves to it—all of us.

"The national economic units created in Japan and the Common Market, and coming in Russia and China, will force economic reassessment in the U.S.," says Roger S. Ahlbrandt, president, Allegheny Ludlum Industries Inc., Pittsburgh. "Antagonisms will have to disappear or be set aside. We can't afford them any longer since we are now, and will be more so in the future, in direct competition with unified national economic systems," he warns.

"Unified national economic systems" doesn't sound like free enterprise talk. But a growing number of leading businessmen are talking that way.

"The free enterprise system needs new definition," believes William H. Moore, chairman, Bankers Trust Co., New York. "It cannot be the barroom brawl of the turn of the century.

"The numbers are now too big for the public and private sectors to go their separate ways. The bottom of the tax barrel is being reached, and when earnings can no longer replenish our businesses, the taxes will continue. What then—nationalization? Confiscation?" he asks.

Mr. Ahlbrandt calls for a "coherent foreign economic policy." He believes it is "imperative for the U. S. to formulate, as quickly as possible, a strategy and policy for international trade, one which will protect our nation's vital interests, just as the vital interests of competing economies are being protected."

How do our foreign competitors protect themselves? "In both West Germany and Japan, a new type of enterprise has arisen in the last 25 years which squarely aligns government participation with business," says Douglas Grymes, president, Koppers Co. Inc., Pittsburgh. "The result is a planned economy . . . I'm not at all sure theirs is more planned than ours—I think it's just better planned."

In a study of Japan's economic policy, the Federal Reserve Bank of San Francisco states: "To carry out export-expansion plans, the Ministry of International Trade & Industry constantly confers with company representatives about the allocation of resources and, through administrative guidance, even sets minimum sizes for industrial plants. The Ministry of Finance, through the Bank of Japan, meanwhile funnels funds to areas with the highest growth potential.

"Thus, government policies work to concentrate new investment in those areas where world demand is highest. Also, by backing the extremely high use of corporate debt to finance growth, the Ministry of Finance and the Bank of Japan play a key part in setting the pace and direction of expansion."

The study lists other areas of cooperation such as tax deductions on income earned from exports, special interest rates on short-term export bills, favorable terms on long-term export financing, and government insurance on certain risks for which private insurance is not available.

By contrast, our political system is leading to divisiveness, fears Dr. Herbert Robinson, president, International Management Systems Corp. ". . . The quickest way to obtain votes is through government spending and

taxation, to offer something for nothing. It is almost axiomatic that, if we have, as now, a large proportion of the population on welfare and other subsidies, then, in general, our legislators will increasingly seek to improve the lot of such persons at the expense of higher income groups in order to secure their votes. The final equilibrium of such a system can only be an undermotivated, underincomed nation."

Top labor executives are using their "monopoly power," says Dr. Robinson, to demand wages that allow for increasing tax rates and the inflation that their own increasing wage rates cause.

BALANCE OUR POWER

Any attempt to establish a national program for survival will have to face up to the restructuring of power within the U.S. It will have to consider bringing unions under the antitrust laws.

It's urgent that we restore "balance to the collective bargaining process," says Phillip D. Block Jr., chairman, Inland Steel Co., Chicago. "The excessive labor settlements of recent years have been products of monopoly labor power and practices which have overwhelmed the bargaining process. These practices have been fostered by an indulgent public attitude toward labor unions, and by the implicit support of Congress and many governmental agencies."

At the same time, any strategy for survival will have to include an evaluation of our antitrust laws and their impact on the competitiveness of U.S. firms. "Where there has been pressure from imports, it makes sense to allow more mergers," says Harald B. Malmgren, president, Malmgren Inc. Antitrust policy that prevented mergers in the textile industry, which would have benefited smaller firms by their absorption into larger firms with financial resources, "was a stupidity," believes Mr. Malmgren, who was a high level trade expert in the Johnson Administration.

"There are many things we might like to do in the way of mergers and acquisitions to give us more efficient operations that we are precluded from doing," says W. Michael Blumenthal, president, Bendix Corp., Detroit.

"We need to reevaluate antitrust policy in terms of multinational operations," says Robert Bjork, chairman, MacKay-Shields Economics Inc., New York. "We need a more relaxed and realistic approach. We need to determine if we need exemptions to enable American firms to compete abroad on an equal basis."

DESIGN LAWS FOR COMPETITIVENESS

The antitrust laws try to encourage efficiency, and this does not run against the notion of an expanding world market, argues a Justice Dept. spokesman. There is not a direct correlation between company size and efficiency. The efficiency that's encouraged by U.S. antitrust laws will help make for success in world markets.

But laws designed to foster competition within our national boundaries aren't working in world competition. Perhaps they give too much support to firms that aren't competitive.

One possible reason some of the foreign economies are stronger than ours, says Mr. Grymes of Koppers, is that their profit motive is even stronger. "The weak and non-profitable companies are stripped away and the available energy and money are guided into the planned and profitable companies. In a free enterprise system, only the strong companies are supposed to survive. But in the U.S., we protect the weak and hamstring the strong through a variety of antitrust laws."

THREAT UPON THREAT

Deterioration of the proper climate for industry in the U.S. has led to a development that is as frightening to some as the threat from foreign producers: the establishment

of manufacturing facilities abroad by U.S. firms.

The first wave of U.S. owned facilities abroad represented an attempt to get a share of the world market that we could not reach via exports. Our high labor rates, tax laws, and other burdens had already handicapped us in producing here for sale abroad. The jobs that such an opportunity could have presented were already lost.

But of greater concern today is the second wave—facilities being built overseas by U.S. firms to protect their markets here. They have been forced offshore to compete with imports coming into the U.S. We now see jobs being created abroad rather than here.

"This is an early warning sign that our competitive position is being eroded," says Harold B. Scott, acting assistant secretary of commerce for domestic and international business. "We must provide as competitive a climate here as is possible . . . a climate in which it will be economically feasible for companies to return production here."

Our laws, policies, and attitudes are bringing us to a crisis. We must face the fact that we are in economic danger—that hundreds of thousands of jobs are being lost to foreign competitors or to the overseas manufacturing facilities of U.S. firms.

What we need is a "partnership of purpose" among government, industry, and labor, says Jack J. Carlson, president, Kaiser Steel Corp., Oakland, Calif. Each segment of the economy must be willing to engage in new practices. Industry must innovate and stay ahead in the technology race. Government should share in this goal. Labor must search for new ways to increase its productivity, he believes.

A new partnership "is unquestionably needed in the decade ahead," agrees Mr. Scott. The relationship of business and government will be much more intimate. Government has traditionally functioned as the regulator. In the future, the role of government will have to be much more supportive."

Mr. Grymes of Koppers says, "The survival of each part of our system may indeed depend upon how we forge an alliance among government, business, and labor. It will only be the interaction of these three groups that will produce a system that is tolerable to all three and is workable and profitable for all."

We must face these truths:

Labor can secure jobs only if we have a strong economy.

Our society can tackle major problems that stand in the way of greatness only if we have an industrial machine big enough to deliver the solutions.

Free enterprise can survive only if we are enterprising; only if we do all the things that are necessary to make ourselves competitive.

Unless we form a "partnership of purpose" we will continue to work at cross purposes and achieve none of these things.

The matter of economic competitiveness is not a problem for industry alone. Rather, it is a test of our ability to organize our talents and resources to serve our hopes for a better life.

What we need is a Strategy for Survival.

HOUSE RESOLUTION 630

HON. ANDREW JACOBS, JR.

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 19, 1971

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, I was wondering, in view of the events of the past few weeks in Saigon, if any Member of

Congress or any member of the executive branch would care to say he or she is willing, from this day forward, to give his or her life, limb, sanity or freedom—POW even for another day—further to prop up the Saigon dictatorship.

Other Americans are being ordered to do so today.

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

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

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

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

"B. Of the release of the totality of military men of all parties and the civilians captured in the war (including American pilots captured in North Vietnam), so that they may all rapidly return to their homes. "These two operations will begin on the same date and will end on the same date.

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

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

VETERANS DAY TRIBUTE BY
CLAUDE B. MILLER, DUBLIN, GA.

HON. HERMAN E. TALMADGE

OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 19, 1971

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, each year the Nation sets aside a day to pay tribute to the veterans of our Armed Forces who have served their country and the cause of freedom throughout the world.

In connection with this year's Veterans Day, there was sent to me a very fine poem written by Claude B. Miller, of the Veterans' Administration Center at Dublin, Ga. In his verse, Mr. Miller has phrased an eloquent tribute to the Nation's veterans and the country we all love so dearly.

I ask unanimous consent that the poem be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

IN ALLEGIANCE TO GOD AND COUNTRY

(By Claude B. Miller)

To our Fellow Americans:

We, the veterans who are alive, are joined in spirit with our fallen brothers.

We do bequeath to you, a heritage—A heritage that is the very soul of America: The Freedom of the Spirit of America.

The fundamental foundation upon which this Nation stands is embedded in every stream and stone—in every waving blade of grass.

The Spirit of Freedom! This is your—our heritage.

We, the veterans, are as one with you in reaffirming, in rededicating our lives . . . that this great American Heritage Shall not perish: That these United States shall endure.

"Count not lightly,
The lives that were lost
In Freedom's Cause . . .
The remaining ones
Will bear the cost."

A WOMAN'S ANALYSIS OF THE COMPREHENSIVE CHILD DEVELOPMENT ACT

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 19, 1971

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the American people rightfully consider the enactment of the Comprehensive Child Development Act contained in S. 2007 as a Government threat to the right of parents to rear their children.

A thorough analysis of the salient features of the Comprehensive Child Development Act is contained in the Barbara M. Morris report of October 1970.

I include the Morris report in the RECORD:

ANATOMY OF A HOAX

The "Comprehensive Child Development Act" recently passed by the U.S. House of Representatives as an amendment to S. 2007 passed by the U.S. Senate is highly deceptive and should not be signed into law by President Nixon.

S. 2007 is deceptive in that it is drafted to give the impression that Child Development Plans and Programs are to be controlled locally by local people, when in fact, Child Development Programs receiving Federal financial assistance are under the rigid control of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

S. 2007 is deceptive in that it appears to disclaim Federal control of Child Development Plans and Programs, when in fact, it does not prohibit Federal control, but clearly establishes TOTAL Federal control.

An analysis of the Comprehensive Child Development Programs in S. 2007 bears witness to these findings.

"SEC. 521. . . . this title may be cited as the 'Comprehensive Child Development Act.'"

STATEMENT OF FINDINGS AND PURPOSE

SEC. 522(a) (5) declares that Congress finds that "it is crucial to the meaningful development of such programs that their planning and operation be undertaken as a partner-

ship of parents, community, State and local governments". Aside from establishing the State as the third parent, this is a noble statement, but as ensuing sections will bear out, planning and operation of child development plans and programs are under strict Federal control of the Secretary of HEW.

SEC. 522(b) (2) declares that it is the purpose of this Act to build upon the successes gained through Headstart, when in fact, abundant evidence points to Headstart as a failure. In a White House Message on Education Reform, signed by President Nixon, dated March 3, 1970, it is stated, "In our Headstart program where so much hope is invested, we find that youngsters enrolled only for the summer achieve almost no gains, and the gains of those in the program for a full year are soon matched by their non-Headstart classmates from similarly poor backgrounds". A comprehensive study made of Headstart by the Westinghouse Learning Corporation and Ohio University in 1969 has clearly shown that Headstart in its present form is not worth the cost and should be radically revised. (Congressional Record 12-15-69 p. 10685).

SEC. 522(b) (4) provides that it is the purpose of this Act to "provide that decisions as to the nature and funding of such programs be made at the community level with the full involvement of parents . . .", when in fact, the decision to fund is to be made by the Secretary, and the nature of such programs is to be decided by Federal standards.

TITLE I—COMPREHENSIVE CHILD DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM, DIRECTION TO ESTABLISH PROGRAMS

CHILD DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

SEC. 523(b) (7) provides that activities of a child development program may include activities such as, diagnosis and identification of mental and emotional barriers with appropriate treatment to overcome such barriers. *What are mental and emotional barriers? Who decides, and how is it decided? What is "appropriate treatment" as applied to an emotional or mental barrier? A statement entitled "Mental Health and World Citizenship" which emanated from the International Conference on Mental Health held in London in 1948 stated that the family imposes their imprint early in the personality development of the children who then perpetuate the traditional pattern to which they have been moulded, and it is these people "who present the immediate resistance to social, economic and political changes". Are the mental and emotional barriers to be overcome the traditional beliefs and religious teachings of the parents?*

SEC. 523(b) (8) provides for activities to ameliorate identified handicaps. *What kind of handicaps? Mental? Emotional? Physical? A statement prepared by the Wisconsin Association for Mental Health, "A Progress Report for the State of Wisconsin" states that an "emotionally disturbed child" cannot be isolated from the definition of the "retarded" or "physically handicapped" because all children at times appear to be disturbed. Thus, all children at some time are "emotionally handicapped". A recent article in the National Enquirer stated that an abnormally high ratio of emotionally handicapped children in Quebec was traceable to poverty, poor health standards and lack of child support programs. Welfare statistics showed that 360,000 children or 24% of the total needed special care for their handicaps, and of those, more than 41,000 children have been removed from their families and placed in institutions and foster homes. As Sec. 523 provides for "separate child development programs designed primarily to meet the needs of handicapped children," and Sec. 582(d) gives the National Center for Child Development the authority to acquire "real and personal property of all kinds necessary . . ." can it be assumed that a grant of power is given to re-*

move children with "identified handicaps" from their homes?

Sec. 524(b)(11) provides for "in home services and training in fundamentals of child development for parents . . ." An article in *Moscow News* of August 14-21, 1971 on preschool education in Russia states that nursery teachers ". . . keep in contact with the parents and help them to bring up the children in a correct manner." The Report of the Joint Commission on Mental Health of Children, p. 75 states that in educational programs for children under three "Mothers would be taught the preferred ways of handling infants . . ." In the Report of the Education Commission of the States, June, 1971, P. 42, the value of home visits is given: "Those children and parents needing special help because of physical and mental handicaps could be identified and provided the additional help required". Are parents to be trained as agents of the State? Dr. Edward Zigler, head of the Office of Child Development was quoted in the *San Francisco Examiner* 2-10-71 as being "very apprehensive" about a nationwide network of child care centers as they were ". . . a concept quite alien to the American ethos". That government controlled child care is indeed an alien concept apparently is not considered a deterrent, but a concept to be emulated.

Sec. 524(b)(13) allows "such other services and activities as the Secretary deems appropriate in furtherance of the purposes of this Act". This is a wide open, blank check grant of power—a Pandora's Box. Anything Goes.

PRIME SPONSORS

Sec. 525 establishes that any State or local unit of government of a given size may be a "prime sponsor" of a child development program. An application from a prime sponsor is required to be submitted to the Secretary and establishes what the application must include. Among other requirements, an application must provide for the establishment of Child Development Councils and Local Policy Councils. Members of CDC's are required to have a membership of at least 1/3 parents of children who are economically disadvantaged. Half the membership of the LPC's are required to be parents of eligible children or "their representatives".

Sec. 525(c)(1) states that CDC's are responsible for planning, coordination and monitoring child development programs. LPC's are responsible for determining child development needs, make recommendations and encourage project applications. While it is made to appear that CDC's plan child development programs, Sec. 525(c)(3) requires that applications from a prime sponsor provide for the delegation by the CDC to "an appropriate agency" the "administrative responsibility" for developing a Comprehensive Child Development Plan. In general, language of the bill would lead one to believe that in any case, the CDC's and LPC's have authority and control over child development plans and programs. The subtitle Federal Standards for Child Development Services clarifies any misunderstanding. Sec. 533(a) clearly states that the Secretary shall "promulgate a common set of program standards which shall be applicable to all programs providing child development services with Federal assistance". This section puts to rest the belief that child development programs will be of local determination. To further the myth of local control, Sec. 533(b) establishes a special committee on Federal standards for child development services. "Such committee shall participate in the development of Federal Standards for Child Development Services. Note that the Secretary will promulgate the standards—the special committee merely "participates".

COMPREHENSIVE CHILD DEVELOPMENT PLANS

This subtitle establishes the requirements for a comprehensive child development program which must include a career develop-

ment plan and advancement on a career ladder; jobs for persons residing in communities served by such projects; enrollment to the extent feasible of children from a wide range of socioeconomic backgrounds. That establishment of child care facilities will bolster the economy by providing jobs for low income persons is often cited as one of the benefits of creating child care programs. Requiring a socioeconomic mix will assure bussing.

Sec. 526 (20) requires the assurance that "mechanisms have been developed . . . to provide continuity between programs for preschool and elementary school children". This requirement effectuates a statement in the Report of the Education Commission of the States, under a chapter titled, "Objectives of a Public Early Childhood Program". Objective number five states: "One of the objectives of education before the age of six should be to foster changes in the public schools . . ." and on page 21, "The public schools need broader definition of objectives. Intellectual objectives need to be expanded to include more emphasis on problem solving and general objectives need to be expanded beyond intellectual development to include the physical and mental health of children."

Here it would be appropriate to consider what is meant by "mental health". It should be realized that the concept of mental health as now used has little relationship to insanity; that mental health according to the United Nations definition is a "state of complete physical, mental and social well being and not merely the absence of disease or infirmity". (World Health Organization Report, March 1948). A statement from "Mental Health and World Citizenship" cited above stated: "Principles of mental health cannot be successfully furthered in any society unless there is a progressive acceptance of the concept of world citizenship. World Citizenship can be widely extended among all peoples through the application of the principles of mental health".

ADDITIONAL CONDITIONS FOR PROGRAMS INCLUDING CONSTRUCTION

This subtitle provides that within 20 years of construction for which Federal funds have been paid, the U.S. has the right to recover an amount which bears the then value of the facility, unless the Secretary decides to release the applicant or other owner from the obligation.

PAYMENTS

This subtitle authorizes the Secretary to pay each prime sponsor not in excess of 80% of the cost of child development programs. However, the Secretary may approve in excess of 80% if he decides it is necessary to provide adequately for child development needs of economically disadvantaged persons.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

Sec. 530 authorizes appropriations for each and every year ". . . such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this title". Such an open ended provision satisfies provisions of Sec. 531(g) which requires that no State or local unit of government "shall reduce expenditures for child development and day care by reasons of assistance under this title". This amounts to a mandate to spend.

OFFICE OF CHILD DEVELOPMENT

Sec. 532 directs the Office of Child Development to be established in the Department of HEW, for which "such funds as may be necessary" are provided to carry out the functions of the OCD. To assure Federal control, Sec. 532 also mandates the President to establish "mechanisms" for coordination of State and local programs using Federal assistance.

DEVELOPMENT OF UNIFORM CODE FOR FACILITIES

Sec. 534(a)(b) directs the Secretary to appoint a special committee to consist of parents and children in development pro-

grams, State and local licensing agencies, public health officials, fire prevention officials, construction unions, etc., to develop a uniform minimum code for child development facilities, to which all child development facilities, both public and private, new and old, shall conform. This section neatly provides a scheme for political maneuvers—something for everybody, not just the children.

Sec. 534(d) provides that the Secretary must approve the code and such standards shall be applicable to all facilities receiving Federal assistance. "The Secretary shall . . . urge their adoption by States and local government". What is the necessity for the States and local governments to go through the formality of adopting the standards when Federal dictates have decreed they shall be applicable to all facilities using Federal assistance? This is a perfect example of the sham of "participatory democracy" at work, or the theory of "citizen participation", better known as "decentralized administration of centralized authority".

TITLE II—FACILITIES FOR CHILD DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

MORTGAGE INSURANCE FOR CHILD DEVELOPMENT FACILITIES

This title, under Sec. 541(g)(1) establishes that "The Secretary shall have the same function powers and duties . . . as the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development", thereby creating yet another expensive bureaucracy. Sec. 541(h)(1) creates a Child Development Facility Insurance Fund, and Sec. 541(h)(5) authorizes initial capital for the Fund and "to assure the soundness of such fund thereafter, such sums as may be necessary." This is an assurance that the Fund need not pay its own way, or in any way, shall accountability be required.

TITLE III—TRAINING OF CHILD DEVELOPMENT PERSONNEL

Sec. 551 authorizes \$40 million to be spent every year for training and re-training professional and non-professional personnel for child development programs. Sec. 553 authorizes the Secretary to award grants for "ongoing inservice training" for professional, non-professional and volunteers. Will it be the purpose of "ongoing inservice training" to change attitudes, values and beliefs via sensitivity training techniques, by whatever name? Will the participants be advised of the nature of their training? Sec. 554 authorizes \$5 million every year to carry out "ongoing inservice training."

TITLE IV—FEDERAL GOVERNMENT CHILD DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

Sec. 561 authorizes the Secretary to make grants for child development programs for children of employees of the Federal government. Sec. 562(a) provides that not more than 80% of the total cost of programs during the first two years, and not more than 40% thereafter shall be paid from Federal funds. Sec. 562(b) provides that the non-Federal share may be provided through public or private funds ". . . and employer contributions". Remember, this Title pertains to children of employees of the Federal government.

TITLE V—EVALUATION AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

EVALUATION

Sec. 571 requires enumeration and description of all Federal activities which affect child development, analysis of expenditures for such activities, determination of effectiveness and results of expenditures and activities. But there is not ONE word about requiring evaluation of child development programs, their success or failure. However, to carry out the "enumeration" "description" "effectiveness of expenditures", the Secretary is authorized to enter into contracts with public or private, profit or non-profit agencies or

individuals to carry out the provisions of Sec. 571.

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

Sec. 574(a) provides that the Secretary shall provide technical assistance "on a continuing basis" to assist in developing and carrying out child development plans. This will assure a continuous flow of Federal funds and an impetus and assurance of Federal control. Sec. 574(b) allows the Secretary to provide funds to the Local Policy Councils (remember, these are primarily the parents who think they are making decisions) for expenses for their part in child development projects. This assures a continuous interest at the local level for agitation for more child development activities.

TITLE VI—NATIONAL CENTER FOR CHILD DEVELOPMENT AND EDUCATION

NATIONAL CENTER FOR CHILD DEVELOPMENT

Sec. 582 (a) establishes that in the Office of Child Development there will be an agency known as the National Center for Child Development. No mention of who will run it, how he or she will be chosen, at what salary.

Sec. 582 (b) (1) establishes that activities of the Center shall include research to "determine the nature of child development processes and the impact of various influences on them". Also, "Research to determine how child development programs conducted in either home or institutional settings positively affect child development processes". Clearly then, research on child development has yet to be done and thus, children will be used as experimental objects—guinea pigs—for how else can the nature of child development processes be determined. Will parents be advised of experimental situations? What protection will parents and children have against research activities that may have detrimental effects on the child or his family? What kind of research will be done in "home settings"? Will the privacy of the home be violated by "live-in" researchers? *The rearing of children in the home by their parents is a God given right and responsibility, and for the undertaking of this privilege, He has imbued conscientious and even not-so-conscientious parents with a remarkable ability that has stood the test of time, without benefit of governmental interference.*

GENERAL AUTHORITY OF THE CENTER

Sec. 583 establishes that the NCCDE is an autonomous entity with authority "to do all things necessary" under its authority, hampered only by "limits of available appropriations". Sec. 583 (d) establishes that the authority of the NCCDE includes, "but not limited to" the authority to acquire real and personal property "of all kinds necessary" for or resulting from "the exercise of authority granted by this title".

Sec. 583 (f) authorizes the NCCDE to "accept and utilize the services of voluntary and uncompensated personnel . . ." In the Report of the Joint Commission on Mental Health of Children, upon whose recommendations child development legislation is based, it is recommended that volunteers be used in child development programs, and included such suggestions as "ex-alcoholics, rehabilitated mental patients, delinquents and criminals who are purposefully seeking a centering point for their lives", (p. 136)

ANNUAL REPORT

An amusing aspect of *The Comprehensive Child Development Act* is the requirement under this subtitle that the NCCDE issue an annual report in which "Supplemental or dissenting views and recommendations, if any, shall be included in this report". Is it reasonable to expect that any bureaucrat under the thumb of the Federal government will issue "dissenting views"?

COORDINATION OF RESEARCH

Sec. 585 (b) assures the Secretary total control of all research and training efforts.

And as assurance of dissemination of federal directives, Sec. 585 (c) creates a Child Development Research Council represented by Federal educational and health agencies, "to assure coordination of activities under their jurisdiction and to carry out the provisions of this title . . ."

TITLE VII—GENERAL PROVISIONS

FEDERAL CONTROL NOT AUTHORIZED

It should be noted that this subtitle does not say "Federal Control Prohibited". It says "Federal Control Not Authorized" *There is a difference.* Sec. 593 states that no department, agency etc. of the U.S. shall "exercise any direction, supervision or control over or impose any requirements or conditions with respect to the personnel, curriculum, methods of instruction or administration of any educational institution". *How does this statement apply to child development facilities?* While education is a part of early childhood programs, the supposed goal is total development of the child. Since this section applies to "educational institutions" and not to "child development facilities", what is the scope of Federal control over child development facilities? Sec. 597 (e) differentiates in designating "schools" and "child development facilities", so it must be assumed that the Federal government does recognize a difference.

DEFINITIONS

This subtitle defines certain terms used in the bill. It offers the definition of "handicapped" which was covered in the discussion of Sec. 524(b) (8). Also defined is "program" as "any mechanism" which "includes special arrangements under which child development activities may be provided." Sec. 597(f) defines "parent" as "any person who has day to day responsibility for a child or children." Is the parent the worker in the child development facility? *Or is the State the Third Parent?*

The assurance of adequate safeguards to eliminate the possibility of infringement upon or usurpation of the moral and legal rights and responsibilities of the legal parents or guardians in the raising of their children was added in Sec. 595. That such a provision was lacking in the original bill and had to be added as an after-thought to the Senate bill, S. 2007 is an indication of the direction of the thinking that went into the drafting of this legislation. The message is clear: The State is All.

It is shocking to find that many parents and taxpayers are unconcerned about the prospect of government controlled child development.

Concerned parents insist they will never allow their children to be "developed" by the government. Maybe so. But what about the grandchildren? The possibility of a tax burden so heavy that mothers will have to put their children in developmental care to allow them to go to work to keep a roof overhead. In the Report to the President of the White House Conference on Children, this coercive suggestion is made: "alteration of tax schedules to provide tax relief to families who have children in development care."

People who do not have children should be especially concerned for their taxes will provide a large share of the money needed to raise their neighbor's children.

Legislation for government controlled child development is the most revolutionary legislation passed in recent years. Just a short time ago it would not be thought possible. Those members of Congress who are promoting this type of legislation are doing so with a zeal that is fired by an unholy dedication. Your zeal to protect your children and preserve the integrity of your family must surpass their zeal.

Your children and grandchildren can't speak for themselves. You have an obligation to act for them. If you don't the govern-

ment will! Remember that quote from the Report to the President of the White House Conference on Children:

"A daycare program that ministers to a child from six months to six years of age has over 8,000 hours to teach him values, fears, beliefs and behaviors."

The government is serious about raising your children. Are you?

S. 2007 must now be conferred upon to reach a mutual agreement with the Senate, as it was passed as an amendment to the Senate Bill. While the bill is in conference, write to your Senators and Congressmen (if you have written already, write again) to express your views on government controlled child development. Write or wire President Nixon and ask him to veto the bill. After you've done everything you can, pray!

CHARLEY PRIDE, ENTERTAINER OF THE YEAR

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 19, 1971

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, a few years ago I was on a plane returning to Washington from Billings, Mont., and I sat down beside Charley Pride who had boarded the plane at Great Falls. I met Charley Pride when he was playing baseball for the East Helena Smelterites at East Helena, Mont., and singing at the U and I Club there. Later, Charley moved to Great Falls and continued to work at the smelter in Great Falls and sang at the Red Barn, but he came to Helena and appeared a couple of times a week at the Silver Spur. He was a darned good ball player and a better singer in those days. When I met him on the plane, Charley told me he was going East to make some records and appear on a couple of shows.

The other night I tuned in on the last half of the annual Country Music Association awards presentation, and the first singer I caught was Charley. Later on in that presentation Charley Pride, of Sledge, Miss., who played a little ball and sang a few songs in Montana was awarded the title of Entertainer of the Year and Male Vocalist of the Year, in Country Music.

Montana is proud that Charley Pride spent a part of his career in our State. Montana is proud that his singing caught the attention of the national audience. We feel that had he not caught on as a singer, he would have made it in baseball. On behalf of his friends and fans in Montana I salute double winner Charley Pride.

I ask unanimous consent that the following articles be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Washington Post, Dec. 13, 1970]

BLACK SINGER OF WHITE "SOUL"

(By Eugene L. Meyer)

The East Tennessee woman, wary about selling her home to the antipoverty worker, tells him: "I don't want you to go reselling the house to any colored." Then her face breaks into a smile. "Except you can sell it to Charley Pride."

Another place. Newark, N.J., and Charley Pride is singing country and western songs in his baritone voice with its Southern twang to a large, responsive audience.

The audience—in this black majority city with a black mayor—is overwhelmingly white. They are the people who voted for Hugh Addonizio over Kenneth Gibson for mayor because of race. But they applaud and cheer Charley Pride until 2 a.m.

This is the paradox of "Country" Charley Pride—black singer of white soul music. He even sounds like a redneck. North and South, in the blue-collar country bars, in the urban ethnic neighborhoods—in George Wallace, white-backlash country—Charley Pride is No. 1.

Charley Pride, 32 years old, became the first black singer to perform at Nashville's Grand Ole Opry, which is to country music what the Palace Theater in New York used to be to vaudeville.

That was nearly four years ago, in Jan. 1967, after a few rough years when the former cotton-picking kid from Sledge, Miss., was bucking white promoters and record companies less than confident of a black man's commercial potential in country and western.

Charley Pride doesn't like to talk about that now. He yearns to be accepted, like the title to one of his 11 albums says, as "Just Plain Charley—Charley Pride." He rails against the neat divisions of society that have made of him a sort of professional freak. "Personally, I am Charley Pride, American," he says.

He discussed his feelings over a breakfast of scrambled eggs and milk on a recent visit to New York to tape NBC's Eddy Arnold Christmas Show, the Kraft Music Hall presentation for Dec. 23.

"I think music is to be enjoyed. I didn't make this society, I was just born into it. I'm the same as Johnny Cash or Hank Williams," he said, "except I got a permanent tan."

"All music we have in this country is American music. We tend to split it down and say, 'Your skin is pink, you go over here.' Country music has been here for years to be enjoyed by everybody."

Charley Pride thinks his acceptance by white audiences and the much wider popularity of country music generally are signposts of shifting attitudes.

"In all facets of our society," he says, "people and ideas are changing."

Pride views his role, however, not just as an entertainer but also as a teacher—to whites of tolerance, to blacks of a broader self-image in music than is projected on soul radio.

"Most blacks don't listen to country-and-western stations," he says. "If they do, they think I'm just another white country singer until they see me."

Network television, Pride feels, is an important vehicle for overcoming what he terms country music's "image" problem—as a music strictly for backwoods hillbillies—among both blacks and whites.

"I said when I got into the business I believed I could sell to all kinds of people—pink, green or purple," he says.

So Charley Pride was pleased when three black teen-agers recognized him on the street in Dallas, where he now lives, after he appeared on the Flip Wilson show. And when a black elevator operator in New York's Rockefeller Plaza asked him, after initial hesitation, if he was Charley Pride.

As a kid, Charley Pride got his first taste of country music listening to Memphis and Nashville radio stations. He left Sledge, a small farming town where his father still has a barber shop, at the age of 17 for Memphis. There he played baseball with the Red Sox of the Old Negro American League and met his wife, Rozene. They now have three children, Kraig, 13; Dion, 8; and Angela, 5.

"I wanted to go into the major leagues, break old records and make new ones, and then go into music," he says. Pride did a brief stint with the California Angels in 1961 as outfielder and pitcher. Presently, he is pondering an offer to show up for spring training—at least—with the Milwaukee Brewers.

Noticeably absent from Pride's albums are the super-patriotic conservative songs that have surfaced in the country-and-western field—songs like "Okie from Muskogee," "Welfare Cadillac," "Fightin' Side of Me."

Neither has Charley Pride joined the populist school of country music with which Johnny Cash has become closely identified. He sings only those songs with which he's most comfortable.

"I leave politics to the politicians and preaching to the preachers," he says. "Country music is basically about life, happiness, joy, sorrow."

Pride describes his Newark reception as "just fine," glossing over the irony of his audience. But then he leaves the table for a few minutes and his manager, Jack D. Johnson, opens up. The Newark audience contained "very few blacks," he concedes.

And then Johnson recalls how his initial efforts to sell Charley Pride were rebuffed because of the singer's race. Seven years ago, Pride had walked into Johnson's Nashville office looking for country star Red Sovine. Sovine had "discovered" Pride in a Great Falls, Montana, nightclub (Pride was a smelter for Anaconda Mining's zinc complex by day) and urged the black singer to go to the country music capital, despite his race.

Pride sang two songs for Johnson. "I said," Johnson recalls, "Now sing in your natural voice." He said, "That is my natural voice." I sent him back to Montana and forwarded a contract soon afterwards.

But it took Johnson two years to sell Pride to a record company. "There were questions. Would disc jockeys play his records to start with because of his color? Who'd pay to see him? A black country-and-western singer was a new thing, and would require quite an investment by a record company."

In 1965, RCA producer Jack Clement made two test recordings. Chet Atkins, RCA vice president and head of its Nashville operations, mulled them over for two months before deciding to proceed. Pride's first single, "Snakes Crawl at Night," was released with little publicity. The record was not a big hit but got good air play, and the successful career of Country Charley Pride was launched.

"Naturally, we had problems at first," even after the first release, Johnson says. "The promoters had their doubts. It's difficult to back anyone who hasn't had a hit. Some promoters and club owners were reluctant because of his color. They wanted to know could he draw. But the doubts didn't last."

This year Charley Pride expects to gross about \$2 million from recordings and appearances. In the last six months, he has appeared at the big country fairs from Mississippi to Montana and from Delaware to Utah and played big cities such as Boston, Detroit, Chicago and Los Angeles.

In the future, Charley Pride says, he might like to buy a baseball club, and then there is always movie acting to consider.

Early questions about his widespread appeal no longer exist. Breakfast over, he leaves the Waldorf Astoria coffee shop and Rita Ragan, a 22-year-old white secretary from Brooklyn, asks for his autograph. "You're my mother's favorite singer," she tells him, and Charley Pride walks away smiling.

CHARLEY PRIDE AND THE CHICKEN LADIES

(By Melvin Shestack)

About fifteen minutes west of Boys Town, Nebraska, and four hundred feet east of the curvaceous old Lincoln Highway (U.S. 6), the

sign in the window of the country bar (the kind of bar that was called a roadhouse in 1940 movies) reads: Dancing to the finest country sounds every weekend. Among the country-star photos Scotch-taped to the sign (Leroy Van Dyke, Dolly Parton, Tompall and the Glaser Brothers, Marty Robbins, Loretta Lynn) is one handsome, black, smiling face. An exophthalmic man, red-faced, hair so closely cropped you'd think he was bald, walks over to the bar and orders a stubby brown bottle of Grain Belt. Afraid to touch the clean glass until he wipes his hands on his greasy Skelly Oil coveralls, he takes a long draw on the beer, looks up, and asks: "Say, who's the nigger in the window, Gus?" "That ain't no nigger," the bartender replies in that monotonously cheerful way Midwesterners have of talking (whether about births or funerals), "that's Country Charley Pride!"

ANNOUNCER. That was the great Charley Pride singing his fantastic hit, *Kaw-Liga*. And remember, Charley Pride will be appearing in another all-star WJZZ Cavalcade on Friday at Symphony Hall in Newark. Yes, Charley Pride, plus the great Kitty Wells Show starring Kitty Wells, Bill Phillips, Johnny Wright, Ruby Wright and Bobby Wright. But that's not all, there's more! (Charley Pride record) fade.

ANNOUNCER. You'll also see Willie Nelson, Red Sovine and one of the great all-time yodelers, Montana Slim. All in person! Friday! At Symphony Hall, Newark. (Charley Pride record) fade.

ANNOUNCER. So, don't miss this great evening. Charley Pride, Kitty Wells, Bill Phillips, Johnny Wright, Ruby Wright and Bobby Wright. Plus, Willie Nelson, Red Sovine and Montana Slim. All at Symphony Hall, Newark, Friday, for two great shows at 7 p.m. and 9:45 p.m. Tickets are available now, by writing to: Cavalcade, WJZZ, Box 970, Hackensack. Ticket prices are \$5.50, \$4.50 and \$3.50. Get your seats now, before it's too late!

(Charley Pride record) fade.

ANNOUNCER. That was the great Charley Pride who some people say is the greatest country voice since Hank Williams.

We were living for a while at the Chelsea Hotel in New York, and our black cleaning lady listened as Charley Pride sang.

"You like that kind of music?" She was incredulous.

"Didn't you ever hear of Charley Pride?" I asked her.

"Who?"

"He's got more soul than any country singer since Hank Williams."

"Joe Williams I know. Hank Williams I never heard of."

Neither had my father in 1948. And he was reluctant to release his beloved new Buick to my charge—especially to drive fifty miles over a country road, at night, to see some hillbilly.

"Silly kid," I remember him telling my mother. *Freak* would have been a better word. Today, if a kid is a freak, he proudly blasts the fact to all who'll listen. Little did I realize, back then, that the entire urban teen-age revolution would be choreographed (partly, anyway) to the twang of a country guitar. But in 1948, when my high school buddies were counting on me to get a date to join them to see Vaughn Monroe ("only in-person appearance this season in Rochester . . .") at the RKO Palace theatre, I spoke to no one about my plans. If word leaked that I was a secret hick, I couldn't have lived it down.

Max Raney's Circle M Ranch in East Bloomfield, New York ("Quality Round and Square Dances Weekly"), was only a big tent in a muddy field. It was raining hard and the crowd was small but enthusiastic. Country people from places like Macedon, Honeoye Falls and West Henrietta, Apple Knockers, we called them in Upstate New York. But whatever they were, Hank Williams ob-

viously gave them their dollar and twenty-five cents' worth.

He was thinner than I'd anticipated and, though just in his early twenties, balding. (He took his Johnny Mack Brown-style Stetson off only once—to wipe his head with a handkerchief.) His meatless frame was hardly enough to support his outrageous, padded-shoulder, lavender-and-white double-breasted cowboy suit. He kept saying that the songs he sang had "a lot of sufferin' in 'em" and the crowd nodded their silent amens. During the intermission he mingled with the audience, signing programs (fifty cents each), hugging blushing farm ladies and answering questions. Yes, he was married. Yes, he wrote some of the songs. No, he didn't live in Nashville, but would like to. And then, in the corner of the tent, with all the lights on, he put down his bottle of Queen-O Orange Soda, picked up his guitar and broke into the now classic *Lovesick Blues*. "I'm gonna REE-cord that one, friends, for M.G.M., so you be sure to run down to your record store and buy it when it comes out."

A question from the crowd: "Hey, Hank. Where'd you learn to sing the blues?"

I still have the piece of paper on which I recorded his reply: "I learned everthin' about singin' from a fine old Mississippi nigger I used to foller aroun' when I was a kid."

"Hey, Charley," someone asked backstage at Symphony Hall in Newark, "Where'd you learn to sing the *Lovesick Blues* like that?"

"From listening to Hank Williams," Charley Pride answered. "Where else."

"Actually, Charley Pride sings it better than Hank Williams did," says Eric Anderson, who has recorded his own version of *Lovesick Blues*. "With a different intensity of feeling. I guess you'd call it soul."

"Johnny Cash might be this year's big country star, but Charley Pride's this year's country phenomenon. . . ."—*Music Record*

"You've really made it when your peers begin honoring you. For instance, when a fellow artist, like Mac Wiseman, begins singing about you. (His current RCA single and new Victor album are both titled, *Johnny's Cash and Charley's Pride*.)"—recent RCA Victor press release

"Charley Pride, whose unique talents as a singer, together with his innate feel of country music, pioneered in removing the color line from country music."—*Billboard* 1970 Trendsetter Award

"Country Charley Pride awarded Gold Record for RCA Album, *The Best of Charley Pride*."—Headline in *Variety*

Backstage at Symphony Hall, the great Bill Phillips is signing autographs for two girls in purple, plastic-fringed skirts, who had come all the way from Hartford to see the show. "They aren't groupies," the great Bill Phillips explained, "not in the rock-and-roll sense. They love country music and country stars. And they're nice girls." He turns to them and smiles. They giggle nervously, covering their blushes with two-dollar Kitty Wells programs.

"Well, so you're here to do a story about Charley." Phillips scratches his nose. "Well, I can tell you, brother, no one deserves it more than he does." Phillips, a former upholsterer from Canton, North Carolina, is in his early thirties, records for Decca and has had a few top-ten hits, the most famous being, *Put It Off Till Tomorrow*. He is a regular member (though non-related) of the great Kitty Wells-Johnny Wright Family Show. (In the country-music world, the epithet "great" may or may not refer to a performer's talent. Mostly it means, "He may have a lousy voice, but the fans still buy his records so he's stood the test of time.")

"Well," the great Bill Phillips offers, "I'm giving you a good quote about Charley. Yeah, Charley Pride is a good old boy [hesitation, eyes squinted, lips tight in thought]

and a credit to country music. Yessir, Charley's a credit to country music." (The great Bill Phillips ignores the two girls in purple skirts who offer programs for autographing and hugs the great Charley Pride.)

It took the great Penn Central twenty-seven minutes to arrive at the Newark Station. No cabs. Friday-night traffic jam. We walk.

A scowling lady in a tie-dye raincoat and loose stockings is waiting by the bus stop. "Where's Symphony Hall?" we ask.

"How the hell should I know," she answers, kindly. A black policeman gives us explicit instructions and offers no comment when I tell him we're going to see Charley Pride.

Newark is a riot-devastated city people by a great many blacks. Blacks lining the walls, standing in clusters in doorways, laughing and arguing on the street. We pass a brightly lit bar. Black faces peer out at us. We imagine that the conversation stops when we walk by, resumes as we pass.

We are going in the right direction. The black hordes grey into white hordes. Medium red-neck types. Only one black lady in the parade and she gravitates toward us. "Is there a restaurant near Symphony Hall? I didn't have a chance to have supper since I came all the way from the Bronx."

"This is our first time in Newark," I answered.

"Mine, too," the black lady informs us. "I just love Kitty Wells." She fingers the button prominently displayed on her grey coat. It reads: I SUPPORT OUR BOYS IN VIETNAM.

"I take it you're a big Charley Pride fan?"

"You bet. And Kitty Wells, too. I have all her records."

Symphony Hall is constructed in, well, classic symphony-hall style. Like the Omaha National Bank. Except for a stage and boxes. Classy for Newark, I think, condescendingly. We were going to sit through the concert but Lazar Emanuel, the Harvard man who turned WJZ from a loser into a New York Mets and country-music station, drags us backstage. (A strolling publicist for WJZ whispers: "Everybody told Lazar he was crazy, that the Mets would never win and country music is sure death in the metropolitan area. But his genius prevailed. WJZ is one of the biggest money-makers in the country.")

I haven't always been an expert in brilliance but I know something about warmth and Lazar Emanuel is a friendly man. The country-music people shake his hand and embrace him. He's down home, like they are.

The show at Symphony Hall, like many of the touring country-western shows, has been pieced together for this one performance. Kitty Wells has her enormous troupe; musicians, performers, relatives. Willie Nelson has his own trio. So does Pride. Red Sovine does a single and so does Wilf Carter, who is the great Montana Slim (although he was born in Canada, lives in Florida, and, for the most successful portion of his career, broadcast from New York). After the Symphony Hall show, Kitty Wells was booked in Ohio where she'd team up with the Ferlin Husky show. Red Sovine was accompanying Charley Pride through Pennsylvania, and Willie Nelson, stopping off to join the WJZ Cavalcade immediately on his return from a European tour, was off to Nashville for a recording session. What with wives, girl friends, camp followers, and musicians and well-wishers, there were more than fifty people backstage, with lots of chatter: where've you been, what've you been doing.

"Country music is a big family thing," the great Red Sovine told us. He seemed sad. "I been in it a long time, and now, for the first time, I don't know everybody in the business. I used to know everybody. Been to their houses. Helped some during hard times. Lord knows, they've helped me. Funerals, christenings. You know. Real family. Well, it's changing. Now that it's a big business, a big city business. Well, it's still a way of life, though. Just look around you. You can't stop

progress I guess and we're all making a better living. But I can't help feeling sad over the change."

Maybe. But the family get-together manner still prevailed. Warm cornball style.

Huggin': "Mmmm. It's worth not seein' you for two months, hon, to get this reception. Mmmm. Mmmm."

Kissin': "You ol' sumbitch. I didn't know you had the zing left in you. . . ."

Laughin': "Then ol' Chet busts a GITar string right onstage and everybody near die. . . ."

There's tuning of instruments. Exchanges of baby pictures. Pressing coats. Sewing spangles. Polishing boots. Lots of combing of hair. And fans.

Fans who manage to get past the stage guards are cheerfully welcomed. They're part of the business. ("We drove all the way from Wheeling for the show, Kitty, and wanted to shake your hand for all the enjoyment you give us. Don't we, Clara?")

Kitty Wells smiles and says, "Bless you." Everybody else smiles, revealing big country teeth. Some of the teeth, on the older performers especially, are tobacco-stained, snagged, even missing. (A phenomenon you wouldn't find backstage at *The Lawrence Welk Show*, or Jackie Gleason's madhouse. That's real jacket-crown country. I recall hearing a musician backstage at *The Ed Sullivan Show* recommend a dentist to his friend: "You've got to go to Dr. S—. I told him to make my mouth look just like Maximilian Schell's." He put a forefinger in each side of his lips and pulled. "Oh, wow," his friend admired. "Just like Maximilian Schell.")

The first thing I noticed about Charley Pride was his smile. He came in late, a half hour after everybody was already there, with his manager in tow. He smiled, showing a part right down the middle of his teeth. He is big, athletic, with an aquiline nose, like a black Cookie Lavagetto. His clothes are expensive and they fit. He wears a tuxedo shirt with one of those dippy ties under the collar like emcees in Midwestern nightclubs wear. Not a rib in his stockings is out of place. He smells nice. Red Sovine touches cheeks with him and says, "You look like a city slicker, Charley."

Pride crouches like a boxer. A quick one-two to Sovine's face knocks off Sovine's glasses. "Well, man, I ain't no cowboy."

Sovine: "Ain't none of us cowboys no more."

They laugh and embrace.

In the greenroom with Charley Pride (a dramatic interlude). Scene: The "greenroom" where actors and their well-wishers can gather backstage. At Symphony Hall, the greenroom is purplish, with satin swag decorating the cinder-block walls. Red Sovine, fiftyish, in a red-clay-colored cowboy suit, plays with his glasses. Charley Pride is drinking a can of Teem, reading some fan letters that have just been handed to him by an old Negro in a shiny black suit. He shakes Charley's hand. In the corner, Willie Nelson (formerly "Country Willie" Nelson), a slight intense, blond man with an intelligent face, picks out a tune on his guitar. It is Beethoven's *Minute in G*. Nelson attended Baylor University, is more articulate than many Nashville musicians and sings what could be called "country Kurt Weill." He is a regular on Grand Ol' Opry, but he probably would wow the audiences in the Maisonette Room of the St. Regis in New York as well. During what a friend calls his "dripping with Jesus" period, Nelson sang sacred songs on the syndicated Ernest Tubb TV show. (Excuse me, the great Ernest Tubb.)

Assorted country-western types, spangled and booted in Tony Lama's finest hand-mades, walk in and out. Some of them are eating deviled eggs and chewing on fried chicken legs and drinking Teem. Jack D. Johnson, wearing heavy black-rimmed

glasses, a tightly fitting eight-button double-breasted suit and a white turtleneck, chews on his finger. Johnson is Charley Pride's manager. Willie Nelson looks up, adjusts his finger picks and starts playing. Charley Pride quickly tunes his instrument. They sing a duet mocking (gently) the style of a Porter Wagoner-Dolly Parton hit. Every body is enthusiastic and applauds. Nelson gets up, slaps Charley:

NELSON. You sure have beautiful timing, boy. (Lee Arnold, Music Director of WJRZ, walks in with a tape recorder and Nelson and Pride shake his hand.) Did you know I was one of the first ones to promote Charley in a personal appearance?

PRIDE. He sure did. In Texas.

NELSON. I'd heard Charley's records and thought he'd be a great novelty act. But when the local promoters in Fort Worth and Dallas heard that Charley was black they called me. "You bringin' a cullid boy to sing in Texas? You crazy, Willie. You want to get us all killed?"

PRIDE (smiling). We're all still alive.

NELSON. Anyway, I was going to close the show. It was my show and I figured Charley would come out and sing a couple of songs before me. He got onstage and there was a big gasp. Then quiet. Then, Charley sang *Kaw-Liga* and they went wild. Wouldn't let the son of a bitch off the stage. (Shakes his head and strums a purposely sour chord.) Next night, I sang before Charley and let him close the show.

SOVINE. That's right. Charley always closes the show. Nobody wants to follow Charley Pride.

JOHNSON (in a management tone). Charley sells more records than Eddy Arnold now.

PRIDE. I'm blushing. Only you can't tell. (Big laugh.)

NELSON. One thing always bothers me, Charley. Why do you spell your name with an "ey" instead of an "ie"?

PRIDE. That's the way my daddy named me. (Pause, finishes Teem, looks around.) He could named me Sue, you know. (Entire company breaks down in peals of laughter.)

Charley Pride puts his guitar down, waves a temporary farewell. "I'm pretty hungry," he admits. "I better get to the chicken ladies before they run out."

Peter Noone (Herman, of Herman's Hermits) once confided that his fans, knowing his liking for chocolate cake, deliver hundreds of home-baked cakes at every one of his American performances. "We couldn't even give them away to orphanages," Herman complained. "Throw them all out. Who knows. Can't take the chance one of them is poisoned."

"Who in Sam Hill would want to poison any of us?" the great yodeling Montana Slim mumbled, his mouth dried by a surfelt of hard-boiled eggs.

A huge table was set up in the far corner of the greenroom area, covered with a yellow paper tablecloth embossed every few inches in gold with the words "We're Havin' A Party!" Huge platters of crisp-fried chicken thighs were guarded by battalions of deviled eggs and hard rolls. The supply of cold cans of Teem seemed unending and individually wrapped chunks of pound cake surrounded a giant pot of coffee. Next to the paper plates, plastic forks and a vat of coleslaw were two bulging scrapbooks and a medium-priced Polaroid camera.

While two of Kitty Wells's sidemen poked through the pile of chicken, the younger of two women, a placid, stringy-haired thin girl with fat legs, asked Montana Slim to pose with her. "Take my picture with Montana Slim, Momma."

Momma, a large, bulb-nosed lady, lumbered from behind the table. "Hey, Slim, we took pictures of you when Hennie was only sixteen and you were appearin' in Dover, Delaware. Remember?"

Slim looked puzzled. He stuffed another

deviled egg in his mouth. Momma persisted. She opened one of the scrapbooks, showing it within inches of Slim's face. She pointed a fat finger at a faded photograph. "There you was with PeeWee King, Hank Thompson and Skeeter Davis and the skinny thing in the middle is Hennie. Ain't that you, darlin'?"

The flashbulb popped, Slim smiled and retreated gracefully. Momma waddled toward the table to begin serving again.

"It's amazing how these ladies do it," Abe Hanza, a swarthy man in a blue Continental suit told me, waving a piece of chicken. Hanza packages country shows all over the Northeast. "I probably booked Hank Williams into Max Raney's when you saw him in 1948."

Hanza explained that the chicken ladies were a country-music tradition. "There are several sets of them that I know of. They're not in it for anything except they like to be around country performers. They work at jobs all week, and on weekends leave their husbands and kids, cook up a batch of food, and feed the performers. When you're on tour, you don't have much time to stop and eat. Often they do a job, hop in their bus, drive about twenty hours, getting to the next theatre hardly in time for the show to begin. They haven't eaten much. The chicken ladies provide food and love. They need both."

"Oh yeah, I been cookin' for country singers for a long time and Hennie, too. She has a six-year-old, but he's stayin' with his father at the gas station," Momma told me. "I don't consider myself a 'chicken lady,' just a country fan. I love these people. They're good. Clean folks. I'm proud that I know them so well. Proud. And it don't cost much and every one of 'em slips some money into the kitty so we break even."

"It's given purpose to my life and my husband don't mind. He comes along sometimes. If it's one of his favorites. And I know 'em all from Roy Acuff to Marty Robbins. They know me."

"Tell 'em what happened last week, Momma," Hennie interrupted.

"What happened?"

"You know. What happened on the road when we were goin' to the Tex Ritter show in Harrisburg."

"Oh, that. Well, we packed our chicken and cases of pop and were off to Harrisburg. Now, I can tell you that old Tex, bless his soul, is one of our very favorites. We love him. But on the way to Harrisburg we see this bus broke down on the side of the road. Darned if it isn't the Faron Young show. [She pronounced the name "Fahrn."] Well, Faron looks out when we stops and says, 'Darned if it ain't the chicken ladies. And we're hungry as horses.' He asks us if we're goin' to Allentown to see his show and I was embarrassed 'cause I love Faron, too. I told him the truth though, that we was goin' to see Tex in Harrisburg. 'Well, we're stuck on the side of the road and hungry so give us somethin' to tide us over.'

"So, we give them the big basket of chicken. Nothin' else we could do, and headed on to Harrisburg and set up backstage when in comes Tex. 'Ah'm hongry as a bear,' he says. I say, 'Go ahead and eat yourself fat, Tex honey.' But there ain't nothin' left but rolls and macaroni what with us given' the chicken to Faron Young."

"Tell him the whole story, Momma," Hennie insisted, "just like it happened."

"Well, Tex he got mad. 'Whar's mah meat?' he bellows. And I mean bellow. He sure don't mince words."

Hennie giggled. "Tell it like it happened."

"Well, Tex says to me, that it can't have meat, he sure ain't gonna eat no macaroni salad. And he walks out sayin' to me that I'm a real, excuse the expression, hitty chicken lady if I can't supply him no chicken. Well, that's what I mean about all this bein' so worthwhile and all. I mean, you don't have

incidents like that if you stay home and that's why we love all the country people so."

"Are you here to do a story on Ruby Wright?" Hennie asked.

"No," I said. "Charley Pride."

Momma stiffened. "We don't know him," she said, turning away to pour the coffee.

Hennie looked at her mother, her eyes turning downward. "I like Charley's records, though."

"Well, Charley's a shock to most people at first," Red Sovine explained. "It's like when I first heard Elvis Presley, on record, and I told Red Foley we should go hear this new colored boy in person and Red told me he was white and I didn't believe him. That's the question that most people ask Charley... how come you don't sound like you supposed to, but I guess that's how the good Lord wanted him to sound. I wish I sounded that good."

Red Sovine can probably be credited with discovering Pride. On a tour of Montana and the Northwest with Red Foley, they caught Pride's act in a Great Falls nightclub and suggested he try for a Nashville audition. "We didn't believe what we were seeing. But he was great. Just great. He had something we all wish we had. Hank Williams had it."

Getting to talk to Charley Pride, alone and uninterrupted, is difficult. His manager obviously worries about him, hovers over him. The country-music people surround him, constantly wishing him well. One of the guitarists told me a story Pride probably doesn't know. "Whether most Southern people like it or not, times are changing," he said. "And Charley's part of that change. We were in this joint in Nashville, this drummer and me, and we come across this old boy who's pretty good on the dobro."

In the midst of our talkin' he comes out with some dirty remark about travelin' "with that coon," and my drummer friend don't wait a minute before he flattens that dobro player. Out colder'n a well digger's ass in January. 'Goddamn,' my friend spits out 'don't he know Charley's a friend.' And lemme tell you, that drummer wasn't brought up exactly liberal."

AUTOBIOGRAPHY OF CHARLEY PRIDE (A SOLILOQUY)

"I was born in Sledge, Mississippi, and as a kid I always dug country music. Nobody in my family was musical. I memorized all those country songs and sung them. My family thought I was crazy. My sister would ask me, 'Why you singin' this music? It ain't gonna get you nowhere.' I said I didn't care if it got me anythin', I loved it. I bought my first guitar when I was fourteen years old, I think, and I played for my own fun. I never had any intention of being a cotton picker, no sir, but I didn't think music was the way out. So at seventeen I left Sledge to play baseball for the Negro American League, with Detroit and the Memphis Red Sox. Then I went into the Army and I played afterwards for a time with the Los Angeles Angels. I ended up in Helena, Montana, playing semipro ball and working as a smelter for Anaconda's zinc complex. Every once in a while I'd sing between innings and the crowds seemed to like it. Some folks who had a nightclub heard me and soon I was playing baseball, smelting, and singing at nights. I thought it was a pretty good life. Then one night Red Sovine came into the club, told me I should look him up in Nashville, but I wasn't ready. I wanted to play for the majors, anyway, and decided to try out for the Mets. I ordered six bats (W 166 Brooks Robinson models) with my name on them and took time off from the smelter to go to the Mets training camp. To make a long story short, Stengel didn't seem to know I was coming and I overheard him saying that he wasn't running a goddamn tryout camp. They let me try out anyway but I wasn't

good enough, so on my way back to Montana, I stopped in Nashville at one in the morning, and woke up Red Sovine and told him I was here. Red told me to go to Cedarwood, where Webb Pierce booked out of. I made a tape which was listened to by Jack Clement who was looking for a Negro entertainer. They liked the tape, but they wanted to dress me up funny and bill me as George Washington III, but I told them I wouldn't be no clown for nobody, that I was going to sing under my own name. Anyway the tape got to Chet Atkins."

Chet Atkins, one of the most successful guitarists in the business, is also big man for RCA Victor in Nashville. When Jack Clement brought him the Charley Pride tape, Atkins thought he was good enough to record and brought the tape to a meeting of A&R men. "All the top creative brass at RCA," he recalls, "I played the record and everybody agreed he was worth signing up. Then I told them he was black. Pure silence. Finally, someone broke in, 'He's great, though. Let's take a chance.' And the rest is history. A lot of people believed we were making a mistake, that disc jockeys in the deep South wouldn't play him. That he wouldn't get any promotion. They were wrong."

Atkins believes Charley will become one of the all-time greats, "and not only in country music." He says that superstars like Hank Williams or Frank Sinatra have a certain intangible edge. "Put Charley Pride on the worst p.a. system in the country and it doesn't matter. He'll penetrate. That's greatness. Few have it. Charley does."

At N.Y.U. during the post-Kent State strike, five or six Black Panthers are sipping Cokes outside of the Gristede's store on Waverly Place. We get into conversation about music. They are friendlier than Black Panthers are supposed to be. They like B.B. King and Otis Redding. And Robert Johnson records. They've never heard of Charley Pride, but they promise to listen. "Why does he want to sing country music," one of them asked me, "for the bread?"

"Country music is alien to a lot of Negroes," Pride admits. "They don't listen to it for enjoyment. But I hope that me being in country will make Negroes listen more. [Pride always says Negro, not black. He won't, or didn't, talk about the war, or race problems.] I'm an entertainer," he says. "A country entertainer. Stone country. A traditional country singer. Like Roy Acuff and Hank Williams. And, right now, 99.9 percent of my records are bought by Caucasians, but I'm beginning to see a few black faces. Why doesn't anyone want to believe I'm comfortable in country music? I think it's as groovy for me to be a country singer as it was for Jimi Hendrix to do blues rock."

After the show begins at Symphony Hall, Kitty Wells, Johnny Wright, Willie Nelson, Montana Slim all have their moments. The house is packed and loud. It screams and whistles and sings along. It knows the words to every song. About twenty-five percent of the audience has cameras, and the flashbulbs pop. Charley Pride is last. Nobody, but nobody, follows Charley Pride. He steps up to the plate, weighs his guitar, looks around. Crouches slightly. It's a big house. He's going to hit a home run. "My name is Charley Pride and I come from Sledge, Mississippi." The crowd goes wild. Absolutely wild. They jump up and down in their seats. They whistle. They clap. They call out for special songs. Someone screams, "You're our boy, Charley boy!"

I ask an RCA Victor executive why, on one of the Charley Pride albums, Charley is shown only from the back? (The album was recorded, incredibly, at some place called Panther Hall in Fort Worth.) I am told that they were cautious, but now his face is on all albums. The Victor executive is a Southerner. "Do you have the Panther Hall album?"

"Yes," I answer.

"Do you like it?"

"I do."

"Well, I have it on good authority that Governor George Wallace listens to that album and likes it and I'll bet you never thought you and Governor Wallace would have anything in common, would you?"

Jules Siegel, journalist, editor, short-story writer and musicologist has been making a study of black and white music styles. He is an expert on seventeenth-century English music. I was surprised that he knew about Charley Pride, and I asked him for a quote. He sent me a letter, which I feel is worth reprinting:

"In order to understand the significance of Charley Pride, you need first to understand that music, like speech, is a form of communication that uses many languages, many dialects, many vernaculars, many accents. The musical language of white Middle America is Country & Western, which has been traced back to the English folk song of the seventeenth century and earlier. The other great popular musical language, rhythm and blues, comes from Africa; the most popular recording stars of our time have sung in a synthesis of these two great traditions. Elvis Presley was a white country boy who sang with a black accent. The Beatles were white English boys who sang in the idiom of Presley and other rock-and-roll performers. Bob Dylan was a white American poet who chose to combine the country voice with the black style. These performers have been translators standing between black and white; and explaining one side to the other. Until now, the black message has mainly flowed through white translators to the white audiences. Its effect has been overpoweringly great. Those of us who watched and felt what Presley, The Beatles, and Dylan did to American consciousness remember that potent sound, still only five years old, was followed by the great wave of revolution we see sweeping the country today. If that was what happened when the voice of the black people was heard secondhand, we can only guess what may result when a black man like Charley Pride sings directly to Middle America in its authentic language, vernacular, dialect and accent.

"Charley Pride may not yet have chosen to deliver any special message, but he has proved that it is possible for a black man to sing in a white voice. When he or those who come after him begin to instruct as well as entertain, white Middle America will be changed forever."

Thank you, Mr. Siegel. Indeed, sagacious. But the reason I keep playing my Charley Pride records is that listening to Charley Pride makes you feel good.

And that's plenty reason enough.

SENATOR JAMES B. PEARSON

HON. LARRY WINN, JR.

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 19, 1971

Mr. WINN. Mr. Speaker, our distinguished senior Senator from the great State of Kansas has become, over a few short years, a symbol of quiet, but firm strength and wisdom within that other body.

Recently the publisher of the Johnson County, Kans., Scout newspaper interviewed Senator JAMES B. PEARSON and wrote an account of that interview in his paper. I think my colleagues here in the House would appreciate the opportunity

to read what Mr. Rose had to say about JIM PEARSON.

The account of the interview follows:

COUNT PEARSON IN

(By Stan Rose)

It's refreshing to talk with Sen. Jim Pearson because he's one of the few men in political life I've met who answers a direct question with a direct answer almost 100 percent of the time. After talking with Senator Pearson for about two hours the other day I was amazed when he told me to evaluate what he had said and to publicize any of his viewpoints I felt might be newsworthy.

Senator Pearson's candid statement that he wasn't talking off the record was, in itself, newsworthy. Without casting any aspersions at anyone else in political office, I've been around politicians long enough to believe that cutting through the double talk is one of the most difficult jobs any reporter has.

As a friend and admirer of Bob Ellsworth, the former third district congressman and former ambassador to NATO, who challenged Senator Pearson in 1966 for the Senate seat, I should have been in the doghouse with Jim Pearson. Our newspapers wholeheartedly endorsed Ellsworth in his race against Pearson for the Republican nomination. Ellsworth won handily in Johnson County but lost the rest of the state to Pearson. Throughout the primary campaign which he eventually won Pearson was never petty or vindictive toward us.

In 1972, if all goes well, Pearson will seek another six years in the Senate. Despite trial balloon news items in U.S. News and World Report and other national media, Ellsworth will not challenge Pearson for the senatorial nomination. In fact, it's hard to imagine anyone challenging Senator Pearson in the Republican primary.

But Pearson says frankly he looks for Governor Docking to take him on, if Docking's private polls indicate he has a chance to beat him. Pearson says if Docking decides to make the race for the Senate it will be a tough fight. Pearson expects to win but a lot depends on how much support he gets from the Republicans, who so far, in my own opinion, have sold him short. Some Republicans, irked by Pearson's dedication to being his own man and not an echo, are circulating a rumor that Pearson is vulnerable in '72. Their comments may be influencing Governor Docking in his evaluation of his chances to beat Pearson next year.

In my opinion these nitpicking Republicans are doing a disservice to one of the most capable and conscientious senators in Washington. If they continue to snipe at Pearson, and withhold all-out support for him they will deserve to lose the Senate seat and the services of a man who has shied away from hoedowns, ribbon cutting and riding in parades, because he fervently believes the job of a Senator can best be done in the chambers of the U.S. Senate and in his offices in the Senate building. (Because of partisan pressures he finds it necessary to leave Washington almost every weekend to come home and mend political fences.)

Through his seniority Pearson has gained an important seat on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. His non-partisan approach to our dealings with foreign countries indicates that this low-keyed, soft-spoken, ordinary appearing-man has the potential to become a real statesman if he's allowed to do his own thing.

On the home front, he deserves praise for his work with Sen. Hubert Humphrey to set up a government program to encourage young people to stay in rural communities instead of leaving the farms for city life.

Senator Pearson appears to have no basic quarrel with most Nixon policies, although he has voted against some Administration programs. He is most enthusiastic about the President's recent actions to freeze wages and

prices and to stabilize the dollar abroad. But he says frankly that unless government controls are continued in some firm manner beyond the 90-day freeze economic chaos will result.

He thinks the Nixon trip to mainland China is a good idea and believes Nixon is really unwinding our war in Vietnam.

He thinks Nixon will not dump Agnew next year because Nixon remembers too well what Eisenhower almost did to him under pressure in 1956.

And he says the real issue in the Presidential campaign of 1972 won't be Vietnam, the economy or crime in the streets. It will be plainly and simply:

"Which candidate do most American voters believe?"

Straight talk from a politician—especially one who holds the high rank of United States Senator.

JOHN D. MONTGOMERY OF KANSAS

HON. WILLIAM R. ROY

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 19, 1971

Mr. ROY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to call to the attention of my colleagues the accomplishments of a great Kansan, John D. Montgomery of Junction City, who last month was awarded the Department of the Army's highest civilian decoration, for distinguished civilian service.

Mr. Montgomery served for 10 years as civilian aide to the Secretary of the Army, from 1961 until 1964 as aide for Kansas, and from 1964 until last June as aide-at-large.

The awards ceremony held at Fort Riley, Kans., was a fitting tribute to this man, who has served his community, his State and his Nation in so many ways.

As publisher of the Junction City Union, John Montgomery has provided the journalistic leadership which every town must have. He also publishes newspapers in Chapman and Lindsborg, Kans., and in addition, owns the only English-language newspaper in Brazil.

As director of highways in Kansas, John Montgomery has always been a leader of responsible political activity, and narrowly was defeated in a bid for the House of Representatives in 1964.

As aide to the Secretary of the Army, John Montgomery has spoken for Kansas in Washington, and spoken for all of his countrymen in the policymaking councils of our Nation.

I would like to insert in the RECORD the citation presented to Mr. Montgomery by Secretary of the Army Robert Froehke, and an editorial which appeared in the Topeka Daily Capital. I add my voice to those in Kansas and Washington and elsewhere who praise this great Kansan for a job well done.

The citation follows:

CITATION

For many years as a private citizen, and particularly as a Civilian Aide to the Secretary of the Army for the State of Kansas from 1961 to 1964, and as Civilian Aide-at-Large from 1964 to June 29, 1971, Mr. John D. Montgomery has selflessly and with great distinction devoted himself to the course of the U.S. Army and to National Defense. An eloquent and articulate writer and spokes-

man, armed with facts gained from frequent trips abroad and first hand observations of our troops overseas, he has interpreted to his fellow newspaper publishers controversial issues, thus creating a better understanding and appreciation of the accomplishments and problems of our Armed Forces.

Particularly noteworthy have been his understanding of military personnel as individuals and his increasing support of measures to make the Army a better place to live and work.

His exceptional abilities in the field of journalism, business, and human relations have always been at the disposal of the Army, and he worked tirelessly to foster in others an awareness that the vitality of the Army depends largely on the morale and esprit of its members. By his unstinting devotion of his time and many talents he has rendered truly distinguished service to the Department of the Army and to the Nation.

[From the Topeka Daily Capital, Sept. 7, 1971]

MONTGOMERY AN ASSET

Junction City's John Montgomery has proved once again that he is a man of many parts.

Montgomery, who habitually wears the two hats of Kansas State Highway Director and publisher of the Junction City Daily Union, was awarded the Army's highest award for civilians last week, in a ceremony at Fort Riley.

Montgomery was presented with the Distinguished Civilian Service Medal by Army Secretary Robert F. Froehke, at a meeting of the Fort Riley Chapter of the Association of the U.S. Army.

The Junction City man was honored for 10 years service as a civilian aide to the Army secretary, during the period July 1961 to July 1971.

Indefatigable in his public service, John Montgomery is one of those citizens whom Kansas is fortunate to have.

THE SCHOOL PRAYER AMENDMENT—NEARER TO REALITY

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 19, 1971

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, just the other day I received a petition containing the signatures of over 5,000 residents of Bedford and Everett, Pa. These Pennsylvanians were writing to show their continuing support of the proposed constitutional amendment to allow voluntary prayer and Bible reading in our schools, which I reintroduced at the beginning of the 92d Congress. I was particularly heartened to learn that this wonderful expression of support was due in large part to the efforts of David Crawford, a 17-year-old student from Everett High School.

These 5,000 people join the thousands and thousands of others who have been sending cards, letters, telegrams, and petitions to me ever since the day prayer was banned from our public schools. A decision by the Third U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals earlier this year further tightened this ban, thus creating even more need for a constitutional amendment specifically permitting voluntary prayer and meditation by our children.

As my colleagues know, a successful

effort in the House of Representatives has finally brought this vital issue to the House floor for a vote by all the Members there. I hope for an overwhelming vote in favor of passage.

Forty-three Members of the Senate have joined me as sponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 34, yet no formal action has been scheduled in the Senate. I believe a strong show of support by the House of Representatives will give the needed additional impetus for Senate action on this issue which is of such importance to the people of Pennsylvania and across our Nation.

RUSSIA'S GOALS IN THE MIDEAST

HON. RICHARD BOLLING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 19, 1971

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, a sense of the realities of complicated situations coupled with an illuminating wit was characteristic of the late Dean Acheson. His article on the Middle East published in the New York Times of October 14 is a superb example of this. It follows:

RUSSIA'S GOALS IN THE MIDEAST

(By Dean Acheson)

WASHINGTON.—This piece begins, like the sermons of my youth, with a text. It is taken from testimony given last March and April before Senator Jackson's Subcommittee on National Security and International Operations by two eminent authorities, the first on the Middle East by Bernard Lewis, the second by Robert Conquest on the Soviet Union:

"The overriding reality is the confrontation, all over the world, including the Middle East, of two great powers—of two systems and civilizations—perhaps about to become three. All else is subordinate and secondary. . . . The object of policy in this area should be to find the most effective means of opposing the adversary—not to collect autographs."

"Closed ideology and lack of access to other thought, which have prevailed in the Soviet Union since its formation, automatically led to progressive degeneration of the political mind, so that the present Soviet leadership [is] composed of a group of rather bigoted fundamentalists with a disturbingly low level of intelligence—in general a third-rate group . . . and since their judgment is not of the highest order, I would expect them to create situations of the utmost danger to the world peace."

The Russian leaders are not unique in their mediocrity. So universally is that shared that our age might be called the apotheosis of mediocrity. What makes them so great a danger to world peace is that third-rate judgment is activated by highly aggressive purpose and armed by a military establishment second to none. The Middle East is a point of danger because there we confront the energetic and purposeful action of an adversary who will be dissuaded only by encountering unacceptable risks, as in Cuba in 1962.

The Arab-Israeli conflict is important to those parties; but it is subordinate and secondary. It becomes a major problem only because of the possibility of direct military involvement of the two great powers. If outside involvement were to be limited to supplying the primary combatants with more, and more sophisticated weapons, the injuries they might inflict upon each other might be greater than in the past, but total victory would not be possible.

While further hostilities would be entirely possible, the probable result would be, for both sides, an excess of losses over gains. Such a situation would contain the seeds of stability and an approach to a *modus vivendi*.

The Soviet Union is currently pursuing two goals in the Middle East, not wholly compatible. One is to continue Arab dependence by maintaining a state of tension approaching, but not reaching outright war. The other is reopening the Suez Canal. This would give her naval dominance in the Persian Gulf and Indian Ocean and power to control the movement of Persian Gulf oil to Europe, East Asia and North America. These aims may be incompatible since a reopened canal would require peace, whereas maintaining a high state of tension would endanger it.

The Kremlin, therefore, must regard with some surprise Secretary of State Rogers' eager advocacy of reopening the Canal as a preliminary to—something. The Kremlin has always believed with Ibn Hazm of Cordova that "the height of stupidity and weakness is not to know an enemy from a friend." Foggy Bottom was not able to make this distinction at the time of the Suez crisis of 1956 and has apparently not made much progress in that direction since.

The first aim of American policy should be to convince the Soviet leaders that direct involvement of their own forces in the Middle East involves unacceptable risks. They are already substantially present in Egypt. Secretary Rogers proposes to compound the evil by having combined Russian-American forces there "to keep the peace." The true American interest is to keep both out. It is also the true interest of both Israelis and Arabs. We have begun to strengthen the air components of the Sixth Fleet and should continue to do so.

American policy should make clear to Moscow in the most quiet and secret manner that the only development that could overcome our determination not to become involved in the Middle East would be the continuance of their apparent involvement. Similar American firmness resulted in Soviet withdrawal from Northern Persia in 1946, from the blockade of Berlin in 1949, and from intervention in Cuba in 1962.

Perhaps the reader will think the quotations that began this article too harsh a judgment of the Soviet leaders. Let me offer one from Jesse Jones of Texas, a real reincarnation of David Harum's Yankee spirit. Asked whether he thought a certain man trustworthy, Jesse replied, "Well, I wouldn't go to sleep with my thumb in his mouth."

WILL G. KELLEY SELECTED AS ONE OF "OUTSTANDING YOUNG MEN OF AMERICA"

HON. JOHN V. TUNNEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, October 19, 1971

Mr. TUNNEY. Mr. President, I was very much pleased to learn recently that Dr. Will G. Kelley, a resident of Oakland, has been selected by the U.S. Jaycees as one of the "Outstanding Young Men of America" for the year of 1970. Dr. Kelley is 30 years old and practices optometry in Berkeley. He is a graduate of the University of California School of Optometry and is president-elect of the Alameda and Contra Costa Counties Optometric Society.

The U.S. Jaycees select "Outstanding Young Men of America" on an annual

basis from men between the ages of 21 and 35 who have distinguished themselves by exceptional service, achievement, and leadership. Dr. Kelley has certainly demonstrated these qualities over the years.

In addition to his activities in the field of vision care, Dr. Kelley has served with Oakland's Minority Recruitment Committee, Berkeley Work Relation Council, Berkeley Jaycees Human Relations Project, and the Allied Health Planning Subcommittee of the Alameda County Comprehensive Health Planning Council.

I am much pleased to have Dr. Kelley as a constituent. I have a deep sense of pride in his accomplishments, and I extend to him my warmest congratulations on the honor that has been extended to him.

THE SUPREME COURT VACANCIES

HON. DONALD W. RIEGLE, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, October 19, 1971

Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. Speaker, I insert into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial written by Rowland Evans and Robert Novak which appeared in today's Washington Post. The article, entitled, "Nixon and Material for Court" follows:

NIXON AND MATERIAL FOR COURT
(By Rowland Evans and Robert Novak)

President Nixon's astonishing attitude toward the Supreme Court, which has now painted him into a political corner, was revealed Oct. 8 when he met at the White House with top advisers to discuss filling the two vacancies.

Blatantly mediocre prospects were suggested and, consequently, the possibility of disapproval by the American Bar Association (ABA) was raised. Mr. Nixon bristled and, startling his unbelieving aides, made clear in uncharacteristically colorful language just what the ABA could go do about it. In short, the President was not going to let questions of legal quality interfere with his political designs for the Supreme Court.

That led to two incontestably mediocre selections, a wave of public and professional repugnance and, finally, a White House decision to rethink the whole business. At the weekend, Mr. Nixon had dug himself into another hole.

At the heart of Mr. Nixon's court troubles is his determination to appoint law-and-order conservatives pleasing to the old segregationist South without regard to ability. That determination is shared, with monomaniacal inflexibility, by Mitchell and Deputy Attorney General Richard Kleindienst.

Kleindienst, in particular, is convinced of boundless political capital flowing from anti-liberal court selections. In charge of recommending judicial appointments, Kleindienst sought out hardliners without worrying about quality.

Two weeks ago, during a session of top administration officials, a fascinating possibility for the court was put forward: Elliot Richardson, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. A former attorney general of Massachusetts, the greatly respected Richardson would be an adornment on the court. Under no conditions, said Kleindienst. The reason: Richardson is too liberal on civil rights and, therefore, would displease the South.

Later, moderate administration officials proposed Edward Levi, president of the Uni-

versity of Chicago. A renowned legal scholar, Levi is a strict constructionist and scarcely a wide-eyed radical. Besides, he would end the absence of any Jews on the court, an absence begun under Mr. Nixon in 1969 for the first time in 53 years. But Levi, too, was vetoed. The reason: He did not fit the law-and-order, anti-civil rights formula.

The wholly political nature of the selection process can be seen in the attitude toward a woman justice. Originally, Mr. Nixon had no intention of appointing a woman but, gradually, realized that would be bad politics, indeed.

That set off a mad search for a law-and-order woman judge. Perhaps the best qualified prospects, Judge Shirley Hufstедler of the U.S. Court of Appeals in Los Angeles, was immediately ruled out as a liberal Democrat. Finally, Kleindienst hit pay dirt. He gleefully told associates he had found in California State Appeals Judge Mildred L. Lillie a very tough lady with no use for the Warren court's libertarianism.

The line was finally drawn at conservative Democratic Sen. Robert Byrd of West Virginia, who has never practiced law and is not a member of the bar. He was just too unqualified for Mitchell. The upshot last week was the selection of Mrs. Lillie and Herschel H. Friday of Little Rock, Ark., best known as attorney for anti-integration suits.

Four other names were sent to the ABA for approval, in case trouble developed over Friday or Mrs. Lillie. Until the last minute, the list also included U.S. District Judges Arlin Adams of Philadelphia (who is Jewish) and the highly regarded Frank Johnson of Montgomery, Ala. Finally, however, they were eliminated for being too liberal. Their inclusion might generate a late campaign for them. Thus, the six names sent the ABA were uniform in both mediocrity and acceptability to the segregationist South.

Mr. Nixon was ill-prepared for what happened when those names were published last Thursday. The press and the bar condemned the choices. Even high White House staffers were heartsick. Moderate Republicans wondered out loud whether Mr. Nixon's interest in excellence, meager in many other governmental appointments, had hit bottom. Prominent Jewish Republicans were furious that no Jew was on the list.

The furor forced Mr. Nixon to rethink his position. Although Judges Friday and Lillie definitely had been picked, the White House issued a smokescreen statement that 15 names were still under consideration. So, at this writing, the President must either stick to his undistinguished selections or ignominiously retreat. Once again, playing politics with the Supreme Court has proved the worst politics of all.

WARNER BROS. 1,500TH FILM

HON. VANCE HARTKE

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, October 19, 1971

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, within recent weeks an outstanding American company will have reached a milestone in a long and glamorous history of producing motion pictures. Warner Bros. has released its 1,500th film, "Skin Game," the most recent in a long series of films designed to fulfill their attempt to combine good picturemaking and good citizenship. The impact of 1,500 films on the American viewer and on world opinion has been tremendous, much of it for the good and welfare of our country.

Warner Bros. has long been a leader in their industry, beginning with their first film in 1917, "My Four Years in Germany," based on Ambassador Gerard's book. Subsequently, their films have ranged from "The Jazz Singer," which launched the age of sound on the screen, to current hits as well known as "Casablanca," "My Fair Lady," and many more. Through the years, Warner Bros. has consistently brought both entertainment and enlightenment to audiences in this country and abroad.

Based on these superb accomplishments, I trust all the Senate will join me on this occasion in a salute to Warner Bros. for its contributions to our country. We all join in this nationwide salute to an organization which we hope will continue to enjoy the acclaim and success in the future which has been paid it in the past.

CONSUMER PROTECTION ACT OF 1971

HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 19, 1971

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, the Consumer Protection Act before us today is one of the most important pieces of consumer legislation to come to the House floor in recent times, and I want to express my strong support of this legislation.

Clearly this legislation will provide more extensive coverage than the American consumer presently enjoys. The basic thrust of the bill is the establishment of an independent Consumer Protection Agency. The Agency will represent consumer interests in other Government agency proceedings, and can obtain judicial review of agency decisions considered adverse to consumer interests. The Agency will also play a catalytic role. It will receive and publicize consumer complaints, communicate with Federal, State, and local agencies on consumer matters, and require Federal agencies to keep the CPA advised on activities affecting consumer interests. Finally, the new Agency will have broad responsibilities, to determine consumer needs through research and investigation, and to disseminate the results.

Passage of such a package, without a doubt, will constitute landmark legislation. For the first time, an independent governmental agency will give the consumer a full-time advocate before those governmental units which make decisions affecting everyday life. For the first time, all agencies of Government will be obliged to consider the American consumer in setting standards and regulations under law. In this way, the CPA will provide a centralized focal point at the Federal level for the American consumer movement.

As I have said, I feel that the Fuqua amendment would seriously weaken the powers of the Consumer Protection Agency and should, therefore, be de-

feated. At present, the consumer has little enough representation before Federal agency proceedings. The Fuqua amendment would weaken the new Agency to the extent that this status would be preserved. The committee bill would be superior to the Fuqua proposal. It would provide actual intervention and thus real bargaining power before Federal proceedings. I, therefore, urge all Members to vote for strong consumer protection, the protection provided for in this effective bill.

VOLUNTARY PUBLIC PRAYER

HON. J. GLENN BEALL, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 19, 1971

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, in the not too distant future, the House of Representatives will vote upon an amendment to the Constitution designed to restore voluntary public prayer. If the amendment is approved by the House of Representatives, then the focal point of this controversy will be centered in this Chamber.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement I have issued with reference to voluntary public prayer be printed in the RECORD, to be followed by a compilation of polls relative to this topic that was compiled by the Reverend Robert G. Howes, national coordinator of Citizens for Public Prayer.

There being no objection, the statement is ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF SENATOR J. GLENN BEALL, JR. WITH REFERENCE TO THE PUBLIC PRAYER AMENDMENT

A great deal of controversy surrounds the status of public prayer in the United States today. There is considerable public confusion and consternation about this issue. This feeling of frustration is, in part, a result of the lack of a meaningful national debate on the matter.

From our founding in the early 17th century, until the Supreme Court rulings of 1962-63, voluntary public prayer and expressions of belief in God were generally regarded as compatible with our governmental system.

The public is concerned, and rightly so, about the social deterioration that has taken place in America during the last decade. The decline of morality, the lack of respect for authority, and the growing mood of permissiveness have caused many Americans to doubt the future of this country. Many of us feel we have cut ourselves loose from our traditional heritage—thus being adrift without a sense of direction.

Many millions of Americans have expressed their concern about voluntary public prayer during the past 8 years.

The Congress has been besieged by letters, petitions and organizations on both sides of the public prayer question. Through it all one thing has been obvious to me—Americans are generally dissatisfied with the present law on the question and feel that change is needed. I agree with them.

I believe that we should amend the Constitution to reaffirm our desire to have our nation based on the belief in God. I am disturbed that the Congress has not moved to bring this issue to the forum of public debate. I am distressed that the rulings of the

Supreme Court, no matter how entrenched in the law, have led to an atmosphere that makes us hesitant to publicly declare our faith under certain circumstances. I urge the Congress to move at once to amend the Constitution to restore voluntary public prayer to our schools and other public functions. To this end, I have written to the Chairman of the House Committee considering this amendment and urged action.

The principle at stake is both simple and complex. I have heard the lawyers' arguments that there is no prohibition against such voluntary prayer now—and they may be correct. But what I believe we need today is the strength to make positive what they arrive at by use of a negative. This point in the history of our Nation makes such an approach imperative. It is no longer enough to say that we can do it now if we are not willing to put our beliefs on the line and stand up and be counted.

Under the first amendment, the Government cannot force us to accept any form of religion. This proposed amendment would add to this protection and make clear the proposition that Government cannot separate us, or our children, from the opportunity to engage in prayer or religious meditation at any place or time that we so choose. I therefore support it.

HOUSE HEADS FOR CRITICAL VOTE ON PRAYER ON NOVEMBER 8, 1971—MAXIMUM NOISE NEEDED

a. Gallup (August 1962). Do you approve or disapprove of religious observances in public schools? Approve, 80%; Disapprove, 14%; No opinion, 6%.

Gallup (30 August 1963). The US Sup. Ct. has ruled that no state or local govt. may require reading of the Lord's Prayer or Bible verses in public schools. What are your views on this? Approve, 24%; Disapprove, 70%; No opinion, 6%.

b. Harris (October 1964). 80% of American people support free school prayer.

Harris (Nov. 1964). The US Sup. Ct. has ruled that children could not be required to recite a prayer in a public school. Was the Court right or wrong? Approve decision, 30%; Disapprove decision, 70%.

c. ABC TV Special (28 December 1970). A poll was conducted in Columbus, Ohio, as a typical American community, on the question: Should prayers be permitted in public schools? Yes, 91.5%; No, 7.3%; No op., 2.1%.

d. On the ballot in the state of Maryland (3 November 1970) this referendum question was placed: Do you favor "... permitting religious reading of prayer and reference to a Supreme Being in certain instances, if participation therein is on a voluntary basis in any governmental or public school, institution, or place?" Yes (409,050)—73%; No (152,706)—27%.

e. Congressional polls (Many Congressmen have polled their home districts on the free prayer question. In every case we have noted, the vote has been overwhelmingly favorable to the civil right of free school prayer. When writing to all Congressmen, they should be urged to include the question in their next home district poll. Results are extremely useful in our effort.) Latest available home district poll (announced by Congressman J. Irving Whalley, whose district is in southern Pennsylvania, on 21 July 1971) show 94% favorable to free school prayer, 4% negative; uncertain, 2%.

f. Advocates Poll (conducted on a national scale for the Advocates TV program by Opinion Research of Princeton, New Jersey, Jan-Feb 1971):

[Answers in percent]

Total sample (2,061):	
Yes	80
No	12
Undecided	4
Do not know	4

Protestant (1,352):	
Yes	84
No	9
Undecided	3
Do not know	4
RC (512):	
Yes	82
No	10
Undecided	5
Do not know	3
Jewish (66):	
Yes	50
No	38
Undecided	6
Do not know	6
No religion (78):	
Yes	46
No	42
Undecided	4
Do not know	8

Question asked: "The US Sup. Ct. has held that the recitation of prayers in public schools is unconstitutional. Would you favor or oppose a Constitutional amendment to permit the use of prayers in public schools?"

REDUCED RAIL PASSENGER FARES FOR RETIRED RAILROAD WORKERS AND DEPENDENTS

HON. ROBERT PRICE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 19, 1971

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate this opportunity to speak as a cosponsor in support of H.R. 11253. This bill, which Mr. SCHERLE and Mr. CRANE and I are sponsoring would amend section 405 of the Rail Passenger Service Act of 1970 to provide for free or reduced rate transportation to retired railroad employees and their dependents on any intercity rail passenger service.

Transportation is one of the major problems confronting our older citizens. Its importance has been stressed by the White House Conference on Aging. Response to questionnaires showed the Conference that many of the 200,000 elderly citizens who responded could not take advantage of available transportation services. The elderly placed transportation behind only health and income as a major concern.

Furthermore, only 1 percent of those citizens aged 65 and over crossed a State line last year. Their travel is intrastate and intercity. Certainly any rise in prices and the cost of living affects all of us to varying degrees, but those existing on a fixed income are the hardest hit. It is to correct an oversight caused by the Rail Passenger Service Act of 1970 that our bill H.R. 11253 has been introduced. By restoring special free or reduced rate rail transportation privileges to retired railroad employees and their dependents on the same basis that such privileges were in effect before the enactment of the Amtrak system, we will in effect be giving due recognition to these retired workers for their contribution in building, maintaining, and operating our Nation's rail passenger system. At insignificant direct cost to the companies involved we will provide much needed and well deserved relief to those who now have the time to enjoy the fruits of their labors.

AMBASSADOR JAMES SHEN ON CHINA

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 19, 1971

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the press of our country is being flooded with news stories about Henry Kissinger's obsession for a projected visit by President Nixon to Red China, but little is being published about the wishes of 14 million Chinese of the Republic of China on Taiwan, the 18 million living overseas, or the 750 million who are silenced in their homeland.

In an address on October 18, 1971, before a distinguished gathering at the Cosmos Club in Washington, Ambassador James C. H. Shen of the Republic of China spoke out for those silenced. He emphasized that appeasement of Chinese Communists on the grounds of realism or other rationalization would be one of the gravest errors in contemporary history with tragic consequences for the entire free world.

Because of the timeliness and pertinence of the indicated address by Ambassador Shen, I quote it as part of my remarks:

SINO-AMERICAN RELATIONS: LET NOTHING PULL US ASUNDER

With your indulgence, I am going to do some plain talking about the unique relationship between my country, the Republic of China, and the United States. In doing so, we shall not be able to ignore the Chinese Communists, simply because they are there. No one is likely to deny that the so-called Chinese problem is one of the most difficult and important ever to face the world. There may be those who fail to realize, however, that a wrong solution could be worse than no solution at all.

The United States and China have had a special relationship with deep roots going back to the first part of the nineteenth century. This relationship has been characterized by cordiality and cooperation in official as well as un-official contacts, of a nature and degree rarely paralleled in bilateral relations. Generally speaking, the American policy toward China has been motivated by high purpose and plenty of goodwill, which has been reciprocated by the Chinese side in full measure. The United States signed its first accord with China only two years after Great Britain and China had signed the Treaty of Nanking in 1842. American missionaries had actually preceded the signing of the treaty. They began arriving in China in 1830. Their role in history has been glorified by some and maligned by others. Truth lies somewhere in between.

In these days of debunking, some historians have questioned the altruism of the Open Door Policy enunciated by Secretary of State John Hay in 1899. Admittedly, it was an extension of the most-favored-nation concept and intended to benefit the United States as well as other countries interested in trading with China. Nevertheless, this concept was a step towards elimination of the inequities which had been visited upon China through most of the 19th century.

The Sino-American relationship since the Boxer Uprisings of 1900 is a more familiar story. At the height of the trouble, John Hay said the United States wanted permanent safety and peace for China and the preservation of Chinese territorial and administrative integrity. Once the Boxers were suppressed, the United States was quick to devote the unused portion of its indemnity

to the welfare of the Chinese people. Over a period of some 40 years it made available \$18 million for the education of young Chinese in American institutions of high learning and many of them later played an important part in China's modernization.

Although the United States was not fully aware of Japan's aggressive intentions at the time, publicity given the Twenty-one Demands of 1915 in America helped China reject some of them, including those which would have turned China into a Japanese protectorate. The voice of protest might have been stronger. Nevertheless, from Washington and from Washington alone came pressure for the preservation of China's independence and territorial integrity.

In World War I, China's diplomatic performance was roughly parallel to that of the United States. Neutrality was followed by severance of relations with the Central Powers and finally by a declaration of war. Unfortunately, the Allied Powers' secret commitments to Japan prevented China from regaining her rights and interests in the Shantung peninsula from a defeated Germany. Although equal in victory, the weak do not always fare so well as the strong.

The Washington Conference of 1921-22 is recalled today, if at all, for its 5-5-3 arrangement of the naval power of the United States, Great Britain and Japan. Yet this also was the Conference which produced the Nine-Power Treaty guaranteeing China's territorial integrity. The same treaty had provisions for review of extraterritorial rights which foreign powers enjoyed in China, for withdrawal of foreign post offices from Chinese soil, for Chinese control of most foreign radio stations, for discussions looking toward withdrawal of foreign troops from China, for concessions with regard to tariffs and for restoration of the Leased Territories. The United States was on China's side.

The existing government of the Republic of China came to power in 1926-28 after it had unified the country in the Northern Expedition against the warlords. The Japanese militarists, however, had different plans. For us, the conflict which was to become World War II and the Pacific War began at Mukden in September 1931. Americans were not yet fighting Japanese militarism, but under the Stimson Doctrine they did refuse to recognize the fruits of Japan's aggression. From 1931 to 1941 we fought single-handedly against one of the mightiest war machines of that time, without allies and with little material aid from abroad. Only after Pearl Harbor, did we begin to receive some aid. And then it was a case of too little, if not too late. It was always Europe First despite the fact that the U.S. entered the war via the Pacific. During those long and difficult years, we had more than once been approached by the enemy to agree to a settlement on terms not altogether unfavorable to us. But we rejected all offers because we were fighting for a principle—international justice. It is a principle on which we could not compromise. Besides, how could we even think of betraying the United States, who had by then become our allies?

China and America stood together during World War II. The United States had the additional complication of fronts in North Africa, Sicily, Italy, Eastern Europe and Soviet Russia. China had the further problem of the Chinese Communists who had already begun their rebellious activities against the lawful Chinese government.

There was misunderstanding in the United States of much that was happening in China between 1945 and 1949. The Marshall Mission came and went. From a gallant ally, for whom no praise was excessive, we were suddenly portrayed as a corrupt reactionary regime. This hurt the Republic of China. Soviet troops which entered Manchuria in their short war against Japan turned seized arms to the Chinese Communists. This tipped the

balance in our civil war in favor of the Chinese Communists. In the end, we had to evacuate from the mainland to set up our Government on the island of Taiwan. The U.S. Department of State issued a White Paper on China and then sat back to wait for the dust to settle. Everybody thought we were done for. But somehow we managed not only to survive but also to gather strength again.

The Korean War which broke out in June, 1950, brought things back into perspective again. Later in the year Chinese Communists came crashing across the Yalu. Two questions need to be asked about the Korean War. If the government of the Republic of China had been on the mainland, would the United Nations Command have been denied victory and Korea denied of unification as a free and democratic country? And if the government of the Republic of China had been in control of the mainland, would there have been any Korean War at all? I think you know the answers. A third question may be worth thinking about. If we the free Chinese had controlled the mainland, would there have been a war in Vietnam?

I have had a great deal to say about Sino-American friendship and cooperation because this is going to be crucial in Asian developments in the next few years. The Chinese Communists are now engaged in a campaign of smiling diplomacy toward your country. Visits by the American table tennis team in April and by a number of American correspondents in subsequent months are only two of Peiping's opening gambits. There will be many others to follow. Mr. Henry Kissinger has just left in his second trip to Peiping to arrange for President Nixon's visit scheduled for sometime before next May to meet Chinese Communist leaders.

Now what is the Peiping regime? It is a cruel regime, which seized the mainland by violence at the end of our long-drawn-out war with Japan. Since then it has imposed on our people the most tyrannical rule known in Chinese history. Specially I wish to draw your attention to a recent publication of the Senate Internal Security Sub-Committee. It is entitled: "The Human Cost of Communism in China." It was prepared at the request of the late Senator Thomas Dodd and produced under the direction of Senator James Eastland. According to this scholarly study by Professor Richard Walker of the University of South Carolina, between 34 and 64 million Chinese have lost their lives since the Communists took over the Chinese mainland. Just think of it!

Externally the Communist regime is aggressive and interventionist. It openly espouses force as an instrument of policy. It believes that political power comes out of the barrel of a gun. During the past 20 years, the Peiping regime has been carrying on a continuous campaign to stir up revolutions and extend Maoist brand of communism in various parts of the world. The Asian nations which have felt the bloody forces of Chinese Communist aggression since 1950 constitute almost a roll-call of the whole continent. Korea, India, Burma, Laos, Cambodia, Vietnam, Thailand, Malaysia, Indonesia and the Philippines have all felt the heavy hand of the Chinese Communists.

The Peiping regime, it should be remembered, was branded by the United Nations as an aggressor for its bloody intervention in the Korean war in 1950 and was also found guilty of committing genocide in Tibet in 1963. Both resolutions are still outstanding and have never been rescinded.

And yet, believe it or not, this is the regime which is being considered this very week for membership or representation in the United Nations. Some member nations are even prepared to admit the Peiping regime into the world organization and to expel the Republic of China from it at the same time.

The government of the Republic of China,

I must emphasize, is the lawful government of the country. Its juridical basis is the Constitution of 1946 which was adopted by the National Congress with the participation of freely-elected delegates representing all the provinces and people in all walks of life. The legal status of our government has not changed since then. It continues to function on Chinese territory. There has been no break in the continuity of its leadership and policies. As an entity we may be smaller in size today but so have become many other countries since the end of World War II. Our government, therefore, represents not only the 14 million in Taiwan, the 18 million Chinese living overseas, but also the 750 million enslaved and silenced on the Chinese mainland.

The Republic of China was one of the principal allies which signed the Declaration of the United Nations in 1942. Subsequently we played an important part in drafting the United Nations Charter at Dumbarton Oaks in 1944. We were one of the four Powers which sponsored the San Francisco Conference in 1945. We were specifically mentioned in the U.N. Charter as a permanent member on the Security Council.

The Communist regime, on the other hand, represents a complete break with China's past. In philosophy and traditions, in social concepts and moral values, in institutions and policies, it has nothing in common whatsoever with the Republic of China. It even calls itself the Chinese People's Republic, thus divorcing itself from China's body politic altogether.

If the Peiping regime should be admitted and given our seat on the Security Council, the question will not merely be one of whether the Republic of China is going to stay but becomes one of whether the United Nations can survive once it has compromised on some of the basic principles and purposes on which and for which it was founded 26 years ago. After all the League of Nations came to its dismal end after it yielded on principles.

For many years one of the basic assumptions of American foreign policy in Asia has been that, since China occupies the central position in East Asia and has an enormous population, whatever happens in China will vitally affect her peripheral countries and ultimately the peace and security of the world. It is, therefore, in the interest of the United States to help bring about "a united, stable, strong and democratic China". But the kind of "China" contemplated can not possibly be the rebel regime now usurping political power on the Chinese mainland.

According to the Webster dictionary, a state is any body of people occupying a definite territory and politically organized under one government. The first two attributes, people and territory, remain the same on the Chinese mainland, but the governing machinery there is in the hands of the Communists. We believe the Communist government will not be there indefinitely. In Chinese history, a despotic regime never lasted very long.

Nowadays, people in the Western world tend to give the Chinese Communist regime an importance far exceeding its capabilities and material and technological resources. Even in such human factors as leadership, discipline, cohesion, authority, skill and technical know-how, its assets are grossly exaggerated. The enormous population under its yoke has been equated with power, while it should be put on the debit side of its ledger. Despite the nuclear arsenal in its possession, the regime is but a small military power—a power formidable enough to play havoc among its neighbors, but certainly not strong enough to challenge any major power, especially the United States which is thousands of miles away. Besides, it has learned a bitter lesson in Korea.

Furthermore, the regime does not have sustained stability. Recent strange goings-on in Peiping showed that the power struggle, unleashed at the time of the Cultural Revolu-

tion, is still going on unabated. Particularly significant is the rise of a Communist military dictatorship. This explains the slowness in re-establishing the party machinery destroyed during recent chaos. It also accounts for the fact why it has not been able as yet to call a "people's congress" to "elect" someone to replace Lu Shao-chi as "head of state." Liu was purged many years ago for "having taken the capitalist road," and has been placed under house arrest ever since. Current speculation was that he was killed in the Chinese Communist jet which crashed in Outer Mongolia on September 12, while fleeing to Soviet Russia.

Actually, therefore the Chinese mainland is still in a state of flux. Lin Biao, Mao's hand-picked heir apparent, is either gravely ill or already dead. Since the Cultural Revolution the central hierarchy in Peiping has been compelled to relinquish more and more to the local military officers its control over various administrative areas and military districts. The more distance these areas are located from Peiping, the more independent their military commanders have become. It is not difficult to foresee what is apt to happen the moment Mao himself should die. Youths on the mainland, especially those who took part in the Cultural Revolution as Red Guards have become disenchanted with the regime. Thousands upon thousands of them have been exiled to the border areas to work as farm hands. They are only waiting for some thing to happen.

The present tendency of American policy towards accommodation with the Chinese Communist regime has foreshadowed phenomenal developments, which will have injurious effects on relations between our two countries. It will also hurt the national interests of the United States.

Under the Sino-American mutual defense pact of 1954, we have been playing our role in the maintenance of peace in the Western Pacific. We have 600,000 men under arms and a first-line reserve of over a million men all trained and ready for mobilization at a moment's notice. The Republic of China is a known quantity—tried, tested and found true. Our armed forces are the third largest in East Asia and waiting to support the United States or its free neighbors in case of need. Should our region reach the point of having a meaningful regional system of collective security, I am confident that my government would be among the first ones prepared to make military contributions to the common cause. On the other hand, any weakening in our defense capability will necessarily mean weakening of the U.S. position in the Western Pacific.

Meanwhile, the possible effects on the free nations in Asia as a result of any U.S. overtures to appease the Chinese Communists also merit careful consideration. Asian leaders who cherish freedom are painfully aware of the threat of the Peiping regime as revealed in its overt and covert activities in providing arms, training, and operational guidance to dissident elements in many of the underdeveloped regions in Asia. Its support to the "Free Thai" movement, the White Flag faction of the Burmese Communists, the "New People's Army" in the Philippines, the Communist insurgents in the Malaysian jungles, and the Naga and Mizo rebels in India are but some of the glaring examples. Leaders in all these countries are apprehensive of the militancy of the Chinese Communists. They, too, are equally concerned with the switch in U.S. policy vis-a-vis the Chinese Communist regime. People in most free Asian nations, including Japan, are asking: If the United States could treat in this way the Republic of China, their closest ally and friend in East Asia what could they expect from the United States?

In its own assessment and analysis, the United States must dig deep beneath the

Chinese surface to get at the bedrock which separates the Republic of China from the Chinese Communists. The brief history we have examined shows the steadfastness with which free China has stood by its alliance and partnership with the United States. But the Republic of China is not merely being loyal to old friends. In the whole 60-year record of the Republic's existence, there is not one aggressive page. Our history is of peace intention. Contrast that record with the words and actions of the Chinese Communists and draw your own conclusions.

I firmly believe that in the long run this great country of yours and the Republic of China have much to gain by maintaining their existing bonds of friendship and close cooperation for peace and security in East Asia and that any alteration to this relationship for reasons of temporary expediency at the expense of principles or in the hope of winning some intangible gains in the future, will surely result in disappointment and an irredeemable loss to the cause of freedom in that part of the world.

My friends, I want to tell you from the bottom of my heart that appeasement of the Chinese Communists on grounds of realism or other rationalization would be one of the gravest mistakes in contemporary history. The consequences would be tragic for the whole free world.

**CAMPBELL, OHIO, ATHLETIC CLUB
BASEBALL TEAM CHAMPS OF
NATIONAL AMATEUR BASEBALL
FEDERATION JUNIOR TOURNAMENT**

HON. CHARLES J. CARNEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 19, 1971

Mr. CARNEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate the Campbell Athletic Club baseball team of Campbell, Ohio on winning the 1971 National Amateur Baseball Federation Junior Tournament.

The Campbell A.C. baseball team is the oldest team in the Youngstown class "B" League. Through natural ability, hard work and dedication, the Campbell A.C. baseball team dominated their league this summer en route to the national title. Their splendid victory in the NABF junior tournament gave the Youngstown area its first championship in this amateur baseball classic.

As a man who was born and raised in Campbell, Ohio, I salute the players, coaches, and managers of the Campbell A.C. baseball team for their outstanding achievement.

The players, coach, and managers of the Campbell Athletic Club championship team are: Business manager, Vlad Tikson; coach, Al Frasco; manager, Steve Krivonak; members are: Rick Beck, George Cappuzzello, Charles Carnahan, Ralph DePizzo, Chip Hanuschak, Albert Johnson, John Linden, Ken Linden, Joe Malys, Jeff Marconi, David Mootz, Mike Morris, Tommy Morris—bat boy, Louis Packer, Alan Rogers, Mike Szenborn, Jan Terlecky, Gary Tondy, Chris White, and Mike Zaluski—most valuable player winner.

I also salute Campbell baseball fans who faithfully supported the team and cheered it on to victory. On November 6,

1971, Campbell fans will give a banquet in honor of their team's achievement. The banquet chairman is Anthony Vivo, and Vlad Tikson is ticket chairman. The members of the banquet committee are: Frank Mills, Rummy DePaul, Don Gardner, Ed Finamore, Pete Keish, Frank Le-seganich, Bill Shabella, Nurmi Caggiano, Les Donnell, Tom Cernoch, George Kovach, Ben Bassetti, Bob Anderson, Mike Modak, Nick Mamrich, Sam DePizzo, John Knapick, Mayor Rocco Mico of Campbell, Mayor Tom Creed of Struthers, Walter Zaluski, Michael Kornick, John Skelly, Joseph Gennaro, and Nick Johnson.

**E. A. "AL" BROWN—PIONEER IN JOB
APPRENTICESHIP TRAINING**

HON. DON H. CLAUSEN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 19, 1971

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate this opportunity today to acquaint my colleagues in the House with a living tribute to one of the most unique and dedicated Americans that it has ever been my privilege and honor to know.

Recently a young, dynamic, and creative writer, Sherri Graves of the Santa Rosa, Calif. Press-Democrat, wrote a feature story about my good friend, E. A. "Al" Brown, director of the Northern California Carpenters Joint Apprenticeship and Training Committee.

Under Al Brown's extraordinary leadership, the Northern California Carpenters Joint Apprenticeship and Training Committee, comprising 41 northern California counties, has grown into one of the largest craft training programs in the Nation. The committee provides formal and on-the-job training in carpenter apprentice skills and is presently striving to expand their program to accommodate 5,000 additional carpenter trainees.

One of the basic philosophies that binds Al Brown and Don CLAUSEN together, in striving to enhance job opportunities for young people today, is our mutual dedication to vocational education, skill training, and apprenticeship programs which prepare young people for meaningful employment, a richer life, and the opportunity to develop a sense of pride and purpose—as they become better prepared to meet the challenges of change in the decade of the 1970's.

In addition to gearing this remarkable carpenter apprenticeship training program to young people, Al Brown has also found time to get heavily involved in community, as well as national and international affairs. In this regard, Al Brown has been very active and personally involved in helping to provide low- and middle-income family housing for people in and around Santa Rosa. His personal commitment to the completion of the Valley Oak housing project will stand as a living monument to this great American who has devoted his life to helping others help themselves to a better life.

I am inserting in the RECORD at this point the feature story written by Sherri Graves to this great man, E. A. "Al" Brown—a trusted friend and adviser:

**"WE MUST SEE TO IT THAT OUR YOUNG PEOPLE
ARE PREPARED FOR EMPLOYMENT . . . AND LIFE"**

(By Sheri Graves)

"I don't think we can do anything more constructive in our society than to see to it that our young people are better prepared than we were," says E. A. (Al) Brown.

"So, I've spent a lot of time engaged in various activities and serving on various committees concerned with the education of youth, trying to afford them the options. I don't go along with the idea that we (adults) are always right and always know best.

"But, young people need to know the options available to them, and they need to be educated to the point where they will be effective in whatever they choose to do. We might not always like what they choose to do, but to be really constructive, we must give them a chance.

"Maybe what they will want to do is change things," he says. "That's not bad. I happen to be an advocate of change. A long time ago I came to the realization that people who talk about progress and never talk about change will never see progress. There can be no progress without change.

"Young people know this. So, it is up to us to see to it that they have the education necessary to choose the best options and to be most effective in making the best changes for the benefit of all society."

The "education" of which Al Brown speaks is not necessarily the type that "comes off the academic assembly line called formal education."

And, the "change" to which he refers is not likely to reflect "the concept that the status quo should be either preserved, perpetuated, or defended."

Which makes him somewhat of a "revolutionary," he says. But, he points out, "Bringing about constructive change isn't easy. It's a very difficult task. There are so many things we have now that once were considered revolutionary . . . Social Security, for example."

One of the changes he advocates concerns the formal educational system, which he has been known to call "absurd snobbery."

The reason for this attitude may or may not be that, by necessity rather than choice, Al Brown's formal education ended when he completed sixth grade. The fact is that he considered education so important that he "read the Bible and the dictionary" and developed what even a college graduate would have to call an extensive vocabulary and a good command of the English language.

He inherited his mother's admiration for Woodrow Wilson and emulated him while trying to "educate myself as much as possible." Today, he says, "I consider myself to be a well-educated man."

And he detests the use of the term "drop-out" as applied to young people who quit school. He also objects to the term "higher education" because of its implication that any other type of education is "low."

"These terms are a form of snobbery," he says, "and I object to this kind of rejection. Young people leave the formal educational system for a variety of valid reasons, and it is an insult to call them 'drop-outs.'"

"One reason young people reject the 'system' is that it does not prepare them for whatever it is they want to do with their lives. Not everybody wants to be a doctor or a lawyer, but society has a definite idea of what success is, and that's it.

"The problem is that the high school (or college) graduates enter a world of surplus. We now have a surplus of teachers, so they can't become teachers any more. We have a surplus of almost everything, especially at the top.

"Our educational system," he says, "is basically a pyramid with a peak composed of a handful of Ph. D.'s. And, they can't get jobs. Engineers and scientists are on the relief rolls, and this is a crisis situation in some cities!

"Special education for the development of special talents does not guarantee a job. But, these young people coming out of high school (and college) have to get a job doing something. The schools are going to have to start preparing young people for employment."

CARPENTER

And, here's where we get to the heart of the matter. For, Al Brown is known best for his 30-plus years of distinguished service in various capacities in his union, the Brotherhood of Carpenters. He's also a certified horse-shoer, author, film director and actor, but that's another story.

His position since June, 1963, has been as director of the Northern California Carpenters Joint Apprenticeship and Training Committee.

He became a carpenter in 1926, reluctantly following in the footsteps of his father, who also was a carpenter. In 1938 he was elected as secretary of the Redwood District Council of Carpenters (Sonoma, Napa and Mendocino counties) and since has been either elected or appointed to so many different positions that it would be difficult to list them. They include, however being president of Carpenters Local 981, the local Local.

He has seen organized labor from the outside looking in, from the inside looking out, and from the middle of the two. And, he has become a campaigner for major overhaul of the formal educational system in order to provide vocational training.

"I got a call the other day from a boy who wanted to quit high school," he says. "Notice I don't say he wanted to 'drop out,' I said he wanted to 'quit.' He wanted to know the qualifications of carpentry. So, I said, 'First, let's talk about math.' I didn't say 'higher mathematics,' I said 'math.'"

HIGHER MATHEMATICS

"Now, you don't have to finish high school or go to college to learn the math necessary to be a carpenter. High school and college counsellors don't tell the whole truth because they tell young people they need to learn 'higher mathematics.' Now, that's an absurd term in the first place. There is nothing 'higher' about it.

"So, I talked with the boy and he said he definitely wanted to quit high school. He had his reasons and I won't go into them now. The point is that I told him there are night courses he could take to learn the math he needed to know in order to be a carpenter. We even give a class in carpentry," he says.

In the last several years, Al Brown reflects, there have been some dramatic changes of attitude within the educational system. Teachers and other educators, he says, are "coming to the realization that academic emphasis is not getting the job done. Vocational education is needed and it is needed now."

Although he uses carpentry as an example of one of the trades for which young people could be trained, he points out that there are many fields which an interested youth may enter in order to find employment. And employment itself is a problem.

UNEMPLOYMENT

"We have reached a stage in our over-all socio-economic situation where we have to live with at least six per cent unemployment," he says.

According to an article in this month's North Bay Labor Journal, more than one billion man-days were lost last year due to the unemployment of an average of more than four-million workers.

"We have created a situation," says Al

Brown, "that can meet all of our needs without employing all of our people."

Therefore, he offers, more jobs will have to be created. And, these jobs will not be "at the top." There already is a surplus of manpower for the jobs "at the top." The new jobs will be for Joe Average who, probably, does not have even a high school education from "the academic assembly line."

Al Brown's philosophy has carried his interests into many fields. It has been said that "he can't be pigeonholed" in either interests or activities.

TESTIMONIAL DINNER

For this reason, and as a tribute to his many years of dedicated service to organized labor, a testimonial dinner in his honor has been planned for Oct. 8 at the Flamingo Hotel. The event will be co-sponsored by the Sonoma County Central Labor Council and the Sonoma-Mendocino-Lake Counties Building Trades Council.

No-host cocktails from 6:30 until 7:30 p.m. will precede the dinner. Ticket information is available by calling 762-7338 or 542-1107. Thursday is the deadline for reservations.

A "This Is Your Life" theme will prevail. It will be mentioned that Al Brown has performed a myriad of community services. Among them was the eight years he served on the board of directors of Santa Rosa Boys Club, Inc., and the one year he served as president of the board.

Then, there was his campaign to save the Church-of-One-Tree and have it moved to its present location. There was his membership on the San Quentin Prison Trade Advisory Committee an appointment made by Governors Earl Warren, Goodwin Knight and Edmund Brown.

He will be honored for many reasons, the most important of which probably is his philosophy. Al Brown once wrote, "Life is a do-it-yourself project." He's a living example of that point of view, yet he is considered a leader.

But, when it comes to leadership, he quotes Eugene Debs: "I would not lead you if I could, for if I could lead you, I could as well mislead you."

And, he says, "I have to live with myself. I'm the only one I HAVE to live with. I have to be able to look at myself in the mirror each morning and not be ashamed of what I see."

OUTPATIENT PRESCRIPTION DRUG COVERAGE UNDER MEDICARE

HON. DAVID R. OBEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 19, 1971

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, as of today 113 Members are cosponsoring my bill to provide outpatient prescription drug coverage under medicare.

The features of this bill, which would establish a comprehensive drug insurance program for the 20 million Americans covered by medicare, include:

First, coverage of prescription drugs and certain nonprescription drugs of special life-sustaining value;

Second, financing under the part A—payroll tax—portion of medicare, rather than part B—supplementary medical insurance—so that beneficiaries would not have to pay monthly premiums, keep records or file claims;

Third, selection by a formulary committee of the drugs to be covered;

Fourth, \$1 copayment by the purchaser for each prescription.

In the other body, Senator MONTAÑO introduced equivalent legislation in February and now has reintroduced it—with 23 cosponsors—as an amendment to H.R. 1.

Mr. Speaker, the growing support for this proposal inside the Congress is matched by growing support outside it.

The American Association of Retired Persons, in the October-November issue of its magazine, Modern Maturity, lists its position on each topic scheduled for discussion at the 1971 White House Conference on Aging. As to health, the association supports enactment of a national health plan, and until it is enacted urges the Congress "to assure that all persons become eligible for medicare upon attaining age 65."

The association further supports "the inclusion of prescription drug costs in medicare."

HOUSE SUBCOMMITTEE REPORTS EFFECTIVE CANCER ATTACK ACT OF 1971

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 19, 1971

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I was privileged to introduce on behalf of myself, Mr. SATTERFIELD, Mr. KYROS, Mr. PREYER, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. ROY, Mr. NELSEN, Mr. CARTER, and Mr. HASTINGS, the Cancer Attack Act of 1971. This bill was unanimously reported to the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee by the Subcommittee on Public Health and Environment on October 14, 1971. It represents the efforts of a subcommittee which held 4 weeks of hearings on the various proposals to stimulate this country's fight against cancer. I believe that it is a bill that each Member of this body can and should support.

Mr. Speaker, as you know, the other body has passed a bill, S. 1823, which has received attention in some newspapers lately through full page advertisements. These advertisements did not even indicate that the House was busy hearing from 51 witnesses on the cancer issue or that legislation other than the Senate version was being considered.

I believe that the Members of this body should have an opportunity to know of the subcommittee's bill, its provisions, and the reasons for its differences with the Senate version. For this reason, I am submitting an editorial and a letter to the editor from Dr. John A. D. Cooper, president of the Association of American Medical Colleges, both of which appeared in today's Washington Post. I include these articles, as well as the text of the bill in the RECORD at this point:

THE CONQUEST OF CANCER

The fight over the proposal to establish a new Conquest of Cancer Institute is building toward a climatic finish. A House subcommittee last Friday voted down the proposal backed by the White House for creating such an independent agency, substituting in its place a bill strengthening the position of the existing cancer institute inside the structure of the National Institutes of Health. Since the Senate had previously

passed the White House plan by an overwhelming majority and since the White House shows no signs of backing down, the way seems clear for a fight on the House floor or in a conference committee or both.

There have been few other legislative proposals in recent years that have divided the nation's medical community so sharply. In our letters column today, the President of the Association of Medical Colleges challenges some of the points raised earlier this month by a letter from the President of the American Cancer Society. We might let the exchange go at that except for the full page advertisement in this newspaper last week in which it was asserted that objections to the bill come mainly from those "who do not have expert cancer knowledge" and "do not fully understand the situation." The implication of the ad, like the implication of similar ads that have appeared elsewhere is that the only way to conquer cancer is to establish a new institute with that as its goal and that only those who want the new institute are ready to support an all-out attack on cancer.

If the situation were really as simple as the authors of this advertisement make it seem, there would be no dispute over the White House proposal. There is no opposition that we know of to increased federal funding for cancer research nor to a federal commitment aimed at providing whatever funds are necessary to find a cure for cancer. But it does not follow that the creation of a new, free-wheeling agency which reports only to the President is either the only or the best way to channel those funds. And that is what the fight is all about.

It is true that many of those researchers who focus solely on cancer favor the establishment of a new agency. That is hardly surprising. Any group of researchers on any subject would love to have an agency devoted exclusively to their field. If there is to be a special institute for cancer, why not one for heart diseases? They kill twice as many people. Or for arthritis, from which far more people suffer.

Part of the need for a new agency, if we are to believe the advertisement, is that it would be "an advance in the mechanics of administration" which would free cancer researchers from the "red tape which now slows the cancer fight." That statement, plus the assertion that it "would be futile just to pour more money into the existing system," is a charge of gross mismanagement against the National Institutes of Health and the Department of Health, Education and Welfare. It is a charge that we think has not been and cannot be proved. Indeed, if the situation is that bad, it seems strange that the panel of experts which first recommended the new agency never saw fit to discuss the problems of research management with any of the top officials of either HEW or NIH.

Inherent in the drive for a new cancer agency is the promise that a cure can be found if only enough money is devoted to the search and administered in a particular way. This is a promise which the supporters of the new agency are careful to hedge, knowing as they do that the cure or cures may still be years or decades away. Yet it is that appeal which has given the drive for a new agency its popularity, a popularity underlined by the heavy mail to members of Congress which resulted when columnist Ann Landers took up the cudgels for the agency some months ago. Nevertheless, President Nixon was right when he said last winter that "scientific breakthroughs are still required and they often cannot be forced—no matter how much money and energy is expended." It is worth noting in passing that many of the basic discoveries which have helped doctors to understand cancer better did not originate in the context of cancer research.

We hope that as the House subcommittee will be sustained in its judgment on this emotion-laden subject when the matter reaches the floor and that the Senate can be persuaded to follow the recommendations of those who oppose stripping cancer studies out of the existing framework of biomedical research.

HEAD OF MEDICAL COLLEGES ASSOCIATION ON THE CANCER AGENCY

In the Washington Post of October 6, there appeared a letter from H. Marvin Pollard, president of the American Cancer Society, Inc., entitled "A New Opportunity to Fight Cancer." Dr. Pollard states that the recent House hearings in Washington on legislation aimed at expanding the national attack on cancer makes it pertinent for the public to have a clear understanding of both the facts and the issues surrounding the proposal contained in the bill S. 1828 to establish an independent Conquest of Cancer Agency within the National Institutes of Health, which has been passed by the Senate but now rejected by Congressman Paul Rogers and his Subcommittee on Public Health and Environment.

Unfortunately, Dr. Pollard's letter will add only to public confusion and misunderstanding concerning the legislation now being considered by the Congress and the most effective way to confront this dread disease.

Dr. Pollard states that S. 1828 is supported by the majority of doctors who are cancer specialists and opposition comes only from scientists who are not experts in cancer and thus do not fully understand the situation.

Many distinguished investigators in the field of cancer, most of whom are also concerned with the care of patients, have appeared before the House committee in opposition to this bill. Among them are Dr. Howard H. Hiatt, Head of the Cancer Division, Department of Medicine, Beth Israel Hospital, Boston; Dr. Robert Handschumacher, American Cancer Society Professor of Pharmacology, Yale University; Dr. George Nichols Jr., Director, Cancer Research Institute, New England Deaconess Hospital, Boston; and Dr. Henry Kaplan, Chairman of the Department of Radiology, Stanford University, and a member of the Panel of Consultants. The major advances in cancer have come from scientific fields which have not been the center of the applied cancer research effort. The views of "scientists" can carry at least as much weight in this matter as those of "doctors."

It is stated that S. 1828 is based upon exhaustive study by a panel of experts who would have liked to support the "status quo" but reluctantly came to the conclusion that an independent cancer authority is necessary because the facts so dictate.

In the report of the Scientific Committee of the panel referred to by Dr. Pollard (a report that comprises 140 pages of the 149 page report of the overall panel), which exhaustively examines and assesses the problems, obstacles, and opportunities relating to further progress in cancer research, there is no mention of the need for an independent cancer authority or of any organizational problems. It is quite clear from the assessment of this scientific group that the major barriers to progress in cancer are scientific and not organizational. The report of the panel provides no evidence or findings to support the sweeping organizational changes recommended.

Dr. Pollard states that "... all that S. 1828 boils down to is an advance in mechanics of administration. The essential intellectual and scientific relationships would remain the same . . ."

S. 1828 would give to the Director of the Conquest of Cancer Agency extraordinary power and authorities which would be unavailable to the Director of the NIH for all other disease and biomedical research pro-

grams in the NIH. Thus, the cancer effort would be separated out of the other research activities in the NIH and the contributions they can make to advancing our knowledge about neoplasia.

Creation of an independent cancer program would force into the over-burdened Office of Management and Budget and the Executive Office of the President decisions which neither is capable of carrying out.

Dr. Pollard notes that the creation of a national cancer agency will not fragment NIH but rather strengthen it and that the American Cancer Society was one of the original supporters of the National Cancer Institute and obviously would not "embrace any proposal that would harm what we helped to create."

Dr. Pollard testified before the Senate committee in support of a bill that would abolish the National Cancer Institute.

No one who has appeared before the committees in the House and Senate has urged any delay or diminishment in the attack upon cancer. As stated by Congressman Rogers, there is a need for a most careful and deliberate examination of a proposal which holds within it the potentiality of destroying the one institution, the NIH, that has made so much of the scientific progress underlying a greater medical capability in cancer possible.

Dr. Pollard holds that S. 1828 will not financially harm the budgets of the other NIH Institutes, citing the fact that the Congress appropriated \$142 million more than the President requested for FY 1972 for NIH research institutes, other than the National Cancer Institute, as evidence.

The President's request for 1972, while supporting a \$100 million special appropriation for new cancer initiatives, drastically cut the support for other institute programs. Thus, the much-publicized increase of \$100 million for cancer research in the President's budget was obtained from programs upon which further progress in cancer is dependent.

True, the Congress appropriated, as Dr. Pollard has noted, some \$142 million more for the NIH programs other than the National Cancer Institute. Unfortunately, the American Cancer Society had little to do with this reversal of the President's budget. Dr. Pollard, in testifying before the HEW appropriations subcommittee in the House, urged only a further increase of \$65 million in the cancer budget, ignoring the serious cutbacks in the other NIH research programs. The American Cancer Society, although invited, did not join the Coalition for Health Funding, whose activities were principally responsible for the increase in research funding.

Dr. Pollard suggests that if S. 1828 is not passed, the "status quo" in respect to cancer research will be retained, and implies that such action will contribute in some way or another to the death of 300,000 persons in this nation from cancer.

Such an implication is untrue. There is before the Congress an alternative, approved last week by the subcommittee. This bill will provide the means for mounting a broadly coordinated assault upon cancer using the full scientific resources of the NIH as well as the National Cancer Institute. It provides for the high level of leadership and the administrative authorities to undertake this urgent cancer effort. Rather than sowing the seeds of division and destruction, this approach will strengthen the entire structure of the NIH so that this nation can continue to be the beneficiary, not only in cancer but also in the other major disease areas, of the vigorous biomedical research programs which this institution has brought into being and so well advanced.

The nation's academic medical centers find it unfortunate that essentially subordinate administrative problems have been

utilized to obscure the fundamental scientific and policy issues. These centers, which carry out a major part of the basic and applied research in cancer and substantial part of the treatment of cancer patients have carefully examined the bills in Congress. They enthusiastically support the Rogers bill as the most effective instrument to mount the attack against this dread disease.

JOHN A. D. COOPER, M.D.,
President, Association of American Medical Colleges,
WASHINGTON.

H.R. 10681

SHORT TITLE

SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as "The National Cancer Attack Act of 1971".

FINDINGS AND DECLARATION OF PURPOSE

SEC. 2. (a) The Congress finds and declares—

(1) that cancer is the disease most feared by Americans today;

(2) that new scientific leads, if comprehensively and energetically exploited, may significantly advance the time when more adequate preventive and therapeutic capabilities are available to cope with cancer;

(3) that cancer, heart, and lung diseases and stroke are the leading causes of death in the United States;

(4) that the present state of our understanding of cancer, heart, and lung diseases and stroke is a consequence of broad advances across the full scope of the biomedical sciences;

(5) that in order to provide for the most effective attack on cancer it is important to use all of the biomedical resources of the National Institutes of Health, rather than the resources of a single Institute; and

(6) that the programs of the research institutes which comprise the National Institutes of Health have made it possible to bring into being the most productive scientific community centered upon health and disease that the world has ever known.

(b) It is the purpose of this Act to enlarge the authorities of the National Cancer Institute and the National Institutes of Health in order to advance the national attack upon cancer.

NATIONAL CANCER ATTACK PROGRAM

SEC. 3. (a) Part A of title IV of the Public Health Service Act is amended by adding after section 406 the following new sections:

"NATIONAL CANCER ATTACK PROGRAM

"Sec. 407. (a) In his capacity as an Associate Director of the National Institutes of Health, the Director of the National Cancer Institute shall coordinate all of the activities of the National Institutes of Health relating to cancer with the National Cancer Attack Program.

"(b) In carrying out the National Cancer Attack Program, the Director of the National Cancer Institute shall:

"(1) With the advice of the National Cancer Advisory Council, plan and develop an expanded, intensified, and coordinated cancer research program encompassing the programs of the National Cancer Institute, related programs of the other research institutes, and other Federal and non-Federal programs.

"(2) Expediently utilize existing research facilities and personnel of the National Institutes of Health for accelerated exploration of the opportunities for the conquest of cancer in areas of special promise.

"(3) Encourage and coordinate cancer research by industrial concerns where such concerns evidence a particular capability for such research.

"(4) Collect, analyze, and disseminate all data useful in the prevention, diagnosis, and

treatment of cancer, including the establishment of an international cancer research data bank to collect, catalog, store, and disseminate insofar as feasible the results of cancer research undertaken in any country for the use of any person involved in cancer research in any country.

"(5) Establish or support the large-scale production or distribution of specialized biological materials and other therapeutic substances for research and set standards of safety and care for persons using such materials.

"(6) Support research in the cancer field outside the United States by highly qualified foreign nationals (where the Director determines that such support can reasonably be expected to inure to the benefit of the American people); support collaborative research involving American and foreign participants; and support the training of American scientists abroad and foreign scientists in the United States.

"(7) Support appropriate manpower programs of training in fundamental sciences and clinical disciplines to provide an expanded and continuing manpower base from which to select investigators, physicians, and allied health professional personnel for participation in clinical and basic research and treatment programs relating to cancer, including where appropriate the use of training stipends, fellowships, and careers awards.

"(8) Call special meetings of the National Cancer Advisory Council at such times and in such places as the Director deems necessary in order to consult with, obtain advice from, or to secure the approval of projects, programs, or other actions to be undertaken without delay in order to gain maximum benefit from a new scientific or technical finding.

"(9) (A) Prepare and submit, directly to the President for review and transmittal to Congress, an annual budget estimate for the National Cancer Attack Program, after opportunity for comment (but without change by the Secretary, the Director of the National Institutes of Health, and the National Cancer Advisory Council; and (B) receive from the President and the Office of Management and Budget directly all funds appropriated by Congress for obligation and expenditure by the National Cancer Institute.

"(c) The National Cancer Advisory Council shall meet at the call of the Director of the National Cancer Institute or of such Council's Chairman, but not less than four times in each calendar year.

"(d) (1) There is hereby established the President's Cancer Attack Panel which shall be composed of three persons appointed by the President, who by virtue of their training, experience, and background are exceptionally qualified to appraise the National Cancer Attack Program. At least two of the members of the Panel shall be distinguished scientists or physicians.

"(2) (A) Members shall be appointed for three-year terms, except that (i) in the case of two of the members first appointed, one shall be appointed for a term of one year and one shall be appointed for a term of two years, as designated by the President at the time of appointment, and (ii) any member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed shall be appointed only for the remainder of such term.

"(B) The President shall designate one of the members to serve as Chairman for a term of one year.

"(C) Members of the Panel shall each be entitled to receive the daily equivalent of the annual rate of basic pay in effect for grade GS-18 of the General Schedule for each day (including traveltime) during which they are engaged in the actual performance of duties vested in the Panel, and

shall be allowed travel expenses (including a per diem allowance) under section 5703(b) of title 5, United States Code.

"(3) The Panel shall meet at the call of the Chairman but not less often than twelve times a year.

"(4) The Panel shall monitor the development and execution of the National Cancer Attack Program under this section, and shall report directly to the President. Any delays or blockages in rapid execution of the program shall immediately be brought to the attention of the President. The Panel shall submit to the President annually an evaluation of the efficacy of the National Cancer Attack Program and suggestions for improvements, and shall submit such other reports as the President shall direct. At the request of the President, it shall submit for his consideration a list of names of persons for consideration for appointment as Director of the National Cancer Institute.

"NATIONAL CANCER RESEARCH AND DEMONSTRATION CENTERS

"Sec. 408. (a) The Director of the National Cancer Institute is authorized to provide for the establishment of fifteen new centers for clinical research, training, and demonstration of advanced diagnostic and treatment methods relating to cancer. Such centers may be supported under subsection (b) or under any other applicable provision of law.

"(b) The Director of the National Cancer Institute, under policies established by the Director of the National Institutes of Health and after consultation with the National Cancer Advisory Council, is authorized to enter into cooperative agreements with public or private nonprofit agencies or institutions to pay all or part of the cost of planning, establishing or strengthening, and providing basic operating support for existing or new centers (including, but not limited to, centers established under subsection (a)) for clinical research, training, and demonstration of advanced diagnostic and treatment methods relating to cancer. Federal payments under this subsection in support of such cooperative agreements may be used for (1) construction (notwithstanding any limitation under section 405), (2) staffing and other basic operating costs, including such patient care costs as are required for research, (3) training (including training for allied health professions personnel) and (4) demonstration purposes; but support under this subsection (other than support for construction) shall not exceed \$5,000,000 per year per center. Support of a center under this section may be for a period of not to exceed three years and may be extended by the Director of the National Cancer Institute for additional periods of not more than three years each, after review of the operations of such center by an appropriate scientific review group established by the Director of the National Cancer Institute.

"CANCER CONTROL PROGRAMS

"Sec. 409. (a) The Director of the National Cancer Institute shall establish programs as necessary for cooperation with State and other health agencies in the prevention, control, and eradication of cancer.

"(b) There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section \$20,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, \$30,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, and \$40,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974.

"AUTHORITY OF DIRECTOR

"Sec. 410. The Director of the National Cancer Institute (after consultation with the National Cancer Advisory Council), in carrying out his functions in administering the national cancer attack program and without regard to any other provision of this Act, is authorized—

"(1) if authorized by the National Cancer Advisory Council, to obtain the services of

not more than fifty experts or consultants who have scientific or professional qualifications, in accordance with the provisions of section 3109 of title 5, United States Code (but any such expert or consultant may be appointed for a period in excess of one year);

"(2) to the extent that the Director of the National Cancer Institute deems it necessary in order to recruit specially qualified scientific or other professional personnel without previous competitive service, to establish the entrance grade for such personnel at not to exceed two grades above the grade otherwise established for such personnel under the applicable provisions of title 5 of the United States Code;

"(3) to acquire, construct, improve, repair, operate, and maintain cancer centers, laboratories, research, and other necessary facilities and equipment, and related accommodations as may be necessary, and such other real or personal property (including patents) as the Director deems necessary; to acquire by lease or otherwise through the Administrator of General Services, buildings or parts of buildings in the District of Columbia or communities located adjacent to the District of Columbia for the use of the National Cancer Institute for a period not to exceed ten years without regard to the Act of March 3, 1877 (40 U.S.C. 34);

"(4) to appoint one or more advisory committees composed of such private citizens and officials of Federal, State, and local governments as he deems desirable to advise him with respect to his functions;

"(5) to utilize, with their consent, the services, equipment, personnel, information, and facilities of other Federal, State, or local public agencies, with or without reimbursement thereof;

"(6) to accept voluntary and uncompensated services;

"(7) to accept unconditional gifts, or donations of services, money, or property, real, personal, or mixed, tangible or intangible;

"(8) to enter into such contracts, leases, cooperative agreements, or other transactions, with regard to sections 3648 and 3709 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (31 U.S.C. 529, 41 U.S.C. 5), as may be necessary in the conduct of his functions, with any public agency, or with any person, firm, association, corporation, or educational institution; and

"(9) to take necessary action to insure that all channels for the dissemination and exchange of scientific knowledge and information are maintained between the National Cancer Institute and the other scientific, medical, and biomedical disciplines and organizations nationally and internationally.

"SEC. 410A. The Director of the National Cancer Institute shall, by regulation, provide for proper scientific review of all research grants and programs over which he has authority (1) by utilizing, to the maximum extent possible, appropriate peer review groups established within the National Institutes of Health and composed principally of non-Federal scientists and other experts in the scientific and disease fields, and (2) when appropriate, by establishing, with the approval of the National Cancer Advisory Council and the Director of the National Institutes of Health, other formal peer review groups as may be required.

"(b) The Director of the National Cancer Institute shall, as soon as practicable after the end of each calendar year, prepare in consultation with the National Cancer Advisory Council and submit to the President for transmittal to the Congress a report on the activities, progress, and accomplishments under the National Cancer Attack Program during the preceding calendar year and a plan for the program during the next five years.

"AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

"SEC. 410B. For the purpose of carrying out this part (other than section 409), there are authorized to be appropriated \$400,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972; \$500,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973; and \$600,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974."

(b) Section 301(d) of the Public Health Service Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "Provided further, That, under procedures approved by the Director of the National Institutes of Health, the Director of the National Cancer Institute may approve grants for research or training purposes—

"(1) in amounts not to exceed \$35,000 after appropriate review for scientific merit but without requirement of review and approval by the National Cancer Advisory Council, and

"(2) in amounts exceeding \$35,000 after appropriate review of scientific merit and recommendation for approval by such council."

REPORT TO CONGRESS

SEC. 4. (a) The President shall carry out a review of all administrative processes under which the National Cancer Attack Program, established under part A of title IV of the Public Health Service Act, will operate, including the processes of advisory council and peer group reviews, in order to assure the most expeditious accomplishment of the objectives of the program. Within one year of the date of enactment of this Act the President shall submit a report to Congress of the findings of such review and the actions taken to facilitate the conduct of the program, together with recommendations for any needed legislative changes.

(b) The President shall request of the Congress without delay such additional appropriations as are required to pursue immediately any development in the National Cancer Attack Program requiring prompt and expeditious support and for which regularly appropriated funds are not available.

PRESIDENTIAL APPOINTMENT OF INSTITUTES' DIRECTORS

SEC. 5. (a) Title IV of the Public Health Service Act is amended by adding after part F the following new part:

"PART G—ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

"DIRECTORS OF INSTITUTES

"SEC. 454. The Director of the National Institutes of Health and the Directors of the National Cancer Institute, the National Heart and Lung Institute, and the National Institute of Neurological Diseases and Stroke shall be appointed by the President. The Directors of the National Cancer Institute, the National Heart and Lung Institute, and the National Institute of Neurological Diseases and Stroke are designated as Associate Directors of the National Institutes of Health, and shall report directly to the Director of the National Institutes of Health."

(b) (1) Section 5314 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(58) Director, National Institutes of Health."

(2) Section 5315 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraphs:

"(95) Deputy Director, National Institutes of Health.

"(96) Deputy Director for Science, National Institutes of Health.

"(97) Associate Director, National Institutes of Health—Director, National Cancer Institute.

"(98) Associate Director, National Institutes of Health—Director, National Heart and Lung Institute.

"(99) Associate Director, National Institutes of Health—Director of National Institute of Neurological Diseases and Stroke."

EFFECTIVE DATE

SEC. 6. (a) This Act and the amendments made by this Act shall take effect sixty days after the date of enactment of this Act or on such prior date after the date of enactment of this Act as the President shall prescribe and publish in the Federal Register.

(b) The first sentence of section 454 of the Public Health Service Act (added by section 5(a) of this Act) shall apply only with respect to appointments made after the effective date of this Act.

Amend the title so as to read: "A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act so as to strengthen the National Cancer Institute and the National Institutes of Health in order to conquer cancer as soon as possible."

TRIBUTE TO DR. JAMES E. ALLEN, JR.

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 19, 1971

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I had the privilege of serving with Dr. James E. Allen, Jr., under Averell Harriman when the latter was Governor of New York, and I had enormous respect and affection for him and his wife. So I was shocked and grieved by news of the death of Dr. and Mrs. Allen in the crash of an airplane near the Grand Canyon on Sunday, October 16. I am certain that all of Jim's many friends and acquaintances share the admiration for him voiced today in a New York Times editorial praising his "steady and principled leadership" in the field of education. That editorial, entitled "Champion of Education," along with a report of other tributes to Dr. James E. Allen, both from today's New York Times, follow:

CHAMPION OF EDUCATION

James E. Allen Jr., who was killed with his wife in a plane crash last weekend, saw the fundamental issues of social justice with a clarity that sometimes made his more politically inclined colleagues in school administration slightly uneasy in his presence. Yet he was never self-righteous or arrogant. He understood why educational officials and politicians were often driven to choose the easier road; and he held the respect of even those whose course he vigorously opposed.

In four years as New York State Education Commissioner, Dr. Allen's policies often drew fire, but his personal integrity remained beyond question. His lack of interest in organizational detail—a temperamental rather than an intellectual flaw—did at times impair his success as an administrator, but most who worked with him considered this a modest enough price to pay for steady and principled leadership.

His appointment in 1969 as United States Commissioner of Education was at first regarded as an Administration signal of liberal intent, particularly in racial matters, but Dr. Allen's outlook proved incompatible with the prevailing political winds in Washington. Refusal to hide his distress over the invasion of Cambodia turned his dismissal into an altogether characteristic exit.

Professional appraisals may weigh his accomplishments in such grave issues as integration, school reform and decentralization.

But the true measure of James Allen may be more appropriately taken from a minor episode. A child wrote urging the Federal Government to spend money on schools rather than on war. One of Dr. Allen's subordinates suggested that the pupil be told to leave such matters to adults. Repudiating this advice, Dr. Allen wrote instead: "I share your concern, and I am sure the President does, too." James E. Allen thought it absurd to hold that the schools were none of a child's business.

GOVERNOR HONORS ALLEN, KILLED IN CRASH IN ARIZONA

ALBANY.—Governor Rockefeller led state officials today in mourning the death of Dr. James E. Allen Jr., who guided New York's education system for 14 years.

Dr. Allen, his wife and eight other persons perished Saturday in the crash of a sight-seeing plane on a desert plateau in northwestern Arizona during a storm. Dr. Allen had left the state in 1969 to become United States Education Commissioner, but was out of that post in little more than a year because of differences with Nixon Administration policy.

"His years as State Education Commissioner stand out as a beacon of forward-looking educational policy," Mr. Rockefeller said in a statement. "An entire generation of New Yorkers who attended school during his tenure is better educated because of it."

"As a responsible public official, as an eminent educator, and as a fine human being, Jim Allen has the lasting gratitude of those who worked with him or were influenced by him," the Governor said.

"As a forward-looking educator, Dr. Allen never turned from doing what he thought was right," Controller Arthur C. Levitt said. "People everywhere will mourn his loss."

Dr. Allen's former deputy and successor as State Education Commissioner, Ewald B. Nyquist said Dr. Allen "was one of those rare individuals who was able to project himself into the future. He was a leader in the fight for both quality and equality in educational opportunity."

After he left the Federal post, Dr. Allen became a visiting lecturer at Princeton University.

CLASHED WITH NIXON ON WAR

(By Michael Knight)

Dr. James Edward Allen Jr., who died Saturday in a plane crash in Arizona, served as Commissioner of Education under President Nixon for only 18 months.

It was an increasingly restive association, with Dr. Allen becoming more and more disillusioned and the Government becoming more and more embarrassed at his critical public statements.

Dr. Allen resigned under pressure, he said, in June, 1970, because of controversial statements he had made advocating school desegregation and deploring United States military activities in Southeast Asia.

Robert H. Finch, then Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare, said at the time that the President had been "generally disappointed" with Dr. Allen's performance.

Dr. Allen had criticized the American invasion of Cambodia in April, 1970, as "disastrous" to education and contended that it had shaken "the confidence of millions of concerned citizens in their Government."

ANGERED CONSERVATIVES

In his former post as New York State Commissioner of Education, Dr. Allen quickly gained a reputation as an urban-oriented innovator who could cut through educational red tape, often flying in the face of local political forces.

He frequently stirred conservatives to anger with his policies of concentrating efforts on deteriorating urban schools, advocat-

ing integration and liberalism on the issue of student rights.

After leaving his Government post, he accepted a position at Princeton University as visiting lecturer at the Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs, a position he held at the time of his death.

Dr. Allen had previously spurned an appointment as Commissioner of Education under President Kennedy, saying that the job was too vague.

Dr. Allen's public disagreement with the Nixon Administration's policies came as a surprise to many who knew him as a man of outspoken conviction but also as an expert politician who had come through many bitter controversies unscathed.

Dr. Allen's opposition to the Administration's policies in Vietnam became more apparent as the action in Cambodia grew more violent in the spring of 1970.

Early that May, he sent a letter of consolation to a 9-year-old girl in Dixon, Calif., who had written to the President urging him to spend more on education and less on war. She got back a letter from an Assistant Commissioner of Education, telling her to mind her studies and leave Government policy to her elders.

But Dr. Allen wrote to her, saying, "I share your concern and am sure the President does, too."

Later that month he differed more sharply, contending that "the war is having a disastrous effect on the young people of this country." Of Cambodia, he said, "We must withdraw from there as rapidly as we can."

At a time when President Nixon was making clear that racial segregation resulting from residential patterns was not a Government concern, Dr. Allen was speaking out against all forms of racial discrimination.

"In the position of national leadership which I occupy," he said in a statement in April, 1970, "I shall continue to emphasize the educational value of integration and the educational deprivation of segregation regardless of cause."

Dr. Allen was born on April 25, 1911, in Elkins, W. Va., the son of Edward Allen Sr., who was president of Davis and Elkins College.

His father, head of a small Presbyterian college that was racially segregated, advised his son against a career in education when the younger Allen graduated from Davis and Elkins in 1932. "They're starving to death," his father told him, referring to teachers.

He worked as a salesman for a few months until a job opened up in the West Virginia Department of Education. In 1939, he moved to Princeton to work as a research assistant in a study of educational finance.

In 1941, he went to Harvard University as a research fellow and took his master's degree there the following year. He earned his doctorate at Harvard in 1945, after serving in the final years of World War II as a civilian operations analyst on the staff of an Air Force general.

EDUCATION ASSISTANT

Dr. Allen came to New York in 1947, and became executive assistant to the Commissioner of Education.

He became Deputy Commissioner in 1950, and was named by Gov. W. Averell Harriman as Commissioner of Education in 1955, at the age of 44.

The job, which includes the title of president of the University of the State of New York, made him chief administration officer of the Board of Regents and responsible for setting standards and policies throughout the state, including testing and certification of teachers, curriculum, building plans, and arbitration of disputes.

Dr. Allen became involved in a number of controversies, usually taking liberal stances. In 1956, when the New York City Board of

Education ruled against employment of Communists, Dr. Allen ruled against the action and called it an "inquisition."

The following year he came out against school prayer.

In the late nineteen-fifties, he tended to rule against arguments that the state should take a hand in correcting racial discrimination. But, by the nineteen-sixties, Dr. Allen had come out for integration at all levels.

In 1962, he imposed a school busing plan on Malverne, L.I., creating a controversy that has lasted until now.

In 1968, Dr. Allen proposed decentralization of New York City's school system, a move that was frustrated but later adopted by the city's Board of Education.

Three experimental school districts, however, were created. Their existence touched off a citywide teachers' strike and widespread disturbances centering on one of the districts, in the Ocean Hill-Brownsville section of Brooklyn.

Under his administration, the state set up programs ranging from prekindergarten schools to adult education. Community colleges sprang up as part of a master plan, aid was granted to parochial schools, and an urban education bill was passed providing \$52 million a year to hard pressed big-city school systems.

APPOINTMENT PRAISED

When Dr. Allen was appointed United States Commissioner of Education in February, 1969, the New York Times observed in an editorial: "The appointment gives assurance that the Federal voice in matters of school and race will remain liberal and independent."

But within a few weeks after taking office, he received unofficial notice that the Administration was less than eager to support him to the hilt. The Office of Education was cut by \$370 million. By nightfall, he said jokingly that day, he was ready to head back to Albany.

In his Federal post, Dr. Allen spent much of his time attempting to control the bureaucracy in the commission and fighting political battles. He aroused opposition when he said he did not approve of penalizing disrupting college students and when he advocated the busing of students to achieve racial integration. He pressed for national recognition of education as the nation's top priority at a time when the war in Vietnam was consuming large amounts of money and manpower.

Dr. Allen was a tall, powerfully built man with pale blue eyes and receding gray hair. His favorite pastime was tennis.

His wife, the former Florence Pell Miller, to whom he had been married for 33 years, also died in the crash. They are survived by a son, James Edward 3d, and a daughter, Mrs. John Dolven.

MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN— HOW LONG?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 19, 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?

GERMAN-AMERICAN YOUTH
ACTIVITIES

HON. GUY VANDER JAGT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 19, 1971

Mr. VANDER JAGT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of the House the very constructive youth programs which our Army personnel in western Germany are conducting in cooperation with young people of that country. In 1970, more than 10,000 American soldiers and civilians and approximately 30,000 Germans between the ages of 18 and 25 participated in more than 500 projects in recreation, education, and community activities. The "Kontakt" councils are developing into principal points of contact for German and American young people. The program offers a way for American servicemen to become more involved in the life of the country in which they are stationed, and to share their interests with the young Germans. I commend our Army command in Germany for supporting this creative volunteer program. The following is the text of a press release issued jointly by the German Government and the American military headquarters and Embassy to announce an expansion of this program:

GERMAN-AMERICAN YOUTH ACTIVITIES

After a series of discussions with the Federal Government, Headquarters, USAREUR and Seventh Army has now provided the basis for intensive German-American youth activities in the Federal Republic.

General Michael S. Davison, Commander in Chief, USAREUR and Seventh Army, has announced that "Kontakt" youth program in cooperation with the Federal Ministry for Youth, Family and Health and local authorities will be expanded to the entire US Army stationing area in the Federal Republic.

"Kontakt" is a bi-national youth program in which more than 10,000 young US soldiers and civilians and approximately 30,000 young Germans aged 18-25 years participated in the past year. More than 500 projects in the fields of recreation, education and community activities were conducted in 1970.

The Federal Ministry for Youth, Family and Health was involved in the creation of the Kontakt program which started with models in Wuerzburg, Heilbronn and Mannheim. It supports the expansion of the program within its capabilities.

Kontakt is an unstructured approach to the development of bi-national councils in more than 55 cities and towns. It emphasizes youth initiative and the establishment of goals, programs and activities which are chosen and developed by the councils themselves. Administrative aid, logistic assistance and minimal funding by USAREUR and the German authorities guarantee a framework for the growing groups.

Councils in local areas are formed with the assistance of a fulltime US Kontakt coordinator, a young USAREUR enlisted man, who is free of other duties. It will be his responsibility to establish contact with host-nation agencies and young Germans who share an interest in forming leisure time groups for discussion, various recreational activities, trips, community assistance projects, and bilingual training.

Kontakt councils are expected to become points of contact for all German-American youth activities for the ages 18-25 in military communities in Germany.

Local unit public affairs offices will be the initial contact for information on the program.

The Federal Ministry for Youth, Family and Health sincerely welcomes the American initiative and requests the youth, youth organizations and youth conferences as well as the local authorities to grant this action full support. "This program may help to fulfill our role as host nation, better than before, to lead young American enlisted men out of their isolation, to include them in the German community, and to establish lasting relationships. The young generation is hereby called upon to contribute in their own way to international understanding".

WORK, STUDY PROPOSALS WILL
AID RETURNING VETS

HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 19, 1971

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, our distinguished colleague from New York (Mr. SCHEUER) has recently initiated two imaginative new legislative programs aimed at aiding returning veterans of the Vietnam era. Although not yet enacted into law, they are well on their way through the legislative process and I think it is not too early to take note of their significance.

One new program would provide new opportunities for part-time off-campus work for veterans and other students in community service, and would thereby combine financial assistance with meaningful, useful employment. The other program is aimed at developing new rehabilitation programs for narcotic addicts with an emphasis on veterans.

The following article by Jim Castelli of the Catholic News, the newspaper of the Archdiocese of New York, published on October 14, 1971, describes these programs and I commend it to the attention of my colleagues:

WORK, STUDY PROPOSALS WILL AID RETURNING VETS

(By Jim Castelli)

Bronx Democratic Congressman James Scheuer, who cosponsored a conference on the problems of the Vietnam era veteran at Fordham University last June, has introduced two legislative amendments aimed at helping the vet re-enter society. The amendments concern a college work-study program and an employment program for rehabilitated drug addicts.

The work study program is an addition to the current work study program which, under the Higher Education Act of 1965, aided 375,000 students at 2386 institutions last year. The current system promotes the creation of new on-campus jobs, mostly clerical. The Scheuer amendment would use \$50,000,000, a third of the current budget, only for off-campus jobs which were involved in community service, in such areas as environmental quality, health care, education, welfare, public safety, crime prevention and control, transportation, recreation, housing and neighborhood improvement, rural development, conservation, beautification, and "other fields of human betterment and community improvement."

The funds would go to public and private non-profit agencies and to governments

which can provide community service programs, and will pay full salary, as compared to the 80 per cent paid by the current program.

The 40-50,000 students and vets in the program could each earn about \$1200 for the school year; this plus \$180 a month GI benefits and summer earnings would mean an annual income of about \$4000, hardly enough for a family man, as Scheuer points out, but enough for a single vet, and more than many have now.

Scheuer notes that this type of work-study program is perfectly suited to the returning veteran, who often finds full-time college life too sedentary and confining after military service. It provides both money and meaningful work which is actually a form of therapy for the vet. "This involvement with the civilian community," points out Scheuer, "will help them re-integrate with the non-military world, and to get the satisfaction of helping society in a direct, immediate way."

The second amendment, this one to the Economic Opportunity Act of 1971, provides funds for employers of rehabilitated addicts, again with preference given to veterans. Scheuer points out, "Previous legislation has focused upon the medical aspects of treatment, ignoring its social and psychological aspects, while rehabilitation has not even been defined in the statutes which have been enacted to date. We have created in effect an 'aftercare gap.'"

He adds that Dr. Beny Primm of Bedford-Stuyvesant's Addiction Research and Treatment Corporation has said that once physical addiction is ended, addicts must learn new ways to handle their emotions, and that learning to obtain a job and to do it well are central in this process.

Scheuer's amendment would pay salaries for addicts who were in a full-time treatment program, as well as added costs, such as counselors. The amendment also provides that, because of the need for the addict to follow one program, his eligibility not be removed after his job takes him above the income level normally dealt with by the Office for Economic Opportunity. The amount of funding for the whole bill has not yet been determined.

The Higher Education Act is out of committee and is being debated in the full house. The Economic Opportunities Act has been approved by the House, and is about to be discussed by the House-Senate conference. The drug amendment isn't in the Senate bill, so it will be one of the topics of discussion. Scheuer feels, however, that both amendments will be approved because of the realization that so much needs to be done for the veterans.

Scheuer notes that the amendments stemmed "emotionally" from the Fordham conference, where veterans were heard on a number of areas, including education, addiction, employment, and health care. He also points out that the amendments are different in that they are attached to a higher education program and the poverty program, and did not come out of the "veterans" establishment which has been criticized for its inability to adapt to the problems of the Vietnam veteran.

Scheuer looks at the two programs as "demonstration projects," believing that they will eventually be extended to all veterans and to non-veterans.

"The generation helped by veterans benefits after World War II has already paid back the investment in them, and will do so two or three times over in its working lifetime. These people have become important leaders in society. If by guaranteeing someone higher education, we get this kind of result, why do we have to justify it on the basis of whether somebody carried a gun? Why can't we justify it on the contribution it makes, and extend such programs to everyone?"

SPYING AS A WAY OF LIFE

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI
OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 19, 1971

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, as additional evidence and information is made public concerning Soviet espionage activities in Great Britain and similar incidents are being reported in other free world countries, a commentary on Soviet espionage is certainly in order. This was the point made by George Morgenstern, columnist and editorial writer for the Chicago Tribune, in a column which appeared in that newspaper on Sunday, October 3:

MINDING MY BUSINESS—SPYING AS A WAY OF LIFE

(By George Morgenstern)

Britain's order unceremoniously expelling 105 Soviet officials attached to the Russian embassy, trade delegation and other agencies for espionage is the largest diplomatic expulsion by any country in peacetime history. The Soviet Union had maintained a huge 550-man embassy and commercial staff, but has been informed by the British that those given their walking papers may not be replaced.

The order was based on information supplied by a defecting KGB [secret police] officer attached to the embassy, who is believed also to have provided lists of spies in other NATO countries in Western Europe. When all of the Soviet and satellite operatives in these countries are put together, they will run well into the thousands, and most of them undoubtedly have intelligence assignments.

In a survey of Soviet intelligence activities by Director J. Edgar Hoover of the FBI in May, 1960, it was stated: "The Soviet Union has maintained a large staff of officials in this country since its first recognition in 1933. These officials have been assigned to Soviet embassies, consulates, trade delegations, news media, the United Nations, and the Amtorg Trading Corporation. It is from these installations that the primary intelligence activities are directed against the United States. A former intelligence officer who defected from the Soviets has estimated that from 70 to 80 percent of the Soviet officials in the United States have some type of intelligence assignment."

WONDERFUL OPPORTUNITY HERE

Mr. Hoover gave similar testimony at the time the Senate was considering a consular treaty with the Soviet Union, ratified in 1967. He said: "Long seeking greater official representation in the United States which would be more widely spread over the country, a cherished goal of the Soviet intelligence services was realized when the United States signed an agreement with the Soviet Union on June 1, 1964, providing for the reciprocal establishment of consulates in our respective countries. One Soviet intelligence officer in commenting on the agreement spoke of the wonderful opportunity this presented his service and that it would enable the Soviets to enhance their intelligence operations."

Mr. Hoover is not popular with American "liberals," who are given to regarding Communism as an innocuous dogma, but his adversaries on the other side respect his talents and realism. When the Soviet agent Kim Philby, once a highly placed operative in British military intelligence, went behind the Iron Curtain, he said of Hoover in an interview with the Soviet newspaper *Izvestia*,

"He is a painfully excellent counterspy who controls an apparatus of repression, amazing in size."

Despite constant abuse of their diplomatic privileges by Soviet-bloc officials and repeated exposure of Communist spies, both Russian and American recruits, the West, and the United States in particular, has continued to regard this obsession for spying with the kind of tolerance characterized by a religious cult of snake-handlers.

Thus in 1946 Prime Minister W. L. Mackenzie King, after Canada had cracked an atomic spy ring thru information given by Igor Gouzenko, a cipher clerk at the Soviet embassy in Ottawa who defected, spent three days on the Presidential yacht on the Potomac disclosing U.S. ramifications of the operation to Harry Truman. Yet, when later taxed by a congressional committee on his failure to act, Mr. Truman dismissed the accusation as a "red herring."

This was also his response to allegations that the Communist espionage apparatus had infiltrated the New and Fair Deals after the finger had been pointed to Alger Hiss, Harry Dexter White and numerous others. As early as 1939 the late Whittaker Chambers, once a courier of Washington secrets for the Communists, had named the members of the network to Adolph Berle, assistant secretary of state. But when Berle placed the evidence before Franklin Roosevelt, he was told by the President to "go take a jump in the lake."

CHUMMY TERMS

Mr. Roosevelt, in fact, was on such chummy terms with the Communists that former Rep. John J. O'Connor of New York, once chairman of the House Rules Committee, who was purged by Roosevelt, stated that the White House latchkey was out for Earl Browder, at that time boss of the Communist Party, during the '30s. O'Connor said Browder was a frequent visitor and helped direct the political purge from the White House in 1938.

Browder himself testified in 1950 before a Senate committee investigating Communist infiltration of the State Department that he reported in 1942 and 1943 to Mr. Roosevelt and that his information had an important role in shaping American policy in China. As everybody knows, China in 1949 fell to the Communists, and anybody who believes that every effect has a cause can draw the appropriate inference.

Espionage against foreign countries has been fixed Russian policy at least since the reign of Ivan the Terrible in the 16th century. One of his agents who fell into the hands of the khan of the Crimea, in response to the czar's gibe that he had "fallen asleep in a hostile land," replied that he was only "carrying out your orders, gathering information for the security of the empire."

So what's new?

PRESIDENT NIXON IS KEEPING HIS WORD

HON. ROBERT McCLODY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 19, 1971

Mr. McCLODY. Mr. Speaker, last week the President of the United States withdrew an additional 4,000 soldiers from Vietnam.

On January 20, 1969, there were 532,500 Americans enduring the perils of an Asian war. Today, there are 206,000 Americans in Vietnam who are planning to come home.

Mr. Speaker, President Nixon is keeping his word.

GRASSROOTS PUSHING UP AGNEW

HON. JACK F. KEMP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 19, 1971

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, on September 9, 1971, the RECORD included an extension of my remarks titled "Have Media Buried AGNEW?—I Think Not." I think these remarks have been justified. It was indeed an honor to have the Vice President as the principal speaker at a \$100-a-plate fundraising dinner in my behalf. The turnout was tremendous with almost 1,300 jamming Buffalo's Statler Hilton. Certainly this was also a testimonial to the Vice President.

Moreover, it was significant to note the grassroots organization support for the Vice President. The cochairmen for my dinner were my good friends Joe Brocato and Jim Dillon. The following letter from Bill Santen, an advance man for the Vice President, points out the tremendous effort put forth by the local committee.

The letter follows:

SANTEN, SANTEN, & HUGHES,
ATTORNEYS AT LAW,
Cincinnati, Ohio, October 13, 1971.

HON. JACK KEMP,
U.S. Representative,
The House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR JACK: As a political advance man handling the Vice President's visit to Buffalo, New York, I want to thank you and your fabulous committee for all the help they gave me while I was there. In my mind the advance was an eminent success with great coverage, great people participation for fund raising, and a beautiful occasion. Your speech was outstanding.

I wanted to mention that while in Buffalo Mr. Joseph V. Brocato, Executive Vice President of the Manufacturers & Traders Trust Company, did so much for us that I think it might be nice to drop him a special note. He provided approximately 90% of the committee manpower, as well as a fantastic amount of the fund raising efforts. His people were constantly at my side in terms of operation and detail and every factor that made the reception, dinner and over night stay a true success. Personally, I can't think of a greater guy to have on your team than Joe Brocato.

Jack, thanks again for everything.
Best regards,

W. E. SANTEN.

Mr. Speaker, Al Bellanca, our Republican county chairman also deserves a great deal of credit in marshaling the party workers who responded with a unified showing of support. You may ask what was the reaction of the public? Anne McIlhenny Matthews answers that question in her column appearing in the October 14, 1971 issue of the Buffalo Courier Express.

At this point I include the article:

AGNEW GIVEN GREAT RECEPTION
(By Anne McIlhenny Matthews)

It is like the detractors who carp at Lib-
erace—and the answer that those who deride

his glitter coats and candle-lit performances envy him all the way to where he banks the big dough.

I am referring to those who were less than enthusiastic about the "Veep," Spiro T. Agnew, who visited Buffalo last week to praise Congressman Jack Kemp as "one of the brightest stars in Washington and for whom I predict an exciting and brilliant future."

Some in the media didn't think the Veep was wonderful. But all the people in the ballroom of the Hotel Statler Hilton and in the Terrace Room across the way did!

"I don't see how he could close his right hand," said GOP Chairman Al Bellanca. "I never saw anyone write so many autographs in one session in my life. And all the while he was laughing and talking personally to people and shaking hands. The crowds adored him!"

Agnew reciprocated. He thought Buffalo—and Buffalonians—were great. He admired the glittering Uncle Sam hat on a pedestal in the lobby and complimented Joe Petrella on this and all the other decorations. When he heard that there was an overflow crowd in the Terrace Room across the lobby who had to be contented to see him and hear him on closed circuit TV he huddled with Bellanca on "ways and means."

"I never knew there was a sort of secret way to get over across the way through service tunnels and kitchen areas," said Bellanca. "It was 40 minutes of intensive argument with the Secret Service officials but finally Agnew prevailed and we went up to the balcony of the main ballroom and then down various 'service stairs' underneath the lobby and up into the Terrace Room across the way.

"The crowd there went wild, Jack Kemp and Agnew were surrounded in a minute. There was such warmth and friendliness that you could almost cut it with a knife. They wanted to shake hands with both Kemp and Agnew. The autographs started and the line of hand-shaking wound around and around.

"It made the heart of a chairman of a major party—me—feel proud. I don't think anybody in the main ballroom knew we had left. But it certainly made the evening for those in the overflow crowd in the Terrace Room!"

In the main ballroom the flash bulbs were busy. For the many top politicians in town that day, and the decision of the Court on the Attica Prison situation, almost all of the major networks were on hand.

Press passes were hard to come by and when I got mine from Lou Rotterman's office I felt that I had been given a saliva test and was racing in the fifth at Batavia. Rightly so, I believe.

Anyway Peter Gust Economou kept to his usual average and had his own photographer take a picture of himself with the Vice President. This means that he has been photographed with every prominent Greek who has come to this country in the past 50 years, and that includes the King and Queen and Crown Prince, Onassis and the Premier.

Prior to the big dinner session for Agnew and Kemp, Peter Gust had staged a big luncheon meeting of every prominent Greek-American in Buffalo to beat the tom toms for the Agnew dinner. Honor guests were Alphonso Bellanca, Jim Dillon and Joe Brocato, all of the GOP Chairman's Club. They wanted support for the big meeting—and they got it.

Despite the tight security, despite the ring-around-the-rosy of special police and Secret Service, the Vice President came across loud and strong. When he smiled his eyes bubbled and almost disappeared in his head—and he smiled often.

He talked about his major sales products—Kemp and Nixon—and he sold them well and truly. His charm and personality projected from the podium and it was returned "in kind."

If this is politics—I'm for it!

PARK SERVICE CALLED "ROTTEN" EMPLOYER

HON. PHILLIP BURTON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 19, 1971

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of the House an article by the distinguished journalist, Mr. John Cramer, which was printed in the Washington Daily News on Thursday, October 14, 1971:

PARK SERVICE CALLED "ROTTEN" EMPLOYER (By John Cramer)

Some government agencies are rotten employers.

One of the rottenest is National Park Service.

It has just proved it. Consider, please, what it has done:

It has decided, presumably all of a sudden, to merge its Eastern Service Center here with its Western Service Center, San Francisco, and transfer both to Denver.

It has given the 280 D.C. employees and the 290 SF employees just 10 days in which to decide whether they want to transfer within a month (by Nov. 15) to Denver.

It has told them that the consolidated Denver Center will have roughly 350 employees—or 220 fewer than the combined DC-SF total.

It has told them it can't guarantee their present jobs and grades—even though they agree to transfer to Denver.

It further has told them that they may face a RIF (reduction-in-force) if they transfer to Denver. (That could happen if more than 350 D.C.'ers might, indeed, like to transfer, because many are transplanted westerners).

And it also has told them (as it must by law) that if they encounter RIF in Denver, they'll be on their own so far as transportation back to D.C. or SF is concerned.

What is rotten about all this is the extremely short deadline given employees to decide whether they want to pick up their belongings, their kids, and their roots, and transfer—only a month from now—to far-off Denver.

Why couldn't they have been told sooner? (Presumably because the move was suddenly decided upon). Or why couldn't the move be delayed to give them more time to decide? (Best answer—and it's a poor one—is that delay might mean a move around Christmas time).

The Service Centers handle planning, design and construction for National Park Service. Its cadre of professionals includes landscape architects, engineers, architects, sociologists, ecologists, and park planners.

In 1969, NPS, closed a Philadelphia Service Center, and transferred some 60 employees here, with customary assurances that the ultimate in economy and efficiency had been achieved.

As it turns out, however, not even the initial Denver move will be the last.

Employees have been told they will go first into temporary quarters, then move next spring into permanent quarters . . . all this at God knows what extra cost to taxpayers. (Despite what employees were told, a Park Service spokesman said last night that neither temporary nor permanent Denver space for the move have been arranged).

Apparently, the rules are broad enough to let Park Service get away with it.

Last June 30, I bragged a bit here because an earlier column had prompted Civil Service Commission to revise its rules controlling such situations. Obviously, I bragged too much.

The revised rule says:

"When the agency asked the employe for his decision on whether he will transfer with the function, it should allow him sufficient time to consider everything that is involved and to give a responsible answer.

"The agency should not demand an answer in less time than it can reasonably allow and still have adequate time to plan and prepare for the transfer. For example, when it is possible to announce the transfer of a function 60 days in advance, it would appear to be unreasonable to ask for a decision from employes in less than 30 days . . ."

The whole Park Service approach appears to me unreasonable.

In a similar situation, not too long ago, employees at a Defense installation responded by unanimously signing their willingness to transfer.

Then those who didn't really want to transfer waited . . . till the very last moment . . . even after transportation orders had been issued . . . before saying they wouldn't move.

It was an appropriate response to a rotten installation.

NO SCHOOL LUNCH CUTBACK

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 19, 1971

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I was pleased that the House approved by a vote of 387 to 0 a proposal coming out of my subcommittee restoring free or reduced lunches to more than 1.3 million needy children in America.

Last week the Chicago Daily News urged such action in a lead editorial and I am pleased to include the editorial in the RECORD today. The Daily News has performed a notable public service by throwing the prestige of its publication behind this worthy cause.

The Chicago Daily News editorial follows:

NO SCHOOL LUNCH CUTBACK

The Department of Agriculture has run into a buzz saw with its directives on free school lunches, designed to save money. Congress is very likely to force the department to reverse a ruling that would have dropped an estimated 1.5 million needy children from the program.

The fuss has been going on since August, when the department established a 35-cent rate for federal reimbursement of states in the lunch program. This was lower by 7 cents than last year's average rate per lunch, and would cut back sharply the number of children benefitting. When many congressmen protested, the Agriculture Department shifted ground and raised the rate to 45 cents, but said the states must hold to a family income level of \$3,940 a year in determining eligibility. This measure would have the effect, it was estimated, of cutting off help for 1.5 million children.

The argument is not wholly one-sided. Agriculture said some states were defining the poverty level as \$5,000 to \$6,000 (one school district tried to put it at \$7,000) in order to collect more federal funds. New definitions of need may be in order.

But on this issue involving the welfare of children, hard-nosed tactics are out of order. Some senators have threatened to push for free school lunches for all children if the administration doesn't yield. This tactic—which might have considerable political appeal—could cost the federal government as much as \$7 billion a year.

Faced with such a budget-wrecking proposal, the administration will doubtless come around to carrying out Congress' wishes, which are to keep up the lunch program pretty much as it is. Even President Nixon's special consultant on hunger, Dr. Jean Mayer of Harvard, chimed in against the administration, saying the cutback was "mean-spirited." He added:

"We ought to find better ways to save money than to take it out of the mouths of hungry children."

That just about says it all.

"CHESTY" PULLER—INCOMPARABLE MARINE

HON. J. KENNETH ROBINSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 19, 1971

Mr. ROBINSON of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, in a corps in which legends are legion, "Chesty" Puller was a bantam Bunyan and a taleteller's delight.

When Lt. Gen. Lewis B. Puller, USMC, retired, died on October 11, every professional Marine, active and retired, knew the corps had lost one of its great.

Hard-fighting, hard-talking General Puller was fiercely loyal to his country, and to his comrades in arms. He proved his loyalty countless times, and five Navy Crosses were among the tokens he collected as he spent freely of his remarkable store of valor.

I include an editorial which appeared in the Evening Star of Washington, D.C., on Wednesday, October 13, 1971, as follows:

CHESTY'S LAST BEACHHEAD

With the death of Lieutenant General Lewis B. Puller, the Marines, Virginia and the nation have lost an almost mythic figure. The most decorated Marine in the history of the Corps was not a man for all seasons; nor will he be remembered as one of the great military thinkers of this or any other time.

What "Chesty" Puller was was an incomparable fighting man, a small-unit leader (he never commanded anything larger than a regiment in combat) without peer who cared for nothing except victory and his men. Enlisted men are not given to adoration of their generals, but there were few Marines who would not have tried to establish a beachhead in hell at a nod from Chesty Puller. The reason was simple: As his old friend General Lewis Walt once put it, Puller "didn't send them into battle, they followed him in."

His Marines knew, too, that once in battle, Puller, who bore the scars of a dozen wounds, would see them through. When his 1st Marines were hard-pressed at Chosin Reservoir, Puller vowed that in future years he would hold the regiment's annual reunion in a telephone booth before he would permit so much as the body of a single dead Marine—not to speak of the wounded—to be abandoned on those frozen Korean passes. He made good on that vow and the 1st Marines came out together, the living and the dead, bringing with them the shattered remnants of other units.

The retired—but not retiring—general never learned to suffer fools gladly and, as a consequence, his stars came late and he was denied the higher combat commands to which he aspired. But there never was a better Marine than that barrel-chested, lantern-jawed, hard-drinking rifleman from West Point, Virginia, "Chesty" Puller.

THE CONQUEST OF CANCER

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 19, 1971

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, as the editor of the Washington Post says "The fight is building" over the establishment of a new Conquest of Cancer Agency.

During our hearings on the budget for the National Institutes of Health this year, Dr. Marston, head of NIH, had this to say:

The funds provided for the uncertain business of probing the unknown in relation to disease problems should reflect the state-of-the-art in the various biomedical disciplines and clinical research fields rather than well-intentioned but extraneous decisions based on political, economic or social factors.

Moreover, cancer research should not be viewed as an isolated—or isolatable—activity. The most important reason for keeping the cancer conquest program within the family of the NIH is that cancer research is inescapably intertwined with various aspects of the research missions of the other Institutes. The complex questions to which biomedical research must address itself and the work that goes into their solution are almost never unique to a particular disease or confined to single scientific disciplines.

The present excitement about the role of viruses in causing cancer illustrates the way in which progress in one field or research depends on work being done in another. Virologists, who for years have been mainly concerned with unravelling the mysteries of infectious diseases, such as the common cold, for which viruses are thought to be responsible, have provided the leads and are now doing much of the work in viral carcinogenesis.

Separating cancer research from other medical research activities—in a way, putting it in competition with other medical research—would, I think, do real damage to all of medical research including cancer research itself. To put it bluntly, from a scientific point of view, it makes no sense.

Mr. Speaker, at this point in the RECORD, I would like to insert the excellent editorial on this subject appearing in this morning's Washington Post:

THE CONQUEST OF CANCER

The fight over the proposal to establish a new Conquest of Cancer Institute is building toward a climatic finish. A House subcommittee last Friday voted down the proposal backed by the White House for creating such an independent agency, substituting in its place a bill strengthening the position of the existing cancer institute inside the structure of the National Institutes of Health. Since the Senate had previously passed the White House plan by an overwhelming majority and since the White House shows no signs of backing down, the way seems clear for a fight on the House floor or in a conference committee or both.

There have been few other legislative proposals in recent years that have divided the nation's medical community so sharply. In our letters column today, the President of the Association of Medical Colleges challenges some of the points raised earlier this month by a letter from the President of the American Cancer Society. We might let the exchange go at that except for the full page advertisement in his newspaper last week in which it was asserted that objections to the bill come mainly from those "who do not have expert cancer knowledge" and "do not fully understand the situation." The implication of the ad, like the implication of

similar ads that have appeared elsewhere, is that the only way to conquer cancer is to establish a new institute with that as its goal and that only those who want the new institute are ready to support an all-out attack on cancer.

If the situation were really as simple as the authors of this advertisement make it seem, there would be no dispute over the White House proposal. There is no opposition that we know of to increased federal funding for cancer research nor to a federal commitment aimed at providing whatever funds are necessary to find a cure for cancer. But it does not follow that the creation of a new, free-wheeling agency which reports only to the President is either the only or the best way to channel those funds. And that is what the fight is all about.

It is true that many of those researchers who focus solely on cancer favor the establishment of a new agency. That is hardly surprising. Any group of researchers on any subject would love to have an agency devoted exclusively to their field. If there is to be a special institute for cancer, why not one for heart diseases? They kill twice as many people. Or for arthritis, from which far more people suffer.

Part of the need for a new agency, if we are to believe the advertisement, is that it would be "an advance in the mechanics of administration" which would free cancer researchers from the "red tape which now slows the cancer fight." That statement, plus the assertion that it "would be futile just to pour more money into the existing system," is a charge of gross mismanagement against the National Institutes of Health and the Department of Health, Education and Welfare. It is a charge that we think has not been and cannot be proved. Indeed, if the situation is that bad, it seems strange that the panel of experts which first recommended the new agency never saw fit to discuss the problems of research management with any of the top officials of either HEW or NIH.

Inherent in the drive for a new cancer agency is the promise that a cure can be found if only enough money is devoted to the search and administered in a particular way. This is a promise which the supporters of the new agency are careful to hedge, knowing as they do that the cure or cures may still be years or decades away. Yet it is that appeal which has given the drive for a new agency its popularity, a popularity underlined by the heavy mail to members of Congress which resulted when columnist Ann Landers took up the cudgels for the agency some months ago. Nevertheless, President Nixon was right when he said last winter that "scientific breakthroughs are still required and they often cannot be forced—no matter how much money and energy is expended." It is worth noting in passing that many of the basic discoveries which have helped doctors to understand cancer better did not originate in the context of cancer research.

We hope that as the House subcommittee will be sustained in its judgment on this emotion-laden subject when the matter reaches the floor and that the Senate can be persuaded to follow the recommendations of those who oppose stripping cancer studies out of the existing framework of biomedical research.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ROBERT PRICE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 19, 1971

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I was unavoidably detained in my district. However, had I been present I would have voted "yea" on the bill

House Joint Resolution 923, I would have voted "yea" on H.R. 10458, I would have voted "yea" on H.R. 8140, and I would have voted "nay" on H.R. 9212.

THREAT TO FARM MARKETS

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 19, 1971

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, the entire world watched closely last week as the United States completed negotiations for a quota on Japanese textile exports. Along with many of my colleagues in the Congress, I am concerned that our hard bargaining with Japan to limit its shipments of textiles may impair U.S. interests.

This concern is also shared by the Chicago Tribune in its lead editorial October 19. Entitled, "Out of the Frying Pan," the editorial dealt with this critically important aspect of our foreign policy.

Quotas impose unfair burdens on consumers, discriminate unfairly among foreign suppliers, and give Government officials plums to dispense which are simply too juicy.

Strong-arming Japan into accepting textile quotas is especially unfortunate. That nation is the American farmers' one and only billion-dollar-a-year customer and is rapidly moving toward becoming a \$2 billion customer. In the year

which ended July 1, Japan purchased \$1.2 billion in U.S. farm products.

Many of the agricultural products we sell to Japan can be purchased from other countries. This year, with our crippling dock strikes, our best buyer of these farm goods has shopped and bought farm products grown in other lands. I sincerely hope our recently approved textile agreement does not cause this important customer to expand its purchases from other nations at the expense of the U.S. farmer.

A copy of the editorial is attached as part of these remarks:

OUT OF THE FRYING PAN

Japan's agreement to limit its wool and synthetic textile exports to the United States, after more than a year of haggling, represents a victory for the Nixon administration. But the reaction should remind us that it is a temporary one and must not be exaggerated.

What Japan has demonstrated [however reluctantly] is that by submitting to American pressure, it is possible to escape from the 10 per cent import surcharge which the President imposed in August and which our trading partners bitterly resent. If other countries take the hint and make concessions of their own, it may be possible to end the surcharge within the three or four months mentioned on Sunday by Secretary of the Treasury Connally.

But to the extent that the surcharge is replaced by quotas, we will merely be moving from one unsatisfactory means of restraining free trade to another.

Quota systems force American consumers to pay more than they otherwise would pay for a long list of commodities whose trade is regulated by "commodity agreements" or other forms of quotas. Among them are sugar, coffee, oil, steel and cotton goods.

The textile issue happens to be more of a political issue than an economic one. Imports account for less than three per cent of our textile market, and the domestic market is growing by well over three per cent a year. Japanese imports could probably double without actually reducing the market for American producers. Limiting them to increases of 5 per cent a year will therefore, in effect, turn the new market over to American producers. And this, presumably, will make good the promise which Mr. Nixon made to southern textile makers in 1968 and which has embarrassed him ever since.

But to the extent that the textile quotas do have a noticeable effect, American consumers will find themselves paying more for textiles in order to subsidize jobs and profits in the textile industry, and in order to help bail the American economy out of a predicament into which a generation of government mismanagement has led it.

For this dubious advantage we have incurred the wrath of our trading partners all over the world. In Japan, the reaction may be especially costly: the Sato government, which has staked its reputation on good relations with the United States, is now accused by both industry and the left of surrendering to the United States. In London, Prime Minister Heath talks gloomily of a trade war.

By turning to new artificial quotas instead of trying to eliminate existing ones here and abroad, we are perpetuating inefficiencies in production and trade. The danger now is that textile quotas, like the others, will tend to become permanent fixtures, at the consumers' expense. Clearly this is not the solution to our problems. Pushing prices up by quotas is no better than allowing them to be pushed up by inflation. The administration should now dedicate itself to the ultimate removal of quotas as well as import surcharges.

SENATE—Wednesday, October 20, 1971

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. ELLENDER).

PRAYER

The Reverend Edgar J. Munding, pastor, Christ Lutheran Church, 5101 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

Gracious God, we make our common prayer for these United States of America, for all who are shaping the destiny of our land, and particularly for this deliberative body as it convenes this day.

Give to each of us wisdom, courage, and concern so that the decisions we make may express Your will for our country.

To this intent, purify our motives and help us order our priorities, that we "seek first the kingdom of God." Help us to maintain faith in each other and confidence in the citizenry, so that the words we speak and the conclusions we reach may serve the greatest good and give You the greatest glory.

We pray that our faith may wear bifocals that see the heartache and the need around us, but down the road also see the patience of God, working out His plan for the world which He has made, which His Son has redeemed, and His spirit regularly renews through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, October 19, 1971, be dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

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.

AUTUMN IN VERMONT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in a supplement to the Berkshire Eagle, the Torrington Register, the Bennington Banner, and the Brattleboro Reformer, entitled "Upland Autumn," for October 1971 there is a most heartwarming article written by the distinguished senior Senator from Vermont (Mr. AIKEN). The title is "Daydreaming About Vermont From a Window in Washington," although I would prefer that it be entitled "Autumn in Vermont."

Mr. President, the article contains much of the philosophy which has made

Senator AIKEN a great Senator, which has kept him close to his homefolks, and which has brought forth the commonsense which he gives us the benefit of almost daily, and so far as we are concerned, appreciatively, and I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the RECORD.

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

DAYDREAMING ABOUT VERMONT FROM A WINDOW IN WASHINGTON

(By Senator GEORGE D. AIKEN)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Leaving Vermont every fall when the Congress goes back to work must be one of the hardest things Sen. George D. Aiken has to do. At this time of year, the nation's capital is beautiful, but it's nothing like being back home in Putney when the nights start turning cold.)

(We suspected that Sen. Aiken must daydream some about his state when he's down there in Washington, and we were right.)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—You ask—what does a Vermonter think about when he's 500 miles away from home and realizes that it's autumn once again?

Well, looking out of our apartment across the park I see the Capitol of the United States—beautiful, imposing, dignified, and symbolizing the strength of the nation. A bit to the right, the Washington Monument points upward to the sky.

And farther beyond are the spires of Georgetown University. These, and other buildings in the distance, bear mute evidence