

shipment of Phantom F-4 aircraft to Israel in order to maintain the arms balance in the Middle East; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CELLER (for himself, Mr. PRICE of Texas, Mr. PUCINSKI, Mr. RAILSBACK, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. REES, Mr. REID of New York, Mr. REUSS, Mr. RHODES, Mr. RIEGLE, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. ROE, Mr. ROGERS, Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. ROY, Mr. RYAN, Mr. ST GERMAIN, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. SATTERFIELD, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. SCHNEEBELI, Mr. SHRIVER, Mr. SIKES, and Mr. SISK):

H. Res. 667. Resolution calling for the shipment of Phantom F-4 aircraft to Israel in order to maintain the arms balance in the Middle East; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CELLER (for himself, Mr. SPRINGER, Mr. J. WILLIAM STANTON, Mr. JAMES V. STANTON, Mr. STEELE, Mr. STEIGER of Arizona, Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin, Mr. STOKES, Mr. STRATTON, Mr. STUCKEY, Mrs. SULLIVAN, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia, Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey, Mr. THONE, Mr. TIERNAN, Mr. UDALL, Mr. VANIK, Mr. VIGORITO, Mr. WAGGONNER, Mr. WALDIE, Mr. WHALEN, Mr. WHITEHURST, Mr. WILLIAMS, and Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON):

H. Res. 668. Resolution calling for the shipment of Phantom F-4 aircraft to Israel in order to maintain the arms balance in the Middle East; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CELLER (for himself, Mr. VAN DEERLIN, Mr. WINN, Mr. WOLFF, Mr. WRIGHT, Mr. WYATT, Mr. WYDLER, Mr. YATES, Mr. YATRON, and Mr. YOUNG of Texas):

H. Res. 669. Resolution calling for the

shipment of Phantom F-4 aircraft to Israel in order to maintain the arms balance in the Middle East; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CELLER (for himself, Mr. ASHLEY, Mr. BERGLAND, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. BRADEMANS, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. CEDERBERG, Mr. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. CONABLE, Mr. CONTE, Mr. COTTER, Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey, Mr. DANIELSON, Mr. DEVINE, Mr. DONOHUE, Mr. DOW, Mrs. DWYER, Mr. EDWARDS of Louisiana, Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD, Mr. FULTON of Tennessee, Mr. GAYDOS, Mrs. GRIFFITHS, Mr. HAWKINS, and Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts):

H. Res. 670. Resolution calling for the shipment of Phantom F-4 aircraft to Israel in order to maintain the arms balance in the Middle East; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CELLER (for himself, Mr. HOLIFIELD, Mr. HULL, Mr. KEE, Mr. KUYKENDALL, Mr. McCLOSKEY, Mr. McCORMACK, Mr. MCKEVITT, Mr. MCKINNEY, Mr. MEEDS, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. MOSS, Mr. NELSEN, Mr. O'NEILL, Mr. PASSMAN, Mr. PATTEN, Mr. PIKE, Mr. POAGE, Mr. QUILLEN, Mr. RANDALL, Mr. RODINO, Mr. RONCALIO, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. SAYLOR, and Mr. SKIBERLING):

H. Res. 671. Resolution calling for the shipment of Phantom F-4 aircraft to Israel in order to maintain the arms balance in the Middle East; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BIAGGI (for himself, Mr. DULSKI, and Mr. CAREY of New York):

H. Res. 672. Resolution relative to Irish national self-determination; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CAREY of New York (for himself, Mr. BURTON, Mrs. GRASSO, Mrs. HICKS of Massachusetts, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. MADDEN, Mr. METCALFE, Mr. O'NEILL, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. PRICE of Illinois, Mr. PUCINSKI, Mr. ROY, Mr. ST GERMAIN, Mr. JAMES V. STANTON, and Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON):

H. Res. 673. Resolution calling for peace in northern Ireland and the establishment of a united Ireland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GARMATZ:

H. Res. 674. Resolution to provide an official flag for the Members of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. MACDONALD of Massachusetts:

H. Res. 675. Resolution calling for the shipment of Phantom F-4 aircraft to Israel in order to maintain the arms balance in the Middle East; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia (by request):

H.R. 11463. A bill for the relief of Col. and Mrs. Allen B. Crane; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H.R. 11464. A bill for the relief of Caroleen G. Fernandez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

150. The SPEAKER presented a petition of Herbert Johnson, Glen Rock, N.J., relative to impeachment of certain civil officers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

WILL THE FEDERAL BUREAUCRACY DESTROY INDIVIDUAL FREEDOM IN AMERICA?

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 27, 1971

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, Eugene C. "Gene" Pulliam, publisher of the Indianapolis Star, Indianapolis News, Phoenix Republic and Phoenix Gazette, placed the following editorial on the front page of his papers during the Veterans Day Weekend. The editorial appeared in the Indianapolis Star and Phoenix Republic on Sunday, October 24, and in the Indianapolis News and Phoenix Gazette on Monday, October 25.

This editorial is a convincing and forthright presentation of one of the most serious problems facing our country today and I submit it here for the attention of my colleagues.

The editorial follows:

WILL THE FEDERAL BUREAUCRACY DESTROY INDIVIDUAL FREEDOM IN AMERICA?

The most serious threat to freedom in America today—including freedom of the press—comes from a Federal bureaucracy

which seems determined to gain control over every facet of American life.

This is not a partisan issue. As a matter of fact, there are now three great parties in America—the Democratic party, the Republican party and the Federal bureaucracy. Of the three, the Federal bureaucracy is the strongest and most powerful because it is the best organized and is protected from political reprisal by civil service.

When a new administration comes in, less than 10 per cent of the bureaucrats go out; the other 90 per cent keep their jobs regardless of which party is in power.

The U.S. State Department is probably the most bureaucrat-infested agency in the entire government. A small coterie of career men who are protected and immune from discipline by civil service constantly harass and embarrass whoever is secretary of state. They did it to Dean Rusk and are doing it now to Secretary Rogers. Secretary Foster Dulles had some very terrible experiences with this group. These State Department parasites don't want any secretary to succeed. They want to run the State Department in their image. They never want to get tough with any nation, whether friend or foe. They just want to be personally popular in all capitals of the world, no matter what their actions do to the prestige of our foreign policy. It's a hell of a way to run a State Department but that is the way it is being run now. If President Nixon is re-elected, he should ask Congress for the right to abolish civil service in the State Department and

clean house from the first under secretary to the brocaded janitors.

Entrenched behind the safety of civil service tenure, the bureaucrats always proclaim that they are acting in the public interest and proceed to issue decree after decree, having the full force and effect of law, whereas not 20 per cent of the bureaucratic rules and regulations and orders are ever voted on by the Congress.

There are thousands of honest and dedicated men and women in the government civil service but their leaders and department heads make life unbearable for anyone who dares speak out against the arrogant plan for government by bureaucratic decree.

PRESIDENT STYMIED

The American people don't realize just how terrifically strong this bureaucracy is. At the present time there are 2,911,000 Federal employees; when President Nixon came to office, out of 4,000 and some employees in the Office of Economic Opportunity he could only change 16! Think of it. The President of the United States was absolutely overwhelmed, to the tune of 4,000 to 16.

Another instance of the arrogant determination of the bureaucracy developed recently in the Interior Department. The United States government has a treaty with the Navajo nation. The treaty is just as binding as any treaty we have with Canada or Mexico, yet the bureaucrats in the Interior Department paid no attention whatever to its stipulations. President Nixon

promised the Indians he would do something about it. When he tried to do so this summer, the Bureau of Indian Affairs paid no more attention to the President of the United States than they had to the chief of the Navajo Indians. The bureaucrats in the Bureau of Indian Affairs are determined to run all matters pertaining to Indians in this country—regardless of treaties, presidents or the welfare of the Indians themselves.

Bureaucrats seldom get mixed up in financial scandals. They are not interested in money; they are interested only in power, and the American people have permitted them to take over, often without legislation.

Robert Finch, one of President Nixon's closest friends, was literally driven out of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare because the career bureaucrats in HEW just weren't about to let anyone else run that department, which is one of the largest and most important and spends more money than any other department except Defense. And things haven't changed one iota since Finch left.

Just how far they will go in expressing contempt for the people to whom they are supposed to be responsible is suggested by protest demonstrations in defiance of the President staged by employes of this Department.

Senator Barry Goldwater observes that "several hundred employes of the Department of HEW—none of whom was elected by the people who pay them—could hold a mass meeting to protest policy decisions reached by the White House and by the Secretary of HEW."

The bureaucracy dominates the Federal Trade Commission, the Food and Drug Administration and countless other agencies. Prof. Yale Brozen of the University of Chicago recently called attention to the fact that because of these regula ory bodies free enterprise in this country is only half alive. He cited as evidence government's control of the mail, of water supplies, schools, airlines, railroads, highways, banks, farms, utilities and insurance companies.

JOB DESTROYERS

Government regulation has driven the railroads to the point of near extinction, hampered the small businessman with a network of controls, created problems in our cities with ill-conceived programs which have caused a net loss of at least half-a-million units of low cost housing since the 1930's. Yet the same bureaucrats and regulators who have created these problems now say they are going to cure them—and that for this purpose they must have still more authority over our lives.

The regulators talk a great deal about unemployment, and the need for still more government power to cure it. Yet Prof. Brozen has shown at length that government wage regulation has caused unemployment, pricing youthful and other marginal workers out of the labor market. Federal wage minimums have caused a doubling of unemployment levels among minority youth since 1954—from 16.5 per cent to well over 30 per cent.

In their effort to control everything, the regulators are trying to dictate virtually every phase of the business process—from the content of peanut butter and breakfast cereals to the packaging of soap flakes and the advertising of tooth paste. The Federal Trade Commission has recently decided it has the right to halt "special" sales in stores and back its decrees with a \$5,000 fine.

In a similar move, attorneys for the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission have argued that businessmen cannot relocate if this would deprive minority workers of employment—claiming such relocation would violate the 1964 Civil Rights Act. Examina-

tion of the act shows it contains no such sweeping provision, and that this interpretation is purely something dreamed up by the bureaucrats to extend their own arbitrary power over business.

Members of Congress are helping the bureaucrats by holding hearings, spending government money by the millions to prove we probably shouldn't be eating cranberries at the wrong time and that cyclamates might poison your neighbor's dog. Think of the time, effort and money that have been wasted on just those two things alone, which accomplished nothing whatever.

Perhaps the clearest example of the way in which the regulators achieve the opposite of what they say they are going to may be seen in the current controversy over pollution. In one case regulatory fever brought the closing of a plant in Northern California which was not in violation of pollution standards and whose termination meant the loss of 800 jobs. A similar story was written in Marietta, Ohio, where Federal pollution standards if enforced would require the closing of a key industrial plant and the loss of 625 jobs. In the most serious case of all, senseless regulation threatened the closing of a Connecticut plant where some 40 per cent of the nation's supply of penicillin is produced.

TIPPING THEIR HAND

The arrogance of the bureaucrats was blatantly emphasized when they proposed a special tax break for themselves. These bureaucrats already enjoy job pay increases more frequently than most Americans and they have all sorts of benefits and special privileges which put them in a class apart from and above the average citizen. The plan now being studied to give them special tax exemption is the last straw. Special exemptions from Federal taxes on the top \$3,000 of salaries paid to bureaucrats in the highest of three civil service classifications are proposed. These salaries range from \$28,000 to \$38,000 a year. A diminishing scale of tax breaks is provided for the lower classes. All bureaucrats will get a tax break if this plan is accepted, while we know of no other group of Americans who are going to receive any such tax breaks.

As their control over our economic life has grown, the bureaucrats and regulators have shown their intentions more and more openly. In a wide variety of cases they are advancing the idea of "social engineering"—the notion that government "experts" should take children away from their parents, break the ties of family life, and mold American youngsters into the image of the bureaucrats themselves. In the dispute over "busing," for example, we have seen Federal regulators disrupting the life of local communities, ordering children transported to schools far from their homes, overriding the wishes of parents and city officials.

The motive behind this is spelled out clearly by spokesmen who say "disadvantaged" children have to be taken away from the influence of their parents and placed increasingly under the influence of the bureaucratic experts. "It is important," says one spokesman, "to replace this family environment as much as possible by an educational environment—by starting school at an early age, and by having a school which begins very early in the day and ends very late."

Busing is opposed by 76 per cent of the American people, including black, white and yellow. It has become a national headache and a national scandal. This never would have happened had it not been for the zealots among the career people in HEW, who are determined to demonstrate their power.

How far the problem of bureaucracy and dictatorial control of American economic life can be carried is suggested by the case of Ralph Nader. Here is a man without any official authority or credentials of any kind,

forcing American industry into submission, threatening Federal prosecution if industry doesn't agree with his plans, bullying his way toward being the supreme dictator of all industrial production in this country. I want to quote here from a speech made by Thomas R. Shepard Jr., publisher of Look Magazine, regarding Nader's program and objectives.

Mr. Shepard says, "I have heard many businessmen dismiss Ralph Nader and his associates as well-meaning fellows who sincerely want to help the American consumer by improving business methods. Forget it. Mr. Nader isn't interested at all in seeing American industry clean house. What he wants is the house—from cellar to attic. His goal is a top-to-bottom takeover of industry by the government, with Mr. Nader, himself, I would guess, in charge of the appropriate commission."

"Find it hard to believe? Then listen to this Associated Press report of a speech he made last September, and I quote: 'Consumer advocate Ralph Nader has proposed that corporations that abuse the public interest should be transferred to public trusteeship and their officers sent to jail.'"

Among the proposals Nader favors are having "publicly elected" members imposed on corporation boards of directors to serve the "public interest" as defined by Nader, abolishing corporate trade secrets on the grounds that "a corporation doesn't have the right of privacy" and making all corporate tax returns public on the same grounds.

Still more incredible are Nader's proposals that corporate executives be suspended from their jobs through "sanctions" he wants to impose and that entire companies be driven out of business if they don't live up to what he calls a "social cost test."

NADER'S FINANCES

Who has appointed this man to play God over American business? Who has given him and the bureaucrats who are helping him the right to destroy the investment and effort of thousands of Americans who have entered into the voluntary associations of corporate endeavor? Who has commissioned them to dictate, suspend, or bankrupt organizations in which the resources and energies of countless American citizens have been invested?

Unbelievably enough, many of his assaults on our business system are financed by elements in the business community itself. He receives a good deal of money from foundations—including the prestigious Carnegie Foundation. He is also supported by the Philip M. Stern family fund, the Norman Fund, the Jerome Levy foundation, and Gordon Sherman of the Midas muffler company, among others.

Even so, Nader never would have gotten to first base with his crusades if he had not had the help of the bureaucrats.

Recently Professor C. Northcote Parkinson, noted for his numerous laws governing human behavior, predicted that, if the present trend toward government employment continues, everyone in Britain will be working for the government by the year 2195. Following this prediction by Dr. Parkinson the Morgan Guaranty Trust Company of New York prophesied that if this trend in America goes on, every American will be working for the government by the year 2000.

The significance of all this for the American press should be apparent. The collectivists and regulators like to say they are in favor of freedom of expression, and that the controls they have placed over our economic lives will not endanger other aspects of our liberty like the free press and freedom of speech.

The argument they use is that "human rights" can be separated from "property rights," and that economic controls do not mean political controls. The whole record of what has been happening in this country

shows such an argument to be false. Those of us in the newspaper business have long argued, and correctly, that the rest of the nation cannot remain free unless the press is free.

By the same token, it is impossible to have a society and economy supervised in every detail by Washington regulators and at the same time expect the press to be free.

The mission of the American press always has been to keep this country free and never before has there been a time when the American press should give first priority, regardless of other considerations, to the job of keeping a free press functioning in this country. The networks are having a very serious battle with the bureaucracy. They cannot fight their own fight because they have one hand tied behind them by bureaucratic controls. We do have an obligation to fight their battle for them because the networks have the same basic right of free expression as we do. The right of free expression is the fundamental right of liberty and we should remember always that America is the greatest country only because America is free.

The bureaucrats have been able to bully and blackmail television into accepting all kinds of unfair regulations. They attempted the same thing with the press. They realize their goal cannot be accomplished until they have control of the press, and now they are using the FCC to do that very thing. They are also using the office of the Attorney General, frequently without his knowledge or consent, to send out threats, directives and regulations unsanctioned by Congress, but with the full force and effect of law nonetheless.

Take two or three of the most recent cases. In 1968 Congress, after two years of debate, passed Senator Carl Hayden's failing newspaper bill. President Nixon signed that bill. Yet two months ago, the same crowd in the Attorney General's office who were there when they made such a terrific fight against the bill and were holdover Civil Service employees—most of them Socialists at heart who believe in statism and state control—sent out letters to a group of 50 newspapers, demanding all kinds of reports and statements under threat of being hauled before the Senate and anti-trust division for violation of the anti-trust laws.

That law was passed by Congress. It hasn't been repealed. It hasn't been violated. And yet these bureaucratic lawyers in the Attorney General's office go right ahead and cause unmitigated annoyance and expense to the newspaper industry, their one object being to get the newspapers to agree to some form of government regulation. Well, thank God, most of the newspapers ignored the Justice Department.

FCC DECREES

Then the FCC gets into the act again by issuing a decree, without consent of Congress, simply on its own volition, telling the networks they must devote so much time to this and so much time to that and so much time to public broadcasts which are put out by the NEA, hardly a source of unbiased information. And what do the television people do? They must comply or else. Now the FCC had no authority to make such a decision and thank God one judge told the FCC to go jump into the lake until it got authority from Congress to issue such a decree. But that didn't stop the bureaucrats. The Justice Department has jumped onto the agreement which was made by the New York Times and the Chicago Daily News wire services. The cost of the wire tolls was increased and the two companies decided to split a day and night wire in order to save money.

The irony of this situation is that in April of 1970 the Federal Communications Commission told the two wire services that they would have to do just exactly what they are

doing if they wanted to use the services of the AT&T, and the Commission itself proposed that the two services share the wire with another user simply as an economical manner in which to serve their clients. And the New York Times and the Chicago Daily News entered into an agreement positively dictated and approved by the FCC.

Now along comes the Justice Department and says, "You can't do this. It is a violation of the anti-trust laws."

Let's take the case of tobacco. The FCC, without the consent of Congress—which it later obtained—told the television stations they could not advertise cigarettes. Yet the very same government which the FCC represents is spending \$660,000,000 a year to promote, encourage and carry on the sale of tobacco. This order of the FCC is clearly unconstitutional unless the United States government absolutely prohibits the growing and sale and manufacture of tobacco and its products.

From the other direction, the U.S. government is subsidizing programs over the Public Broadcasting Service network which are often slanted to the radical side. The nature of this bias came to light in an "educational" TV attack on the FBI which was cancelled from its regular broadcast slot after J. Edgar Hoover protested. The Corporation for Public Broadcasting will receive an estimated \$35 million from the taxpayers this year, some \$9.2 million going to PBS. Why should bureaucrats force the taxpayer to underwrite one-sided propaganda?

A related case involving abuse of the regulatory power of the Federal Communications Commission is the interpretation that has been given the so-called "fairness doctrine." A memorandum prepared by the Reuther brothers in 1961 urged that this doctrine, which is supposed to insure balanced programming, be used as a device for attacking conservative broadcasters, most of whom appear on a local and not a network basis. Over the past 10 years the "fairness doctrine" has repeatedly been invoked against broadcasters and station owners whose views are different from those of the collectivists, but has not been invoked against network figures whose views are more in keeping with the Reuther memorandum outlook.

PRESS IS NEXT

Two years ago a member of the Federal Communications Commission urged that this dictatorial formula be used against newspapers as well. In an August 1969 speech in Dallas, Tex., Kenneth Cox of the FCC said that "Congress could constitutionally apply counterparts of our equal time and rights of reply obligations to most newspapers, since they move in, or clearly affect, interstate commerce, and since the public interest in their providing their readers with both sides of important questions is clear."

Give these bureaucrats the right of regulation over the American press and you have lost America to bureaucratic statism.

This country was founded as a republic with a representative government, but has degenerated into a democracy run by organized minorities, the strongest of which is the Federal bureaucracy. Never in the history of man has a democracy survived more than 200 years, and ours will not survive unless we make it a representative government and abolish the power of the Federal bureaucrats.

Most democracies have been destroyed by centralized bureaucracies—or at least by the rule of organized minorities. The newspapers of this country owe it to America and to the world to make sure that representative government survives in this country—that freedom of the press and the right of free expression are never destroyed by a bureaucracy or any minority group. If we prove here

that representative government can work, then freedom will spread to all corners of the world in time.

The United States spends billions of dollars every year to oppose Russia's determination to impose its autocratic rule of complete domination on other countries and to control individual freedom, industrial production, education and everything that approaches freedom of speech and freedom of expression. Here in America the bureaucrats are forcing the United States, step by step, to accept a system of government that will destroy free enterprise, local control of our educational system and, most important of all, the right of free expression, the fundamental right of liberty. If the bureaucrats succeed, freedom as we know it in America will be lost—maybe forever.

GENE PULLIAM, Publisher.

APPROACHING DOMINANCE OF SOVIET SEAPOWER

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 27, 1971

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, only through an informed citizenry will Congress be able to deal effectively with critics of our Military Establishment who believe peace can be achieved only through parity.

An excellent editorial on the approaching dominance of the Soviet Union in the area of seapower was published in the Columbia, S.C., Record of October 11, 1971.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be published in the Record, as follows:

AMERICA'S DECLINING SEAPOWER

Britannia's rule of the waves gave America a sense of security. After World War II the sea role of free world protection passed to the United States. But ocean dominance is being taken over by the Soviet Union.

"The blunt truth is this: if present policies continue, there will be only one super power left in the world five years from now—Russia." This quotation is from Willard F. Rockwell, chairman of the board of a company that bears his name and has a Columbia plant. He is also chief executive officer of North American Rockwell Corporation, one of the nation's largest aerospace and commercial manufacturing concerns.

"It was only a very short time ago, perhaps six years, when our nuclear strategic superiority over the Soviets was a secure four to one," he added. "Today that lead has been wiped out. It was only a very short time ago—seven years in fact—that there were no Soviet nuclear submarines. Three years from now their fleet will outnumber ours."

He warned that by 1975 the Russians will have nearly twice as many surface warships and nearly three times as many soldiers in a standing military.

Authoritative *Jane's Fighting Ships*, an annual British compendium of the world's navies, confirmed the serious situation in American seapower.

"The size and relative capabilities of the United States Navy," it said, "continue to decline at what many authorities consider

to be an alarming rate. . . . So prolific has the Soviet naval-building effort been that the USSR is now able to maintain a standing naval force in the Mediterranean five times stronger than five years ago to counter the American Sixth Fleet."

The London publication reported that the Soviet fleet now exceeds the U.S. Navy in the numbers and capabilities of active surface ships and submarines.

"Among the great nations," Mr. Rockwell pointed out, "only the strong survive. Weakness of the United States—of its military capability and its will—could be the gravest threat to peace in the world."

The United States should and must form a more workable coalition with its naval allies, but the chief responsibility for future free world security rests with this country. Americans should be acutely aware of the dangers of declining seapower before it is too late.

A BILL TO AMEND THE LEAD-BASED PAINT POISONING PREVENTION ACT

HON. ROBERT O. TIERNAN

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 27, 1971

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Speaker, during the last session of Congress we enacted the Lead-Based Paint Poisoning Prevention Act—Public Law 91-695. One of the purposes of this very important bill was to provide Federal financial assistance to help cities and communities to develop and carry out intensive local programs to eliminate the causes of lead-based paint poisoning and local programs to detect and treat incidents of such poisoning.

The Lead-Based Paint Poisoning Prevention Act specifies, however, that only "units of general local government in any State" are eligible for grants under title I and title II. This means that Rhode Island is ineligible to receive funds under the provisions of this act. In July of 1966 a State law abolished all local health departments and offices and placed all these matters under the jurisdiction of the State department of health. This was done in an effort to coordinate and improve our health services.

I am today introducing legislation to amend the Lead-Based Paint Poisoning Prevention Act to permit grants to be made to a State agency in any case where local agencies are prevented by State law from receiving and expending such grants.

It is extremely important that every area and every State in our country be eligible to receive funds to combat lead poisoning. I might add here that the State of Delaware has the same situation as Rhode Island, with the health units being operated on a statewide basis.

The problem of childhood lead poisoning is reaching epidemic proportions in most of the large cities in our Nation. In the State of Rhode Island, the incidence of lead poisoning is also growing. Between 1960 and 1970 there were 63 cases of lead poisoning treated in our hospitals. During the 9-month period from April 1970 to December 1970, on the

other hand, 200 children were found to have elevated blood levels and 65 of them were hospitalized. So far this year the State Health Department has screened 1,183 children. Fifty-two were referred to hospital clinics because of elevated blood levels.

Mr. Speaker, Rhode Island needs assistance in their efforts to detect and treat lead poisoning. The amendment I introduce today would merely clarify an innocent error in the original bill so that Rhode Island and Delaware children would not be excluded from Federal assistance. It is my hope that this bill will receive early consideration and passage.

The bill follows:

A bill to amend the Lead-Based Paint Poisoning Prevention Act to permit grants thereunder to be made to a State agency in any case where local agencies are prevented by State law from receiving and expending such grants

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That title V of the Lead-Based Paint Poisoning Prevention Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"AUTHORITY TO MAKE GRANTS TO STATE AGENCIES IN CERTAIN CASES

"Sec. 504. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, grants under sections 101 and 201 may be made to an agency of State government in any case where units of general local government within the State are prevented by State law from receiving such grants or from expending such grants in accordance with their intended purpose; and in any such case the term 'local' when used in section 101 or 201 with respect to any program shall be deemed to read 'State'."

STRANGE BEDFELLOWS ATTACK FBI

HON. SAMUEL L. DEVINE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 27, 1971

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, once again the Federal Bureau of Investigation comes under fire from the radical left. Apparently the critics of Mr. Hoover's organization never tire of attacking him or the accomplishments of the FBI. This weekend at Princeton University in New Jersey, a group known as the Committee for Public Justice will undertake to conduct an "objective" review of the Bureau's activities.

A look at the background of the public-spirited citizens, scholars, and experts who will assemble to investigate the Nation's top investigators is most informative—all are avowed enemies of the FBI. William F. Buckley's column in the Evening Star on October 25 provides some revealing insights into the political affiliations of the conferees, which the American people are entitled to know. Mr. Buckley's article is, therefore, included in its entirety:

IS IT PUBLIC JUSTICE OR JUST HOOVER BAITING?

(By William F. Buckley, Jr.)

A gentleman at Princeton University got the idea a while ago that it would be inter-

esting to inquire into the nature of something. So he founded the Committee for Public Justice.

Having founded a Committee for Public Justice, the question naturally arose, public justice for whom? The answer was obvious: Public justice for victims of—J. Edgar Hoover. The first extensive meeting is scheduled to be held at the Woodrow Wilson School in Princeton Friday and Saturday, and it is fearfully predictable that they will talk about the deficiencies of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

It is strange that a committee so self-advertisedly concerned with justice should solicit, in the name of estimating the usefulness of the FBI, the services of men who are, some of them, anti-FBI nuts. I say nuts, because criticism of the FBI needs to be evaluated with some reference to the evaluator's general view of things. If there is anyone on the masthead of the new committee who has given 10 minutes' fruitful thought to the question of crime and punishment, with the possible exception of Norman Dorsen of the ACLU, then there will be headlines indeed out of Princeton this weekend, to celebrate the discovery of crime by this set.

The most conspicuous figure in the executive council is Ramsey Clark. Clark, who is a splendid fellow, wrote, alas, the most perverse book about morals since De Sade, the jurisprudential equivalent of "The Greening of America". On top of that, Clark and Hoover, who was a subordinate of Clark for a few years, in the sense that Marshal Montgomery was a subordinate to King George V, were exchanging epithets a year or so ago.

Then there is, of all people, Lillian Hellman who, notwithstanding her great resourcefulness as a dramatist, could only think, in 1952, to answer questions about her involvement with the Communist party with mutterings about the 5th Amendment. Burke Marshall was an assistant attorney general during the Kennedy years, and in pursuit of public justice rushed to Chappaquiddick not at the urging of Mr. and Mrs. Kopechne, but of Sen. Kennedy.

Oh, it is a wonderful list! Did you know that Warren Beatty was interested in public justice?

Jules Feiffer is there, to protest what a spokesman for the committee has described as "political repression," which is to be defined, one gathers, as resistance to the burning down of ROTC buildings. J. Fred Cook is best known as having discovered that the FBI framed Alger Hiss.

Frank Donner also pleaded the 5th Amendment about his connections with the Communist party. Martin Peretz of Harvard, the philanthropist of the hard left, is still dazed from the anti-Semitic talk he ran into during one of the caucuses which, as I remember, he got the bill for.

Shirley MacLaine will be consulted. We never can remember whether Shirley MacLaine is Shelley Winters, and which of the two is related, and how, to Warren Beatty though it is good to know that they are both related by their common thirst for public justice. There is a military man. Who? You guessed it, former Marine Commandant Gen. David Shoup, who has been talking about American war crimes ever since the Viet Cong launched their reign of terror. And Candice Bergen, Mrs. Marshall Field, Mrs. Elinor Gimbel, and—Charles Goodell.

Other contributors to Princeton's search for expanding the vocabulary of anti-Hooverism are Paul Newman, who will contribute the facial expressions; Mike Nichols, who will direct them; and Arthur Schlesinger Jr., who will write the history of the Committee for Public Justice, which will be the shortest book he ever wrote, meaning that there is something in public justice for all of us.

WETLANDS LEGISLATION

HON. WILLIAM B. SPONG, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 27, 1971

Mr. SPONG. Mr. President, it was my privilege last Friday to discuss the pollution problems of Chesapeake Bay and the need for a Virginia wetlands statute at the annual banquet meeting of the York chapter of the Chesapeake Bay Foundation.

I emphasized in my remarks that the cumulative impact of the gradual loss of wetlands poses serious ecological problems because the bay must be regarded as a system. Each facet of the system is interrelated.

The conservation provisions of the new Virginia constitution are the foundation upon which to build a body of law to protect and preserve our wetland resources. Hopefully, the Virginia Wetlands Study Commission will recommend such measures to the 1972 session of the general assembly and that the legislation will be enacted by our State lawmakers.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of my remarks be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

SPEECH TO THE CHESAPEAKE BAY FOUNDATION

It is a pleasure to appear before a group whose purpose is to preserve the environmental integrity of Chesapeake Bay. This body of water—the country's largest estuary—has served a remarkable diversity of needs since it was first described by English settlers at Jamestown as "the noblest bay in the universe."

The Bay is one of the oldest and richest fishing grounds along the shores of the United States. The dockside value of the annual harvest of fish and shellfish amounts to well over \$30 million. The two major ports on the Bay handle in excess of 100 million tons of cargo a year. This waterborne commerce makes an immense contribution to Virginia's economic well-being.

In addition, Chesapeake Bay forms the nucleus for hundreds of thousands of recreational visitors who participate in hundreds of outdoor and water-related activities.

Our prodigious use of Chesapeake Bay presents many problems. The many industries and municipalities lining the Bay use this resource as a place to discharge their wastes. Shipping and navigation require dredging and filling. These uses frequently cause oil spills and discharges of toxic materials. Treated sewage over-enriches the waters of the Bay, and poisonous industrial wastes sap their vitality. Even such aesthetic uses as filling for housing or recreation have serious adverse effects upon the estuary.

Pollution has caused extensive damage to the oyster industry in localized areas. The National Estuary Study conducted by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service estimated that 42,000 acres of shellfish grounds on Chesapeake Bay have been closed because of domestic sewage pollution. Loss of production from these areas was estimated at 1½ million pounds of shellfish worth about \$1 million.

Public concern over pollution has resulted in the enactment of stringent new laws to cope with discharges into the nation's waterways. The statutes haven't been implemented as quickly as I had hoped, but the delays may be attributed in large measure to a lack

of funds. The situation has improved rather dramatically over the past three years. From Fiscal 1969 through Fiscal 1972 the Congressional appropriation for the federal grant program for construction of local sewage treatment plants has risen from \$214 million to \$2 billion. The program has been aptly described as the bellwether of political concern over the environment. I have no hesitancy in predicting that the appropriation for Fiscal 1973 and subsequent years will be even larger.

Pollution is an offensive problem, but the need to preserve our wetlands is an equally serious matter which deserves immediate attention. Like most of the man-made changes around the Bay, the loss of wetlands has been so gradual that it hasn't seemed to do much harm. A bayside cottage built on a filled marshland here and a motel there would appear to constitute negligible decreases in the bay's food system.

However, the cumulative impact of this nibbling phenomenon—as I like to call it—has been far from negligible. The Department of the Interior has said that Virginia lost five per cent of its wetlands during the period 1954 to 1966. The Department estimated that at the current rate eighteen per cent of the Bay's present wetland habitats will be lost by the year 2000.

Wetlands are important because they are the major food source and habitat for an enormous variety of birds, fish and other wildlife. At least two-thirds of the world's entire fisheries harvest spends an essential portion of its life cycle in estuarine wetlands, or is dependent upon species that do.

It can be argued, I suppose, that each marsh that is lost is not important to an ecosystem as large as Chesapeake Bay. That attitude, however, disregards the fact that some species—like the blue crab—use the entire system for their life cycles. Some, like the rock fish, use the fresh water rivers for spawning and the rest of the bay as a nursery.

Scientists tell us that we must look at the bay as a system and that each facet of the system is inter-related. They also tell us that we must stop making changes with little idea of what the changes may bring. In layman's terms, our attitude toward the bay has been comparable to a man jumping from a ten-story building, and saying as he passed the fourth floor—"so far, so good."

The conservation provisions of the new Virginia Constitution are the foundation upon which to build a body of law to protect and preserve our wetland resources. I hope the Virginia Wetlands Study Commission will recommend such measures to the 1972 session of the General Assembly, and that the legislation will be enacted by our state lawmakers.

Such action would dovetail with a bill which I hope will soon be cleared by the Senate Commerce Committee for action on the Senate floor. As a member of the Committee and of its Subcommittee on Oceanography, it was my privilege to cosponsor the measure and to participate in hearings on it. A few details have not yet been worked out, but I would like to review with you this evening its essential provisions.

First the bill provides for grants to assist the states in the development of management programs for the land and water resources of the coastal and estuarine zone. The grants could be in an amount up to two-thirds of the cost of developing management programs. There are provisions in the measure to assure full participation in the developmental stage by local governments, and public and private organizations.

Second, grants would be provided to assist in the cost of administering the management programs of the coastal states. These too would amount to two-thirds of the cost.

Other sections of the bill permit adoption of a management program in segments so that immediate attention may be devoted to

areas of critical environmental concern, and specify that coastal states receiving these funds must have the authority for management of the coastal and estuarine zone.

Finally, and perhaps most significantly, the legislation authorizes grants of up to 50 per cent of the cost of acquiring, developing and managing estuarine sanctuaries. These would serve as natural field laboratories in which data would be collected and studies made of the natural and human processes occurring within the estuaries of the coastal and estuarine zone.

I believe you will agree that this bill would complement state action. I hope the General Assembly not only will establish the legislative machinery to protect our wetland resources, but will create a fund to acquire those wetlands considered most important.

The enactment of federal and state legislation should give impetus to the development of a hydraulic model of the Chesapeake Bay, a project which unfortunately is lagging. The model is a part of a study first authorized in 1965 to develop a comprehensive plan to maintain the environmental integrity of the bay. The problem has been that only a small portion of the necessary funds has been appropriated. The House Appropriations Committee deferred action on a \$2.4 million budget request this year which would have enabled federal and state officials to expedite work on the model. The Committee has questioned the cost of the study, and the cost of the model.

Because the Bay is situated in a rapidly expanding industrial and urban complex, it is as vulnerable to the adverse effects of man as any other estuarine system in the world. Without the model, the study would not provide data on the Bay's water quality, sedimentation and ecological problems. I hope that the funds necessary to expedite this important work will be forthcoming next year. I shall do my part to see that they are appropriated.

The legislation and projects I have discussed thus far really are only the framework of a far more important objective. Please don't misunderstand. The protection and preservation of the Chesapeake Bay are important problems which must be resolved. However, we are talking essentially about repairing damage that has already been done, and taking steps to prevent further harm.

As a matter of national policy, we also should be thinking in terms of developing mechanisms to assess the environmental impact of man's technological innovations and activities before they get into the market place. If we have learned anything from the past, it is the realization that once technology is turned on and incorporated into the nation's commercial fabric, turning it off or attempting to curtail it involves economic disruption, political strife and many other unpleasanties. This of course is aside from the environmental considerations involved.

We traditionally have assumed that our resources of air, water and land could be used as a dumping ground until someone in government could prove that a given activity was harmful. As a consequence of that attitude, the ability of our resources to assimilate these wastes has been grossly over-extended. This point was dramatically brought out Monday in testimony by Jacques Cousteau, the internationally known oceanographer before the Senate Subcommittee on Oceans and Atmosphere. Captain Cousteau said he could foresee the end of the earth in another 30 to 50 years unless steps are taken now to protect the ocean environment.

It seems to me that the time has come when the burden of proof should be reversed. In view of the damage already caused, and the cost to repair it, there is a clear need to modify some of our live-and-let-live economic policies as they affect the public and its right to a decent environment.

It would be desirable in my judgment to require those wishing to discharge materials or introduce new substances to show on a before-the-fact basis that their activities would have no adverse environmental impact.

This authority would have to be exercised with great care and reason. The United States is a world leader because of its technological innovations. It would not be in the public interest to stifle the genius of our businessmen, scientists and engineers. No one can predict the inventions which will be developed in the next decade. As these technological gains accelerate, so will the need to assess their impact, and to minimize or avoid their adverse effects.

A healthy trend has already begun to require a before-the-fact assessment of a wide range of activities. The National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 is a good example of what I mean. That statute requires all agencies of the federal government to include an environmental impact statement with every recommendation or report on proposals for legislation and other major federal actions significantly affecting the quality of the human environment.

The Federal Water Quality Act of 1970, the Airport and Airways Development Act of 1970, and the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1970 contain provisions which require that consideration be given to environmental factors.

Hopefully, as we seek to improve the quality of our environment we won't bounce from the extreme of development-at-any-cost to preservation at any cost. Our objective should be to achieve both an improved physical environment and an increase in the economic well-being of the general citizenry. We must seek a partnership between man and nature in which man's varied needs are in harmony with nature's processes and resources. This won't be an easy task, because the extremes of development and preservation will continually be in conflict.

As members of an organization interested in resolving environmental problems you no doubt want to know where the general public

fits into the picture. Congress has attempted to respond to citizen demands for a cleaner environment by including explicit provisions in anti-pollution legislation for fuller participation by the public. There are requirements for public hearings on air and water quality standards, and on construction projects. It was my privilege to be personally involved in the development of provisions in last year's Clean Air Amendments which authorize court action by citizens to assure enforcement of air quality standards, and of plans to implement the standards. I am confident that the privilege of bringing citizen suits will be extended to other statutes dealing with environmental quality.

Encouraging citizen participation reflects an awareness by lawmakers that the environment is truly a national issue—a concern of Americans in all walks of life. Public opinion polls rate environmental quality as a top domestic concern. There are those who believe that the concern is simply a passing fad and who doubt that we will have the will and the persistence to resolve environmental problems. I disagree.

The environmental ethic, relatively speaking, is still in its infancy. But I don't believe it is a fad. Laws to control pollution and to preserve and protect our resources will be refined as new circumstances arise, but in my judgment the pursuit of environmental quality is firmly embedded in the American conscience.

taining administration requests for supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 1972, that the Office of Management and Budget is asking for a total of \$1,020,989,154.

But in this billion dollar request, there is only one item for the Office of Education, less than \$20 million sought for education activities under title IV of the Civil Rights Act. There is not one suggestion that the Federal Government should add to the 1972 budget sums to which school districts are entitled by act of Congress.

Earlier this year, school superintendents of the San Diego Unified School District and the Alameda Unified School District warned of the serious situation that is caused by the failure of the Congress to provide money under Public Law 874, the impacted areas legislation, resulting in additional burdens to the local tax base. If there is one urgent need in the United States, it is in the area of school finance. Additional funds are badly needed by school systems of every size, rural and urban, and especially those who have been charged with the education of the children of parents serving in the armed services, at home and abroad.

We have committed the interest of the Congress to the education of all American children, specifically including those whose parents are serving their country. We should honor these commitments.

The payments due these school districts are a debt that should be paid. It can be discharged in the Urgent Supplemental Act.

I have had prepared a chart which sets forth on a State-by-State basis, the differences between what has been allowed to date and what is owed. I include the chart to which I have alluded in the RECORD at this point in my remarks:

IMPACTED AREAS FUNDING NEEDS TRULY URGENT IN FISCAL YEAR 1972

HON. LIONEL VAN DEERLIN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 27, 1971

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, I note from House Document 92-164, con-

PUBLIC LAW 874, 1971-72—ENTITLEMENT, APPROPRIATIONS, DEFICIENCY

(In thousands of dollars)

| | Sec. 3(a) | Sec. 3(b) and others | Sec. 6 | Low-cost housing | Total | | Sec. 3(a) | Sec. 3(b) and others | Sec. 6 | Low-cost housing | Total | |
|---------------------|---|---|-------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-------------|------------------|---|---|-------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---------|--|
| | Child lives on Federal property; parent works on Federal property | Child lives on private property; parent works on Federal property | Base schools operated by USOE | Children living in public housing | | | Child lives on Federal property; parent works on Federal property | Child lives on private property; parent works on Federal property | Base schools operated by USOE | Children living in public housing | | |
| Grand total | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Entitlement | \$188,100 | \$512,640 | \$37,700 | \$300,000 | \$1,038,440 | Delaware: | | | | | | |
| Appropriation | 178,090 | 376,790 | 37,700 | 592,580 | 592,580 | Entitlement | \$16 | \$548 | \$1,638 | \$614 | \$2,816 | |
| Deficiency | 10,010 | 135,850 | 0 | 300,000 | 445,860 | Appropriation | 14 | 402 | 1,638 | | 2,054 | |
| | | | | | | Deficiency | 2 | 146 | | 614 | 762 | |
| Alabama: | | | | | | Florida: | | | | | | |
| Entitlement | 973 | 10,643 | 1,890 | 9,096 | 22,602 | Entitlement | 5,959 | 18,517 | 682 | 7,124 | 32,282 | |
| Appropriation | 876 | 7,799 | 1,890 | | 10,565 | Appropriation | 5,363 | 13,567 | 682 | | 19,612 | |
| Deficiency | 97 | 2,844 | | 9,096 | 12,037 | Deficiency | 596 | 4,950 | | 7,124 | 12,670 | |
| Alaska: | | | | | | Georgia: | | | | | | |
| Entitlement | 17,481 | 4,650 | | 354 | 22,485 | Entitlement | 1,584 | 17,059 | 4,803 | 11,467 | 34,913 | |
| Appropriation | 17,257 | 3,614 | | | 20,871 | Appropriation | 1,426 | 12,499 | 4,803 | | 18,728 | |
| Deficiency | 224 | 1,036 | | 354 | 1,614 | Deficiency | 158 | 4,560 | | 11,467 | 16,185 | |
| Arizona: | | | | | | Hawaii: | | | | | | |
| Entitlement | 8,281 | 6,117 | | 1,269 | 15,667 | Entitlement | 6,732 | 6,881 | | 1,238 | 14,851 | |
| Appropriation | 8,060 | 4,564 | | | 12,624 | Appropriation | 6,059 | 5,041 | | | 11,100 | |
| Deficiency | 221 | 1,553 | | 1,269 | 3,043 | Deficiency | 673 | 1,840 | | 1,238 | 3,751 | |
| Arkansas: | | | | | | Idaho: | | | | | | |
| Entitlement | 1,180 | 2,759 | | 2,418 | 6,357 | Entitlement | 1,321 | 2,973 | | 121 | 4,415 | |
| Appropriation | 1,099 | 2,027 | | 3,126 | 5,252 | Appropriation | 1,251 | 2,187 | | | 3,438 | |
| Deficiency | 81 | 732 | | 2,418 | 3,231 | Deficiency | 70 | 786 | | 121 | 977 | |
| California: | | | | | | Illinois: | | | | | | |
| Entitlement | 29,875 | 77,121 | 570 | 16,697 | 123,750 | Entitlement | 5,270 | 14,479 | | 25,843 | 45,592 | |
| Appropriation | 28,137 | 56,674 | 570 | | 84,868 | Appropriation | 5,122 | 10,661 | | | 15,783 | |
| Deficiency | 1,738 | 20,447 | | 16,697 | 38,882 | Deficiency | 148 | 3,818 | | 25,843 | 29,809 | |
| Colorado: | | | | | | Indiana: | | | | | | |
| Entitlement | 3,463 | 14,439 | | 1,780 | 19,682 | Entitlement | 1,056 | 4,624 | | 3,170 | 8,850 | |
| Appropriation | 3,333 | 10,606 | | | 13,939 | Appropriation | 1,024 | 3,398 | | | 4,422 | |
| Deficiency | 130 | 3,833 | | 1,780 | 5,743 | Deficiency | 32 | 1,226 | | 3,170 | 4,428 | |
| Connecticut: | | | | | | Iowa: | | | | | | |
| Entitlement | 1,887 | 3,884 | | 6,438 | 12,209 | Entitlement | 109 | 2,806 | | 575 | 3,490 | |
| Appropriation | 1,854 | 2,867 | | 4,721 | 5,442 | Appropriation | 98 | 2,055 | | | 2,153 | |
| Deficiency | 33 | 1,017 | | 6,438 | 7,488 | Deficiency | 11 | 751 | | 575 | 1,337 | |

PUBLIC LAW 874, 1971-72—ENTITLEMENT, APPROPRIATIONS, DEFICIENCY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

| | Sec. 3(a) | Sec. 3(b) and others | Sec. 6 | Low-cost housing | Total | | Sec. 3(a) | Sec. 3(b) and others | Sec. 6 | Low-cost housing | Total |
|------------------------|---|---|-------------------------------|-----------------------------------|----------|------------------------------|---|---|-------------------------------|-----------------------------------|----------|
| | Child lives on Federal property; parent works on Federal property | Child lives on private property; parent works on Federal property | Base schools operated by USOE | Children living in public housing | | | Child lives on Federal property; parent works on Federal property | Child lives on private property; parent works on Federal property | Base schools operated by USOE | Children living in public housing | |
| Kansas: | | | | | | Oklahoma: | | | | | |
| Entitlement..... | \$4,323 | \$8,256 | \$23 | \$901 | \$13,503 | Entitlement..... | \$4,363 | \$13,049 | | \$1,517 | \$18,929 |
| Appropriation..... | 4,155 | 6,084 | 23 | | 10,262 | Appropriation..... | 4,027 | 9,573 | | | 13,600 |
| Deficiency..... | 168 | 2,172 | | 901 | 3,241 | Deficiency..... | 336 | 3,476 | | 1,517 | 5,329 |
| Kentucky: | | | | | | Oregon: | | | | | |
| Entitlement..... | 67 | 5,383 | 5,536 | 896 | 11,882 | Entitlement..... | 1,351 | 3,703 | \$3 | 2,645 | 7,702 |
| Appropriation..... | 60 | 3,944 | 5,536 | | 9,540 | Appropriation..... | 1,227 | 2,714 | 3 | | 3,944 |
| Deficiency..... | 7 | 1,439 | | 896 | 2,342 | Deficiency..... | 124 | 989 | | 2,645 | 3,758 |
| Louisiana: | | | | | | Pennsylvania: | | | | | |
| Entitlement..... | 763 | 3,908 | 337 | 5,746 | 10,754 | Entitlement..... | 809 | 11,476 | 4 | 19,766 | 32,055 |
| Appropriation..... | 687 | 2,863 | 337 | | 3,887 | Appropriation..... | 728 | 8,407 | 4 | | 9,139 |
| Deficiency..... | 76 | 1,045 | | 5,746 | 6,867 | Deficiency..... | 81 | 3,069 | | 19,766 | 22,916 |
| Maine: | | | | | | Rhode Island: | | | | | |
| Entitlement..... | 2,272 | 2,304 | | 470 | 5,046 | Entitlement..... | 2,166 | 3,147 | | 3,418 | 8,731 |
| Appropriation..... | 2,133 | 1,699 | | | 3,832 | Appropriation..... | 2,001 | 2,314 | | | 4,315 |
| Deficiency..... | 139 | 605 | | 470 | 1,214 | Deficiency..... | 165 | 833 | | 3,418 | 4,416 |
| Maryland: | | | | | | South Carolina: | | | | | |
| Entitlement..... | 3,568 | 33,193 | | 5,023 | 41,784 | Entitlement..... | 2,326 | 7,493 | 2,303 | 2,237 | 14,359 |
| Appropriation..... | 3,211 | 24,320 | | | 27,531 | Appropriation..... | 2,093 | 5,490 | 2,303 | | 9,886 |
| Deficiency..... | 357 | 8,873 | | 5,023 | 34,253 | Deficiency..... | 233 | 2,003 | | 2,237 | 4,473 |
| Massachusetts: | | | | | | South Dakota: | | | | | |
| Entitlement..... | 5,543 | 13,526 | 1,500 | 14,085 | 34,634 | Entitlement..... | 3,460 | 2,061 | | 411 | 5,932 |
| Appropriation..... | 5,285 | 9,953 | 1,500 | | 16,738 | Appropriation..... | 3,357 | 1,543 | | | 4,900 |
| Deficiency..... | 238 | 3,573 | | 14,085 | 17,896 | Deficiency..... | 103 | 518 | | 411 | 1,032 |
| Michigan: | | | | | | Tennessee: | | | | | |
| Entitlement..... | 3,722 | 3,434 | | 6,755 | 33,911 | Entitlement..... | 848 | 9,120 | | 7,954 | 17,922 |
| Appropriation..... | 3,582 | 2,547 | | | 6,129 | Appropriation..... | 763 | 6,682 | | | 7,445 |
| Deficiency..... | 140 | 887 | | 6,755 | 7,782 | Deficiency..... | 85 | 2,438 | | 7,954 | 10,477 |
| Minnesota: | | | | | | Texas: | | | | | |
| Entitlement..... | 1,122 | 3,803 | | 4,009 | 8,934 | Entitlement..... | 9,202 | 35,605 | | 11,365 | 56,172 |
| Appropriation..... | 1,062 | 2,793 | | | 3,855 | Appropriation..... | 8,723 | 26,146 | | | 34,869 |
| Deficiency..... | 60 | 1,010 | | 4,009 | 5,079 | Deficiency..... | 479 | 9,459 | | 11,365 | 21,303 |
| Mississippi: | | | | | | Utah: | | | | | |
| Entitlement..... | 1,203 | 2,507 | | 2,000 | 5,710 | Entitlement..... | 1,418 | 9,167 | | 15 | 10,600 |
| Appropriation..... | 1,083 | 1,837 | | | 2,920 | Appropriation..... | 1,304 | 6,720 | | | 8,024 |
| Deficiency..... | 120 | 670 | | 2,000 | 2,790 | Deficiency..... | 114 | 2,447 | | 15 | 2,576 |
| Missouri: | | | | | | Vermont: | | | | | |
| Entitlement..... | 2,326 | 9,556 | | 4,624 | 16,506 | Entitlement..... | 7 | 193 | | 269 | 469 |
| Appropriation..... | 2,306 | 7,030 | | | 9,336 | Appropriation..... | 6 | 142 | | | 148 |
| Deficiency..... | 20 | 2,526 | | 4,624 | 7,170 | Deficiency..... | 1 | 51 | | 269 | 321 |
| Montana: | | | | | | Virginia: | | | | | |
| Entitlement..... | 4,028 | 2,319 | | 428 | 6,775 | Entitlement..... | 5,918 | 44,294 | 2,330 | 5,292 | 57,834 |
| Appropriation..... | 3,858 | 1,730 | | | 5,588 | Appropriation..... | 5,326 | 32,452 | 2,330 | | 40,108 |
| Deficiency..... | 170 | 589 | | 428 | 1,187 | Deficiency..... | 592 | 11,842 | | 5,292 | 17,726 |
| Nebraska: | | | | | | Washington: | | | | | |
| Entitlement..... | 3,178 | 3,944 | | 3,015 | 10,137 | Entitlement..... | 5,896 | 13,138 | | 3,755 | 22,789 |
| Appropriation..... | 3,131 | 2,927 | | | 6,058 | Appropriation..... | 5,659 | 9,673 | | | 15,332 |
| Deficiency..... | 47 | 1,017 | | 3,015 | 4,079 | Deficiency..... | 237 | 3,465 | | 3,755 | 7,457 |
| Nevada: | | | | | | West Virginia: | | | | | |
| Entitlement..... | 1,597 | 3,144 | | 675 | 5,416 | Entitlement..... | 26 | 768 | | 900 | 1,694 |
| Appropriation..... | 1,465 | 2,308 | | | 3,773 | Appropriation..... | 23 | 562 | | | 585 |
| Deficiency..... | 132 | 836 | | 675 | 1,643 | Deficiency..... | 3 | 206 | | 900 | 1,109 |
| New Hampshire: | | | | | | Wisconsin: | | | | | |
| Entitlement..... | 923 | 1,991 | | 1,186 | 4,100 | Entitlement..... | 669 | 2,598 | | 2,813 | 6,080 |
| Appropriation..... | 919 | 1,470 | | | 2,389 | Appropriation..... | 606 | 1,906 | | | 2,512 |
| Deficiency..... | 4 | 521 | | 1,186 | 1,711 | Deficiency..... | 63 | 692 | | 2,813 | 3,568 |
| New Jersey: | | | | | | Wyoming: | | | | | |
| Entitlement..... | 4,543 | 13,167 | | 19,485 | 37,195 | Entitlement..... | 1,568 | 1,222 | | 78 | 2,868 |
| Appropriation..... | 4,431 | 9,694 | | | 14,125 | Appropriation..... | 1,497 | 908 | | | 2,405 |
| Deficiency..... | 112 | 3,473 | | 19,485 | 23,070 | Deficiency..... | 71 | 314 | | 78 | 463 |
| New Mexico: | | | | | | Guam: | | | | | |
| Entitlement..... | 8,626 | 7,857 | | 691 | 17,174 | Entitlement..... | 1,771 | 1,402 | | 71 | 3,244 |
| Appropriation..... | 8,196 | 5,817 | | | 14,013 | Appropriation..... | 1,594 | 1,027 | | | 2,621 |
| Deficiency..... | 430 | 2,040 | | 691 | 3,161 | Deficiency..... | 177 | 375 | | 71 | 623 |
| New York: | | | | | | Puerto Rico: | | | | | |
| Entitlement..... | 5,928 | 17,723 | 1,458,000 | 48,918 | 74,027 | Entitlement..... | | 753 | 7,688 | 7,423 | 15,864 |
| Appropriation..... | 5,515 | 13,010 | 1,458,000 | | 19,983 | Appropriation..... | | 551 | 7,688 | | 8,239 |
| Deficiency..... | 413 | 4,713 | | 48,918 | 54,044 | Deficiency..... | | 202 | | 7,423 | 7,625 |
| North Carolina: | | | | | | Virgin Islands: | | | | | |
| Entitlement..... | 1,771 | 7,622 | 7,114 | 5,571 | 22,258 | Entitlement..... | | 147 | | 614 | 761 |
| Appropriation..... | 1,594 | 5,585 | 7,114 | | 14,293 | Appropriation..... | | 108 | | | 108 |
| Deficiency..... | 177 | 2,037 | | 5,571 | 7,965 | Deficiency..... | | 39 | | 614 | 653 |
| North Dakota: | | | | | | Wake Island: | | | | | |
| Entitlement..... | 3,764 | 762 | | 277 | 4,803 | Entitlement..... | | | 328 | | 328 |
| Appropriation..... | 3,703 | 601 | | | 4,304 | Appropriation..... | | | 328 | | 328 |
| Deficiency..... | 61 | 161 | | 277 | 499 | Deficiency..... | | | 0 | | 0 |
| Ohio: | | | | | | District of Columbia: | | | | | |
| Entitlement..... | 1,586 | 13,712 | | 12,261 | 27,559 | Entitlement..... | 282 | 7,693 | 6 | 4,057 | 12,038 |
| Appropriation..... | 1,553 | 10,063 | | | 11,616 | Appropriation..... | 254 | 5,636 | 6 | | 5,896 |
| Deficiency..... | 33 | 3,649 | | 12,261 | 15,943 | Deficiency..... | 28 | 2,057 | | 4,057 | 6,142 |

Mr. Speaker, the Congress in its wisdom assumed a further commitment to certain of our school districts when it authorized payments on behalf of the education of children living in public housing units. No money has, as yet, been provided for this aid to many of our larger school systems whose financial condition is in a particularly perilous state. Aid which was granted to Penn Central by the Congress, ought to be

paralleled by aid to Philadelphia schools. A chart showing how just one-third of the \$300 million authorized would be allocated can, I am confident, be of interest to many of my colleagues who represent such districts.

I include a chart prepared by the Council of the Great City Schools showing this distribution at this point in my remarks:

THE COUNCIL OF THE GREAT CITY SCHOOLS—RESEARCH DIVISION
ESTIMATED GRANTS FOR PUBLIC HOUSING BASED ON \$100,000,000 APPROPRIATION

| City | Projected number of children | Estimated grant |
|-------------------------|------------------------------|-----------------|
| Akron, Ohio..... | 4,208 | \$355,080 |
| Albany, N.Y..... | 2,528 | 327,694 |
| Albuquerque, M.Nex..... | 2,040 | 71,843 |

THE COUNCIL OF THE GREAT CITY SCHOOLS—RESEARCH
DIVISION—Continued
ESTIMATED GRANTS FOR PUBLIC HOUSING BASED ON
\$100,000,000 APPROPRIATION—Continued

| City | Projected number of children | Estimated grant |
|-----------------------|------------------------------|-----------------|
| Allentown, Pa. | 1,431 | \$126,556 |
| Amarillo, Tex. | 0 | 0 |
| Anaheim, Calif. | 0 | 0 |
| Atlanta, Ga. | 19,600 | 1,353,779 |
| Austin, Tex. | 1,755 | 124,394 |
| Baltimore, Md. | 18,490 | 1,651,703 |
| Baton Rouge, La. | 1,196 | 82,620 |
| Beaumont, Tex. | 845 | 59,894 |
| Berkeley, Calif. | 1,430 | 128,126 |
| Birmingham, Ala. | 8,869 | 612,733 |
| Boston, Mass. | 26,159 | 3,207,829 |
| Bridgeport, Conn. | 3,783 | 434,099 |
| Buffalo, N.Y. | 6,354 | 923,520 |
| Cambridge, Mass. | 1,884 | 230,988 |
| Camden, N.J. | 2,825 | 338,141 |
| Canton, Ohio | 0 | 0 |
| Charlotte, N.C. | 4,781 | 330,299 |
| Chattanooga, Tenn. | 4,005 | 276,686 |
| Chicago, Ill. | 54,864 | 5,863,853 |
| Cincinnati, Ohio | 9,698 | 818,317 |
| Cleveland, Ohio | 16,575 | 1,398,598 |
| Columbus, Ga. | 2,655 | 183,353 |
| Columbus, Ohio | 8,653 | 730,140 |
| Corpus Christi, Tex. | 2,309 | 163,648 |
| Dallas, Tex. | 9,590 | 679,746 |
| Dayton, Ohio | 4,869 | 410,840 |
| Dearborn, Mich. | 433 | 36,623 |
| Denver, Colo. | 5,909 | 557,117 |
| Des Moines, Iowa | 650 | 61,276 |
| Detroit, Mich. | 13,134 | 1,111,128 |
| Duluth, Minn. | 1,459 | 111,918 |
| Elizabeth, N.J. | 2,051 | 245,553 |
| El Paso, Tex. | 6,960 | 493,239 |
| Erie, Pa. | 1,997 | 176,557 |
| Evansville, Ind. | 1,535 | 118,495 |
| Flint, Mich. | 1,781 | 150,674 |
| Fort Wayne, Ind. | 555 | 42,843 |
| Fort Worth, Tex. | 1,396 | 98,963 |
| Fresno, Calif. | 2,386 | 197,519 |
| Gary, Ind. | 3,224 | 248,828 |
| Glendale, Calif. | 0 | 0 |
| Grand Rapids, Mich. | 426 | 36,073 |
| Greensboro, N.C. | 3,041 | 210,052 |
| Hammond, Ind. | 779 | 60,100 |
| Hartford, Conn. | 4,018 | 461,100 |
| Honolulu, Hawaii | 4,841 | 344,209 |
| Houston, Tex. | 3,970 | 281,408 |
| Indianapolis, Ind. | 4,688 | 361,804 |
| Jackson, Miss. | 390 | 26,941 |
| Jacksonville, Fla. | 4,560 | 314,987 |
| Jersey City, N.J. | 5,205 | 623,062 |
| Kansas City, Kans. | 1,782 | 111,656 |
| Kansas City, Mo. | 3,507 | 269,894 |
| Knoxville, Tenn. | 4,830 | 333,622 |
| Lansing, Mich. | 1,097 | 92,823 |
| Lincoln, Neb. | 1,755 | 189,540 |
| Little Rock, Ark. | 1,840 | 127,073 |
| Long Beach, Calif. | 910 | 75,348 |
| Los Angeles, Calif. | 14,243 | 1,179,304 |
| Louisville, Ky. | 7,592 | 524,455 |
| Lubbock, Tex. | 476 | 33,725 |
| Madison, Wis. | 699 | 68,143 |
| Memphis, Tenn. | 9,084 | 625,036 |
| Miami, Fla. | 11,049 | 763,134 |
| Milwaukee, Wis. | 5,842 | 569,206 |
| Minneapolis, Minn. | 10,187 | 781,633 |
| Mobile, Ala. | 5,251 | 362,718 |
| Montgomery, Ala. | 3,593 | 248,218 |
| Nashville, Tenn. | 8,382 | 579,056 |
| New Bedford, Mass. | 3,453 | 423,417 |
| New Haven, Conn. | 2,467 | 283,134 |
| New Orleans, La. | 18,534 | 1,280,358 |
| New York, N.Y. | 106,690 | 14,215,837 |
| Newark, N.J. | 18,116 | 2,168,425 |
| Newport News, Va. | 2,213 | 181,168 |
| Niagara Falls, N.Y. | 1,013 | 131,246 |
| Norfolk, Va. | 4,836 | 395,972 |
| Oakland, Calif. | 6,080 | 503,432 |
| Oklahoma City, Okla. | 4,290 | 324,324 |
| Omaha, Nebr. | 4,645 | 501,650 |
| Pasadena, Calif. | 325 | 26,910 |
| Paterson, N.J. | 3,085 | 369,263 |
| Peoria, Ill. | 5,355 | 573,310 |
| Philadelphia, Pa. | 29,173 | 2,579,503 |
| Phoenix, Ariz. | 2,085 | 164,210 |
| Pittsburgh, Pa. | 14,689 | 1,298,775 |
| Portland, Oreg. | 5,075 | 606,385 |
| Portsmouth, Va. | 2,479 | 202,981 |
| Providence, R.I. | 4,516 | 486,756 |
| Richmond, Va. | 5,312 | 434,930 |
| Rochester, N.Y. | 2,570 | 233,065 |
| Rockford, Ill. | 2,188 | 233,843 |
| Sacramento, Calif. | 3,010 | 265,438 |
| St. Louis, Mo. | 12,613 | 970,540 |
| St. Paul, Minn. | 6,000 | 460,441 |
| St. Petersburg, Fla. | 1,232 | 85,122 |
| Salt Lake City, Utah | 0 | 0 |
| San Antonio, Tex. | 8,878 | 621,251 |
| San Diego, Calif. | 1,300 | 107,640 |
| San Francisco, Calif. | 10,793 | 893,627 |
| San Jose, Calif. | 1,937 | 170,843 |

| City | Projected number of children | Estimated grant |
|---------------------|------------------------------|-----------------|
| Santa Anna, Calif. | 0 | 0 |
| Savannah, Ga. | 3,666 | \$253,211 |
| Scranton, Pa. | 1,820 | 160,927 |
| Seattle, Wash. | 8,588 | 635,755 |
| Shreveport, La. | 761 | 52,535 |
| South Bend, Ind. | 1,268 | 97,864 |
| Spokane, Wash. | 0 | 0 |
| Springfield, Mass. | 1,511 | 185,245 |
| Syracuse, N.Y. | 3,012 | 390,368 |
| Tacoma, Wash. | 2,152 | 159,276 |
| Tampa, Fla. | 6,026 | 416,181 |
| Toledo, Ohio | 3,868 | 326,340 |
| Topeka, Kans. | 697 | 56,754 |
| Torrance, Calif. | 0 | 0 |
| Trenton, N.J. | 2,638 | 315,733 |
| Tucson, Ariz. | 1,010 | 79,545 |
| Tulsa, Okla. | 2,981 | 225,364 |
| Utica, N.Y. | 602 | 78,006 |
| Washington, D.C. | 15,652 | 1,394,593 |
| Waterbury, Conn. | 1,086 | 124,561 |
| Wichita, Kans. | 1,344 | 109,485 |
| Wichita Falls, Tex. | 104 | 7,362 |
| Winston-Salem, N.C. | 4,326 | 298,868 |
| Worcester, Mass. | 2,394 | 233,650 |
| Yonkers, N.Y. | 2,674 | 346,563 |
| Youngstown, Ohio | 382 | 116,605 |

THE SENATE HIGHER EDUCATION
BILL—AN OBLIGATION TO PEOPLE
RATHER THAN TO INSTITUTIONS

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 27, 1971

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, on August 6, the Senate passed by unanimous vote what the late Senator Prouty had dubbed a "landmark bill" for higher education. This comprehensive measure, S. 659, enjoyed the cosponsorship of every member of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, a historic first for a complex bill of this type.

In an address yesterday in New York City before the College Entrance Examination Board, the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. PELL), chairman of the Education Subcommittee and the principal sponsor of S. 659, stated with reference to the bill approved by the Senate:

The basic theme of the Senate bill is that the Federal Government has an obligation to people rather than to institutions. Under the Senate bill, institutions will receive assistance if they serve the people, and adapt to meet their needs. The Senate bill basically puts the decision-making in the hands of the "consumer" of educational services rather than in the "conduits" of those services. The Senate realized that the present institutional structure would not meet the needs of the consumers and, therefore, recommends a program to encourage the establishment of community colleges—institutions which, by definition, must meet the educational needs of the residents of the communities they serve.

Senator PELL's address is an important one, especially in the light of the debate now underway in the Congress on the subject of the thrust of higher education legislation. I ask unanimous consent that his speech be printed in the RECORD.

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

REMARKS OF SENATOR CLAIBORNE PELL

Thank you for that most kind of introduction. I should also like to express my appreciation at being invited to meet with you. It was an invitation accepted with pleasure. I must admit that some organiza-

tions representing the higher education establishment have not looked kindly upon my efforts as Chairman of the Education Subcommittee of the United States Senate and I welcome the opportunity to discuss with you just what we in the Senate sought to do in the recently passed Education Amendments of 1971, S. 659.

Our meeting today could not be more timely. The House is about to act on its higher education bill; and we will be meeting the House managers of the bill in conference committee very shortly. That conference will be the forum in which far-reaching decisions as to the future of higher education will be made. It could well be the most significant confrontation on higher education policy in this century. A basic philosophical difference between the two bills must be resolved: Will Federal policy be focused on people, on youngsters, and their needs, or will it focus primarily on the needs of institutions?

I shall not take the time to restate the multitude of problems which we are told will bring higher education to its knees within the next few years. Suffice it to say that the many reports, newspaper articles, statements, and television news reports of yet another college about to go bankrupt have created a climate conducive to meaningful action.

This spate of publicity, pessimistic though it has been, indicates that there finally is an awareness of, and a growing concern for, the problems of higher education.

These many articles and studies moan and groan. But what they fail to do, and this is most distressing to me, is to assert positively: "Yes, there are problems; they are a source of great concern; they are crucial; but they are problems with which we can deal!" I think this is a time of great opportunity for higher education, precisely because we have been made aware of its troubles and are beginning to approach those problems seriously and with dispatch.

Fortunately, the volume and intensity of expressions of concern for higher education coincided with the necessity for a reauthorization by the Congress of the Federal programs of assistance in higher education. The luck of fortune gave us a forum to discuss these well-defined problems and to chart a course for Federal involvement to meet them.

The Senate Subcommittee on Education first studied new higher education legislation in 1970, holding eleven days of hearings. We heard a large number of witnesses, but action was not taken. The climate was not right; nothing jelled; there was no consensus for action, either among the witnesses or the Subcommittee members.

This year, as we started a new set of hearings, I let it be known that I did not want to hear again a simple gloomy recitation of problems; I wanted ideas for solutions.

I introduced a bill with two major theses: the establishment as a policy of the Federal Government, the right of every youngster, regardless of his family's financial circumstances, to obtain education beyond high school and provision of a certain amount of direct aid to educational institutions which would follow the student receiving basic Federal assistance. In other words, the student receiving Federal help would carry with him a bonus to the institution that is to educate him.

The Administration offered its own proposal, which included some provisions for grants to students, but which appeared to shift the emphasis of Federal assistance to one of much greater reliance on loans, thus leaving to the individual student the ultimate burden of paying the costs of his education.

In addition to these two proposals, there were others advanced in the House of Representatives. It became clear early this year that the House proposals with regard to in-

stitutional aid, which provided for institutional aid on a straight per capita basis, were more to the liking of representatives of the higher education establishment than was mine.

With these various proposals in mind, the Subcommittee conducted fifteen days of hearings. By the time they were completed, I believe every member of our Subcommittee had been fully informed of the problems and the various proposals for solutions, and the Subcommittee accepted the principle that each qualified student should be guaranteed basic financial assistance, through grants, as a matter of right.

The development of thinking on institutional aid was interesting to watch. The Administration's view originally was negative. I am glad to say, though, that the question gradually changed from one of "yes" or "no" to one of "yes", but "how". And the Administration rethought its position and chose finally to support aid to institutions based on a percentage of the student assistance funds received by each institution.

After much soul searching and discussion, our Subcommittee on Education, and the full Committee on Labor and Public Welfare after it, unanimously reported out a bill that contained these two key provisions:

First, an entitlement for each student who is accepted at an accredited postsecondary institution of up to \$1,400, from which is subtracted a sum based on what a family could be expected to contribute.

Second, a plan for institutional aid that has the aid following our basic educational opportunity grants to the students.

Obviously, there is much more in the Senate bill, which is 247 pages in length. A new provision for emergency direct institutional aid to schools in imminent danger of bankruptcy is included in both the House and Senate bill. All present categorical higher education programs have been reauthorized in one form or another. A National Institute of Education and a National Foundation for Postsecondary Education are established. But the main features of the bill, which arouse both support and opposition are the student grant and institutional aid provisions.

Contrary to what has been reported in both the popular press and especially in some of the "trade press", this bill is not a jerry-built structure put together by nameless people, working on general outlines set forth by a few interested legislators. Indeed, in my almost 11 years experience in the Senate I can think of no legislation that has benefited from wider or more knowledgeable participation by members of the Senate.

In attempting to meet today's problems in higher education the Subcommittee members realized that a mere tinkering with the present federal programs would not do. Federal assistance to higher education grew somewhat like Topsy, with a piece added every few years as individual problems arose. This year existing programs were studied as a complete package. Some were found wanting and were altered.

The philosophic underpinning of this bill was the profound belief that every individual in the country should have the right to a floor of support for his postsecondary education. Once this thesis was adopted, all that followed was logical. And here let me make one point. It is currently popular to express concern about the idea that everybody should go to college. We, in the Senate, recognized that point and consequently the bill specifically speaks of postsecondary education and we include in this term career training, junior and community colleges, branch campuses and proprietary business schools—many of these categories for the first time.

It has been said that the Senate bill would shift the thrust of Federal support away from the institutions of higher learning—the

"establishment"—to the student, the "consumer." This may be true. But is not the most pressing problem today the eternal one faced by the student—the elemental worry about how he can afford to attend school? There is one other point to consider when speaking of the change in Federal thrust. The institutions have been the recipients of Federal assistance in one form or another for quite some time; yet it is those very institutions which have received the most aid that are experiencing the greatest problems. Witness after witness asked for more Federal money in one form or another, yet nothing was said of institutional reform. Simple queries about actual cost of education, universal systems of accounts and other managerial and administrative matters were met with embarrassed silence. Perhaps this is one reason why there was not great desire in the Senate to establish a massive program of institutional aid. And I would hope that this is not a reason why the Senate bill has met with opposition from the institutional establishment.

The basic theme of the Senate bill is that the Federal Government has an obligation to people rather than to institutions. Under the Senate bill, institutions will receive assistance if they serve the people, and adapt to meet their needs. The Senate bill basically puts the decision-making in the hands of the "consumer" of educational services rather than in the "conduits" of those services. The Senate realized that the present institutional structure would not meet the needs of the consumers and, therefore, recommends a program to encourage the establishment of community colleges—institutions, which, by definition, must meet the educational needs of the residents of the communities they serve.

S. 659 was brought to the Senate floor and on August 6 was passed without a single negative vote. To my mind, this legislation is landmark in nature, for it is the first piece of Federal legislation that clearly states that the United States has a responsibility to provide a floor of postsecondary education to all students desirous of it and capable of absorbing it, and simultaneously states that the federal government has some responsibility to aid the institutions which provide that education.

With its passage should have come a feeling of elation, of accomplishment. Yet the reverse has been true. There has been no outpouring of support. The higher education community, which at first ignored the Senate bill, now seems to seek to see it defeated in conference.

I can well understand that opposition when it centers around the institutional aid provision. I believe that every lobby has a right to be heard, and to prevail if it has either the right argument or enough votes. And perhaps, just perhaps, I could understand a stodgy established bureaucracy which would sacrifice all that is positive—the student assistance provisions—to achieve its one aim—per capita institutional aid. But what appears imminently wrong is a position of opposition to the Senate-passed student aid provisions on the grounds that increased financial resources might prompt students to leave middle-cost institutions and attend the higher-cost private universities. Frankly I doubt that this would happen, but should the students be denied this option?

To my mind this is an unconscionable approach, one that we in the Senate will not stand for.

Our experiences over the last two years raise the question, "who is looking out for the student?", for most public expressions of concern focus on the institution. All the altruistic words cloak a position of let-me-get-mine-then-we-will-revamp-the-help-for-students. I remember the words of William Vanderbilt, "The public be damned." I would

hope that educational establishment spokesmen would not get themselves in the position of saying—or whispering—"the students be damned".

The Senate has not been convinced. In the upcoming conference, we will tenaciously seek to insure that our proposed right to student assistance remains the salient portion of the Federal approach to higher education.

It is my hope that we will be joined by the institutions of higher education throughout the nation. We seek to move ahead and make manifest in legislation the oft-repeated thesis that there be equality in education. We believe that this is a thesis worth fighting for; we sincerely hope you will join with us.

Let us remember that the true national strength and wealth of a nation is not measured by the number of its weapons or even by its current cash position, but by the education and health of its people. This is a theme on which I believe everyone of us in this room can join, in which we believe in, for which we will fight.

POVERTY PICTURE IN STATE NOT PLEASANT

HON. JOHN M. ZWACH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 27, 1971

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, Gordon Duenow, editor of the Little Falls Daily Transcript, in our Minnesota Sixth Congressional District, recently published an editorial about the poverty picture in Minnesota.

Minnesota, as you know, is not a backward State. In fact, it ranked second in the quality of life, of all the 50 States. I was surprised to learn, in reading Mr. Duenow's editorial that we have counties, mostly rural, which list 34.4 percent of their families below the poverty level.

Mr. Speaker, I think that it is significant that there is a spread in poverty from the 34.4 percent in a rural county to only 5.6 percent in a suburban county.

In order to give rise to increased concern about this situation among my colleagues, I insert Editor Duenow's editorial in the RECORD:

POVERTY PICTURE IN STATE NOT PLEASANT

Minnesota made progress in its fight against poverty during the 1960's, but largely, poverty remains embedded as a cancerous sore in the sides of many communities. This is the assessment of Emiel Owens, a University of Minnesota visiting professor of agriculture and applied economics in Minnesota Science, a magazine published by the University's Agriculture Experiment Station.

We suspect that the professor's assessment may be shocking to some.

Just as shocking is his statement that "over 13 per cent of Minnesota's more than one million families have something in common today: They are living in poverty." He points out that this constitutes 22 per cent of the state's population which lives at the poverty line established in 1970 by the Office of Economic Opportunity.

Owens states that the number of poverty families by county ranges from a low of 5.6 per cent of families in the suburban county of Anoka to a high of 34.4 per cent in the rural, sparsely populated Mahanomen county. In 1969, an average of 1,616 poverty families resided in each of the 87 counties of the state, he said. In 1965 rural areas

claimed 358,000 individuals living in poverty, or 67.7 per cent of the state's poor.

Minnesota's poor fit this stereotype, Owens said: "Picture someone with limited education and poor health. He may be a farm laborer or an operator of a small farm. He either lives on the farm or has migrated to an urban center. Make him a minority member—chances are he is among the state's poor. If this is a woman living under similar circumstances, plus heading a household of dependent children with no adult male present regularly, almost surely she is poor."

He mentioned that "contrary to what many people believe, Minnesota's urban and rural poor are not in that condition primarily because of ignorance or indifference. Being poor is often the by-product of community and working conditions over which the individual has little control. The poor, then, find themselves trapped, both within themselves and by external circumstances that grip them firmly in the jaws of poverty."

While Owens said the roots of poverty in Minnesota are complex, he particularly mentioned that in rural Minnesota the small farmer can no longer compete with or break into the present agricultural production system which demands larger acreages, greater technology, more efficiency and less labor.

This certainly isn't a pretty picture and undoubtedly the facts he cites also could apply to most other states.

NATO SPEECH BY GEN. A. J. GOODPASTER BEFORE THE AMERICAN LEGION

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, October 27, 1971

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, Gen. A. J. Goodpaster, Supreme Allied Commander in Europe, recently addressed the American Legion National Convention in Houston, Tex.

In his address, on September 2, 1971, he spoke of the importance of NATO and the changing balance of power between the United States and the Soviet Union.

These remarks should be read and studied by those who favor a unilateral withdrawal of U.S. forces in Europe. General Goodpaster has answered advocates of this policy quite well. He has also made the point that moving these troops back to the continental United States will not bring about any significant monetary savings.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the speech be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

AN ADDRESS BY GEN. A. J. GOODPASTER

Mr. chairman and fellow veterans: It is a deep pleasure to be here and to renew associations with former comrades-in-arms who have served our country in past moments of peril.

Beyond this, it is a special pleasure and a prized opportunity to discuss NATO—keystone of American security—and the U.S. forces in Europe with this American Legion Convention here today.

I believe NATO and our NATO Allies are and will remain of crucial importance to the future of the United States, and the United States is and will remain of crucial

importance to the NATO Alliance and the future of our NATO Allies.

I welcome the chance to talk of this *today* because there are pressures and moves afoot at this moment that threaten the successful posture of defense that we have built here. And I welcome the meeting with Legionnaires because by your experience and mature understanding of these issues, your sense of responsibility, your dedication and patriotism, you are outstandingly qualified to join effectively in the task of security for the 70's.

We are fortunate to be able to meet here, in Texas. For Texas is not just a place; it is also, as we know, a state of mind—and a strong and hearty state of mind. It is where, as the saying goes, men are men, and women are glad of it.

And I will report on our *American forces in Europe* because they are vital to the success of our security mission, because they are your sons, brothers and nephews, and because you will want to hear a firsthand report on their condition.

Just six days ago, I completed my latest round of visits in Europe and the Mediterranean area to the units of the United States Army, Navy, Air Force and Marine Corps. I met and talked with men in ranks, with junior officers and NCOs, with commanders and their staffs of all services at all echelons. I can tell you that these are fine units—none finer in the world today—manned by servicemen deeply conscious of the job they have to do, hard at work on the tasks and the problems that confront them. And when I speak of servicemen, I am referring and will always be referring to our fine service-women there as well. I will report in more detail on this whole subject later, but I will tell you now that what these dedicated Americans are doing there—and doing in a way in which they and you can take great pride—is indispensable to the peace and the security that they, you, all of us enjoy.

When we begin to speak of NATO, the first thing we should do is recognize that it has been a great success. That is its great achievement but that, as we shall see, is likewise one of its great problems.

First, as to its success, as General Lemnitzer, my predecessor, untiringly emphasizes, in NATO's twenty years there has been no war in Europe, no NATO territory has been lost, and no NATO country has lost its freedom and independence. If we reflect only for a moment on these simple facts, I think we can agree that its success is indisputable.

But what are the problems of success? Well, my friends, they are familiar ones—complacency, let-down, lack of vigilance, an easy assumption that NATO's benefits—stability and peace in Europe, confidence and freedom from fear—are now somehow automatic, that we can have the benefits of NATO without making the efforts that produce them. But let me say at once that if we are to have problems in NATO, I would far rather that we have the problems of success than the problems of failure, with all the dangers to peace and freedom that failure would bring.

Sometimes it is suggested to me that one of the problems of success comes from those on the American scene today who, apparently, simply cannot stand the sight of success—who are only happy when they can criticize or impugn, often with the thought that by belittling others they elevate themselves. But this all-too-human trait, if widely indulged in serious matters of this kind, could be destructive and defeatist. We must not allow ourselves to become people who have lost the will to win—a nation of compulsive losers—which would be the inevitable result. Such is neither in our national character nor in our national interest.

We meet at a time when many problems

compete for public and governmental attention... when there is an accelerated tempo of change in the world about us. Many of the problems we face are indeed military, such as force levels, weapons modernization and military planning—and often they are highly complex, and beset with many unknowns, though they must nevertheless be faced, and decisions and actions must be taken. But many of the most gripping problems are non-military, and sometimes they press us in directions opposite to the needs of defense.

Here at home we see the problems in inflation and unemployment, foreign imports, the crisis of the cities, pollution, crime, drug abuse, racial unrest, social discord over the Vietnam War and other issues, a kind of "accentuation of the negative" in the public information media and elsewhere, and violence in many forms. Frequently the concern over these problems seems to express itself in antagonism to things and people military.

Those of us who have seen the ebb and flow of this or something like it in the past, while deeply concerned, can trust that once more, it will pass. However, for the young officers and enlisted personnel on whom our services depend today—and who must be the leaders tomorrow—anti-military attitudes of this kind are deeply disturbing. They are causing the loss of men we sorely need and could affect in serious ways the morale of our Armed Forces. In this respect, I am reminded of what General George Marshall once said: "A soldier's heart, a soldier's spirit, a soldier's soul are everything. Unless the soldier's soul sustains him, he cannot be relied on, and he will fail himself, his commander and his country in the end." Attacks on the military are not the way to sustain the soul of the soldier.

It would be tragic indeed if in preoccupation with our internal problems—serious as they certainly are—we were to cast away our security, whether through neglect or willful opposition. It is essential that work go forward on solutions to the difficult and important domestic problems. But it will not solve them if NATO—the keystone of American security—is destroyed or should fail in its mission of preventing war and protecting the freedom and safety of our people. For our national security remains an indispensable umbrella under which durable solutions to our national problems can be searched for and constructed.

And if NATO should falter or fail, this change in itself would aggravate and multiply the problems that would press in upon us. It would mean a Western Europe, indeed a whole free world, fragmented, set at cross-purposes, exposed to renewed threat from outside. But if NATO remains strong, as I believe it can and should, it will continue to provide the platform of stability, security and solidarity from which the West can work for domestic and international solutions to many of the problems which beset our nations today.

The military instrument that provides the shield of security for NATO in Europe was first formed by General Eisenhower twenty years ago. He activated SHAPE—his headquarters—and the allied command in Europe on April 2, 1951, in Paris, France. This was a new kind of military command created in time of peace to prevent war and to keep peace secure for the free peoples it serves. The memories of that day hold a particular significance for me, for it was my privilege to serve as a staff officer at that time under General Eisenhower, and in fact one of my specific duties was the preparation of the activation order that he signed.

Many of you will recall how low was our strength then... how apprehensive we were of our future as free peoples. Under the threatening clouds of 1950 and 1951, many doubts attended the launching of this ven-

ture in collective security. Many wondered not so much whether there would be war as when and how it would start.

But in addition to despair and resignation, there was opposition to what needed to be done. General Eisenhower, in words that have meaning for us today, reported that "strong voices could be heard in America, disputing the NATO concept of collective security and opposing further reinforcements of the European area," and that "the doubts of the European peoples gave birth to the false but glittering doctrine of neutralism." We are by no means free today of the dangers of a new isolationism in America—or a new neutralism in Europe, sometimes called "Finlandization."

Hard military facts of life shaped the international structures that were established then and still exist today.

You will remember the war-torn state of Europe and how Soviet political pressures, backed by the presence of the Red Army—still at wartime strength—resulted in Soviet domination of Albania, Rumania, Bulgaria, Eastern Germany, Poland and Hungary. Those countries, with a population of about 87 million non-Russian people, were brought under Soviet control.

At the same time, communist pressures were being applied directly or indirectly in other parts of the world—in Northern Iran, in Turkey, in Greece, in Indochina, in Malaya, in Burma, and in the Philippines.

But it was the communist coup d'etat in Czechoslovakia in 1948 and the Soviet blockade of Berlin late that same year that served as a shock to the Western world, which had looked forward to peace and conciliation, and instead found itself facing power and conspiracy.

And in 1950 the North Korean invasion of South Korea again alerted the Western world to communist aggression. It was then that the North Atlantic Council decided that an "integrated force under a centralized command, adequate to deter aggression and to insure the defense of Western Europe, was to be created and placed under a Supreme Commander to be appointed by NATO."

In late December, 1950, General Eisenhower was invited to serve as the first Supreme Commander, and he immediately accepted the appointment.

In the strenuous days that followed, General Eisenhower—by his inspiring leadership, building on his wartime success in international military organization, and by his unstinting effort transformed the state of morale in Europe.

National military force contingents were quickly organized into a collective defense force. A command structure was created with integrated international headquarters dedicated to the prevention of war. Unified plans for coordinated defense were prepared. Training was accelerated, and the buildup of stocks of supply carried forward. A commonly-financed "infrastructure" of airbases, signal communications, pipelines and other facilities was brought into being. And the nations proceeded rapidly to strengthen and re-arm the forces they provided. The NATO nations, working together in a spirit of solidarity and cooperation, achieved—in words he often used—a result which, if they had acted separately, would have been far beyond the reach of any or of all.

NATO has been a remarkable association—perhaps unique in history—in which fifteen nations, recognizing their community of interests, have joined their effort in a common cause—a cause that is nothing less than the freedom, the security and the system of life of the Western world.

The military capabilities of the Alliance as we know it today include conventional, tactical nuclear and strategic nuclear elements in carefully coordinated combination. The span of the collective force extends from the North Cape of Norway on the North, through

Central Europe, to the eastern boundary of Turkey on the East. It begins with the forces deployed along the Iron Curtain, and extends back through rank upon rank of land, sea and air forces of all kinds of major combat units that would man the main battle positions, deployed air and naval forces in high states of readiness, reinforcing ground formations and reserve forces as well as air and naval augmentation forces that would be rapidly moved forward to build up the forward combat strength.

Behind all of these, linked through carefully prepared plans, in controlled coordination in case their use should be required, stand the tactical nuclear units and the strategic nuclear forces.

This is a powerful force for deterrence and defense, and it is an effective one. It serves four broad objectives.

The first is deterrence of war. In today's world, preventing war and making peace secure must be the paramount route by which we provide for the safety of our people while ensuring our freedom. By any calculation, the destructiveness of war and the risks of nuclear escalation put a heavy premium on preventing war, while still maintaining our freedom and territorial integrity. This aim—deterrence—guides all that we try to do.

It rests upon a second objective: defense. For deterrence to be effective, we must make convincingly clear to any potential aggressor that the peoples of the Atlantic Community have the will and means to defend their territories and to make aggression unprofitable. Thus, both as the indispensable underpinning to deterrence and as the means to safeguard our nations if deterrence should fail, we need strong and ready defense forces.

I identify as a third objective served by NATO's military instrument: solidarity—collective action and unity in the Alliance. Through solidarity the NATO nations rise above the quarrels, the ancient hatreds and the mutual conflicts of the past which have exhausted them and twice this century have nearly destroyed them. In uniting their efforts for the collective defense, the Allies work together rather than against each other, and deny to any enemy the opportunity to take the nations on one at a time, or to play one against the other.

A fourth and final objective for the military instrument of NATO is detente—a relaxation of tensions. To endure and be meaningful, detente must be based upon reducing and removing the real causes of tension rather than merely treating the symptoms—while at the same time preserving the security, the integrity, and the values of our societies.

The primary cause of tensions in the European area is the capability of the large Soviet and Warsaw Pact military forces which overhang Western Europe. By holding this force in check, NATO's military capability, which is entirely defensive, works for true and meaningful detente, rather than against it, as is sometimes mistakenly assumed.

A few weeks ago, a comprehensive analysis of Soviet armed strength—size, composition and trends—by Professor Jorh Erickson was published by the Royal United Services Institute for Defense Studies in London. His disclosure of substantial and sustained increases in Soviet forces occasioned a good deal of comment and surprise—which is itself surprising, since there has been no lack of public statements, including my own, about this buildup. In each of the last five years—since the time of the removal of Khrushchev, as Professor Erickson points out—the Soviet military budget has increased in real terms.

And these forces are exercised to a high state of readiness. Last year, major Soviet training exercises demonstrated their capabilities on the land, on and under the sea, and in the air. Exercise OKEAN, executed on a global basis, was the largest naval exercise

ever conducted by any Navy in the world. Late last fall Exercise COMRADES-IN-ARMS in East Germany was the largest Warsaw Pact exercise of its kind since World War II in Central Europe. Just last month Warsaw Pact forces in Exercise OPAL 71 in Hungary practiced military operations to increase combat proficiency.

The growth of Soviet strategic nuclear offensive and defensive capabilities is progressively changing the strategic balance in a direction adverse to the West. The continuing production and deployment of Soviet missiles, together with their expanding research, development and test programs, constitute, in military terms, a threat of massive proportions. We still possess on our side a devastating strategic nuclear capability that could be used in retaliation, but the rising trend of Soviet strength makes it all the more necessary that we do, in fact, keep up our conventional strength, as well, of course, as our nuclear capabilities.

The Warsaw Pact ground forces substantially outnumber NATO forces in terms of divisions, firepower and manpower. The Warsaw Pact has twice as many divisions as NATO in the Central Region of Allied Command Europe. Through the introduction of improved weapons systems and continuous modernization, giving them highly increased firepower, these Warsaw Pact forces are intensively trained, and positioned well forward in Eastern and Central Europe. Their tank forces outnumber the tank forces of the Allied Command by a ratio of three to one. Soviet mobility and discipline were convincingly demonstrated just three years ago by the ruthlessness but highly efficient use of many of these same divisions against Czechoslovakia—their Warsaw Pact Ally. And as a consequence of that tragic episode, there are today more Soviet divisions stationed closer to the Iron Curtain in Germany than prior to the action against Czechoslovakia in 1968.

The Warsaw Pact Air Forces in Europe have twice as many combat aircraft as NATO. Not only are they quantitatively superior with respect to aircraft, but they have more airfields, more shelters, better command and control facilities, and considerably more anti-aircraft defenses. Newer types of high-performance aircraft have been introduced by the Soviets into all Warsaw Pact Air Forces.

The expansion of Soviet maritime power is a matter of particular concern. The Soviet Navy is the second largest fleet in the world. Only one percent of her combat vessels are more than twenty years old. This is in marked contrast to the growing obsolescence of several NATO navies. The Soviet submarine fleet is now the largest in the world. It could in the event of war, severely threaten Allied Command Europe's sea lines of communications with Canada and the United States from the very outset. The threat to sea lines of communications exists also in the Mediterranean Sea which, for the shipment of oil as well as other commodities, is of great strategic importance to our Alliance.

A special note should be made of the activities of the Soviet Union on the Southern flank of NATO. The number of Soviet warships deployed in the Mediterranean has continuously increased in the last several years. Their overall activity increased from six hundred operating days in 1964, to seventeen thousand operating days last year.

Along with increased deployments in the Mediterranean, there has been increased Soviet activity, as you well know, all along the North African and Middle East littoral. This Soviet presence—in the air, on the sea and ground—is in an area marked by instability and deeply rooted discord. It is clear that a substantial position of Allied defensive strength will remain essential in that area, if Allied interests, including American interests, are to be safeguarded.

These are some of the elements of the pat-

tern of Soviet military strength and activity. They are on the move in many areas, particularly where they see or sense weakness, confusion and conflict. There is a steady trend of expansion, widened deployments and increasing presence in new strategic areas of the world. Together the Soviet Armed Forces constitute a concentration of military power that goes far beyond anything the world has ever previously seen. It is a force that far exceeds the reasonable requirements solely for defense. It places stress on offensive operations as evidenced by the emphasis given to armored firepower and mobility, including the mobility of its tactical air forces.

Because NATO is a defensive Alliance, the Warsaw Pact has the advantage of the initiative. Should they so decide, they could choose the time, place, mode and weight of attack against us.

In addition, they hold important geographic advantages. There is a geographic position with great depth, whereas ours is a rimland, extended in width, but quite shallow in depth, broken by internal water and neutral nation barriers.

It is the reality of this Soviet and Warsaw Pact military strength which NATO must face and hold in check and balance.

In countering the forces of the Warsaw Pact, Allied Command Europe relies heavily on the contribution made by the U.S. forces in Europe. There are, I believe, three propositions that are basic to United States security interests in this regard.

The first proposition is that NATO, or something like it, is essential to the security interests of the United States, just as I believe it is to the security interests of every other member nation of NATO. Without NATO, the West would lie exposed to Soviet pressure, and to Soviet efforts to pick off countries one by one.

The second proposition is that a substantial collective force is essential to a viable NATO and therefore to United States security. If this collective force which exists today were to disintegrate, I do not believe that it could be reconstituted. It was constituted under unusual conditions in the early 1950's and under a leader—General Eisenhower—uniquely qualified to inspire and organize it, whose like we shall not see again. Once lost, it would not be possible to put NATO back together again.

The third proposition is that a balanced American military force contribution in place in the European area, not substantially less than we have there today, is essential to the continued existence of a strong collective force, therefore, to the continued effectiveness and viability of NATO, and therefore, to the security interests of the United States.

These three propositions, in my judgment, will be as valid for a number of years to come as they are today, for the threat which the NATO forces have to hold in check has not diminished. On the contrary, as I have mentioned, the Warsaw Pact and Soviet military capabilities continue to increase.

It costs us three billion dollars a year to support the U.S. forces that are located in the European area. This figure includes pay, operations and maintenance, construction—everything, in fact, but major re-equipment when that occurs. There are two or three other figures that help to put these costs in perspective. The first is that these, plus the forces in the United States that would be employed in the NATO area in case of communist attack, cost some fourteen billion dollars. I stress this point because statements are sometimes made indicating our forces in Europe cost fourteen billion dollars a year. This is incorrect—by a factor of nearly five. The next figure of interest is what our Allies are paying for defense. Their military expenditures are running some twenty-five billion dollars a year. This is about eight times the costs of the forces the U.S. maintains in the European area, more than twice the costs of

the total forces and support the U.S. provides in the U.S. to resist a Warsaw Pact attack in the European and Atlantic areas, and about one-third of the total U.S. defense effect, worldwide, including our strategic nuclear forces of all kinds.

Balance of payments costs are another element in the troop deployment problem, but here, through European purchases and other special programs, it has been possible so far to "offset" a very large part of this impact.

When proposals are made to pull U.S. forces out of Europe, we are talking about cutting down the three billion dollar commitment per year. But it should be realized that the financial cost of maintaining these forces if they are simply moved back home instead of being kept in Europe would be no less, and in fact somewhat higher than it is now. It would be necessary to maintain extra sets of heavy equipment such as tanks and artillery in Europe, if we were to have the capability of moving these forces back quickly and putting them in operation in case of emergency. And we would pay the costs associated with annual transport of these forces to Europe, followed by exercise and maneuver on the continent to give them the very essential European familiarization and training.

When in 1951 the four additional U.S. divisions were brought to Europe to help form NATO, they put the glue into NATO. I think that is still true.

What many people may not know is that American forces in Europe have already been substantially reduced in the past ten years. Since 1961 more than one-fourth—more than one hundred thousand of the U.S. forces in Europe have been returned to the United States. We have now reached the point where further reductions would seriously impair our deterrent and defensive posture.

Western Europe, with its great economic, cultural, intellectual and human and material resources have always had close traditional ties with the United States.

Twice in this twentieth century, American Presidents and American Congresses have had to recognize that the security of Europe is vital to the security of the United States. Twice the U.S. has sent expeditionary forces to Europe to restore the military and political balance; and the price has been a big one. The premium that the American taxpayer pays today to maintain the peace and security, so expensively restored when violated in the past, is low cost insurance for something we treasure so highly. We Americans and our NATO Allies cannot afford to further reduce our already limited forces unless and until reciprocal and mutual force reductions are made by our potential adversaries. . . . or until Free Europe, united in the European Economic Community, can muster greater strength to take up additional parts of the collective security burden. But until that time, let every American understand that the three hundred thousand U.S. soldiers, sailors, airmen and Marines stationed in Europe play a role which is of critical importance in maintaining and strengthening peace and is therefore strongly in our enlightened national self-interest.

I told you at the outset that I would report to you on the status of U.S. forces in Europe. In my visits to the Sixth Fleet in the Mediterranean, to the U.S. Army in Germany, and to the U.S. Air Force units in Germany and England, I have been encouraged anew to see the effective performance of duties. . . . and in my talks with soldiers, sailors, airmen and Marines, I have seen no loss of spirit or surrender to discouragement. Instead, I have seen responsible, self-respecting young Americans, going about their jobs. . . . and I have heard realistic assessments from commanders on the combat capabilities and the needs of their units. Those forces present, in the familiar American term once used by George Washington, a respectable posture of defense.

This is not to fail to recognize that many things are far from rosy. Over the past years, when priority of support was given—rightly, so far as I am concerned—to the needs of our fighting men in Vietnam, levels of equipment, supplies, maintenance, manning and facilities support suffered in Europe in all services—in some cases very seriously. Recently we have gone through a very serious shortage in some categories of combat personnel, from which we are just now recovering. And we are experiencing problems in the command which parallel those in our society at home. Three of them are drug abuse, racial unrest, and discipline, which is closely linked to morale. We recognize them and are hard at work on them.

With respect to drug abuse, we have comprehensive, intensive programs underway, but neither my commanders nor I can be satisfied with the degree of control over the problem we have yet attained. We believe our program is sound. It has several phases internal to the command, starting with education of both the younger members of the service and the more senior personnel—both officers and non-commissioned officers—on the dangers and the nature of the drug problem. Much remains to be done in this phase.

A second phase is enforcement of the law to curtail drug traffic particularly going after the pushers. A further phase is identification and rehabilitation of addicts including a policy of immunity for those who voluntarily enter the rehabilitation program. I believe we are making progress but there are no grounds for complacency. Finally, we strongly welcome, cooperate with and support what I term the external phases of effort, including education in the society at home from which our young people come, and steps to cut off the production, manufacture and movement of the drugs themselves, particularly the hard drugs.

Now in the racial area, I believe that for a long time we in the military service have been in the vanguard in providing a fair treatment and equal opportunity for all races in our services. This is as it should be, for the hazards of combat know no color bar, nor does the mutual dependence of man upon the battlefield. But the picture is not perfect. The intensification of hostile attitudes has not by-passed Europe, and there have occurred instances of unfair practices that give fuel to such feelings. Here too we have serious and substantial programs underway. In the Army, for example, General Polk gave strong personal leadership while he was in command, with beneficial results, and General Davison, his successor in command, is broadening and deepening the effort. We are continuing vigorously an education program and working to build and strengthen a decent and proper relationship within our forces. We recognize that some of our younger men bring with them to Europe a generalized sense of discrimination and injustice, and a number of our programs aim to move from the realm of emotions to practical actions that will remove every vestige of racial discrimination that we can find. We are emphasizing fair treatment for all, the need to be specific, the need to bring problems in, and the need for mutual communication and mutual respect. I can assure you we will continue to work for racial equality and racial amity in the United States European Command. I believe our record on this score in the United States Armed Forces is a good one, and I believe it can and should be better.

In the area of morale and discipline, we well recognize, in General Marshall's terms, that we are dealing with the heart and soul of the Armed Forces. We are intensively concerned over problems in this area. As our manpower situation improves, and supply and the maintenance of barracks are improved, and funds are provided for expanded training, we expect to see—and believe we are

seeing—an improvement in morale and discipline. In this connection, may I say that we very much hope we will not lose these gains later this year as a result of the failure of Congress to pass a renewed draft law before their August recess. The lapse concerns us very much, for it is already putting a "bubble" in the manpower pipeline that will reach us late this year, and it will be hard if not impossible to avoid renewed damage to unit strengths, morale and discipline.

In the meantime, we are approaching our disciplinary problems through emphasis upon effective leadership, at every echelon of supervision and command, which Legionnaires recognize, I am sure, as the key to military success. This includes, as always, concern and regard for our men and open channels of communication with them.

And when and as our American society at home recovers its composure and gains in its stability, confidence and constructive spirit, we expect our forces to benefit as well.

With all of this, the main message I would like to leave with you—loud and clear—is that the structure of our forces has retained its integrity and its military effectiveness. We do not have an undisciplined body and we do not intend to have one. We have not compromised our standards of conduct and the qualities required in the performance of duty. As a matter of fact, the lapses from integrity, especially those at high ranks—enlisted and officer—have provided further impetus to our efforts.

Before leaving this point, let me say that anyone who says our forces are in such a shape they cannot do their job and should be brought home, is ill-informed and ill-advised. The U.S. force on the European continent and above it, and on, over and under waters around it is one of formidable power in a high state of readiness, capable of performing its wartime missions with high effectiveness and reliability. The dedicated men and women of all our services—working as a great team—are hard at work in accomplishing their assigned tasks. You can all be proud of the American units that man the forward defenses in Europe. They are a credit to the United States. They are quietly and efficiently performing tasks essential to our national defense.

On the Allied side, programs to maintain and strengthen the collective force and its national contingents are likewise going forward. Throughout most of last year, searching studies were conducted on NATO's defense tasks in the decade of the 1970's, culminating in decisions as to the principal areas in which force improvements should be made. At the same time, the European nations of NATO were meeting on a so-called European Defense Improvement Program whereby they would take further improvement measures, thereby assuming a greater share of the overall military burden and effort.

One outcome of these constructive efforts was the decision by President Nixon, announced at the NATO meetings last December, that "we have agreed that NATO's conventional forces must not only be maintained, but in certain key areas, strengthened. Given a similar approach by our Allies, the United States will maintain and improve its own forces in Europe and will not reduce them unless there is reciprocal action from our adversaries. We will continue to talk with our NATO allies with regard to how we can meet our responsibilities together." Subsequently, in his 1971 Foreign Policy Report, President Nixon stated, "In maintaining and improving our forces in Europe—and in the seas on Europe's flanks—we are doing what is necessary to encourage our European Allies to take up a greater share of the collective responsibility."

For the Alliance as a whole, the NATO meetings resulted in the commitment of the extra increment of effort by the European

Group in the form of their European Defense Improvement Plan, amounting to an additional billion dollars of effort over the next five years, divided evenly between funding of certain urgent NATO projects, and strengthening of their own forces. And the NATO nations, including the United States, also identified, as areas where further strengthening of defense is needed, such areas as—

Strengthening of Allied armor and anti-tank weapons, to offset the heavy preponderance the Warsaw Pact holds;

Improvements in our air posture, including aircraft shelters; here, using the special funding provided by the European countries, actual construction is going forward at a rapid rate. With the lesson before us of the lightning-quick destruction of the Arab air forces by the Israelis in 1967, this remedial action is urgent;

Next, improvement in NATO's overall maritime capabilities, with special reference to anti-submarine forces, to meet the threat posed by the Soviet Navy;

Also, improvements in Allied mobilization processes and streamlining of reinforcement capabilities, including the construction of reception facilities to utilize our C-5 and other strategic airlift assets; and

Finally, a major new integrated system of NATO communications, on which command and control are crucially dependent; here too, the funding provided by the European countries has enabled initial work to begin on an accelerated basis.

At the present time, these statements of improvements needed are being converted into concrete program recommendations, specific as to numbers of tanks, anti-tank weapons, new aircraft and the like for the nations to consider and to fill. Now we recognize that it is one thing to acknowledge a need, and something else to provide the money to meet it, but the nations have made serious commitments in this regard. As action is taken, it will keep NATO modernized and in step with the needs of the 1970's.

Earlier in my remarks I stated that it is the large military force that the Warsaw Pact maintains deployed in positions to threaten Western Europe that NATO must hold in check and counter. This means that, in logic, if the Soviets should reduce their forces—particularly those such as tank forces and air forces that give them their greatest offensive capability—it should be possible for NATO to make some corresponding reduction in its forces. This is the basis for NATO's long-standing offer for so-called "mutual and balanced force reductions." It was only in May of this year that the Soviet leaders finally responded to the long-standing NATO initiative.

My own view on this subject goes back a long way, and it parallels the view General Norstad held some fourteen years ago when he was the commander in the position I now hold. It is that it should be possible in principle to find some lower level of forces at which security would be as well served as at present on both sides, with savings in the manpower and effort committed.

It turns out, however, that converting this principle into practical reality is a highly complex matter—involving fifteen NATO nations and the seven Warsaw Pact countries with the many variables of different weapons systems. Because of the inherent advantages—or asymmetries—that the Warsaw Pact enjoys—I mentioned geography and the initiative earlier—compensating asymmetries for NATO would be needed. Consider, for example, that the distance from Russia to the Iron Curtain is only one eighth of the distance from the United States to the Iron Curtain, with land and sea transitions. Even flying from the United States would involve major logistic problems with limited reception facilities. And beyond this lies the whole difficult problem of verification, for it would be dangerously risky to make any reductions without assurance that the other side had

indeed carried out reductions. This is not to say the task is impossible. Indeed, it is a promising possibility, but it will be difficult to achieve.

The very fact that mutual and balanced force reductions are a promising possibility is a strong reason for the U.S. not to make any unilateral force reductions. The Soviets would have little incentive to reciprocate if they were convinced that the United States, because of internal pressures, would reduce its forces in any case.

Let me conclude with a few brief observations. The success or failure of NATO can have a determining impact on the security of the United States, and on the related security and stability not only of Europe and the Atlantic area but of the world as a whole. For those of us who serve in NATO, the challenge will be to find solutions that help NATO continue to achieve success in the future as it has in the past.

The role and contribution of the U.S. forces, at their present level, are indispensable, and will remain so until Soviet and Warsaw Pact force reductions—which might be part of a mutual reductions plan—make it possible, and safe, to reduce forces on our side. As Western Europe itself becomes more unified and musters additional strength, it may be possible for the European states to assume more of the burden.

We recognize that we live in a time of challenge, even opposition, to what we are doing, when many problems beset us both within the military and without. But the solutions to these problems should not be sought at the expense of our nation's defenses—rather, an adequate security system is essential if we are to have an environment in which solutions to social and economic problems can be found.

Many of the Americans who visit us in our European commands, after discussion of these issues, ask the same question: What can I do? I know you as Legionnaires have the same questions.

I would not presume even to attempt to give a full answer, but I will offer a few suggestions for your consideration.

First, and foremost, do not be taken in by those who denigrate the American man in uniform, or the American fighting forces, and try to paint them as a dispirited, ineffectual rabble. Nothing could be further from the truth. They are first-class military forces who serve you well on the frontiers of freedom.

Second, when faced with the burdens of defense in a troubled and dangerous world, or with proposals to dismantle or to slash the defense structure that provides our protection, face squarely the consequences of failure or inadequacy, insist that others do the same, and follow the course that provides security for our country.

Third, follow the old and true military principle of reinforcing success. We are not a nation of compulsive losers and there is plenty of past achievement that can serve as a springboard for the future.

And finally, join me in pride in what our country has done in the past, is doing today, and can do in the future. Where there is wrongdoing, injustice or inefficiency, let us root it out. But let us not mistake the disease for the otherwise healthy body itself.

It is my deep conviction that the American people in the future, as in the past, will act with innate common sense, and will make the right choices when their lives, their well being, and their security are in question. I believe in the same way that our Atlantic Alliance can continue to play its essential role in keeping our nation safe and free if we support it.

The contribution made by members of The American Legion to the moral fiber of our society is of tremendous importance. In a very real sense, you veterans continue to serve. I appreciate the opportunity of bringing to your attention this morning the role

of NATO and the American forces under my command, with the hope that you—from communities across our land, from all walks of life—will help to further public understanding and support of this great and necessary endeavor.

ONE MANAGEMENT JOB THAT
CANNOT BE DELEGATED

HON. BILL FRENZEL

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 27, 1971

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Speaker, this week I received a copy of a speech of Mr. Herbert P. Patterson to the Commerce and Industry Association in New York on September 22. The theme of the speech is a businessman's responsibility to communicate with his elected representatives and the speech includes many helpful hints concerning how best to deal with Members of Congress. The speech is reprinted below. I hope all Members will find it as instructive as I did.

ONE MANAGEMENT JOB THAT CANNOT
BE DELEGATED

(Address by Herbert P. Patterson, President of The Chase Manhattan Bank)

I'm very pleased to have this opportunity of appearing at your Forum and am gratified that you preferred listening to me rather than strolling through the park on this last day of summer.

Like most of you, I look forward to the summer months as a time to catch up on my reading. However, I now look back in dismay at the relatively few books and articles I've managed to read thoroughly.

I did find one article especially provocative. It appeared in the July-August issue of The Harvard Business Review under the intriguing title "The Sounds of Executive Silence."

Those of you who read it will recall that author Norman Adler points out that the stridency of both the radical left and the radical right is on the upsurge. The academic community has become increasingly vocal; politicians at all levels of government are rarely at a loss for words on any subject; yet from most corporate executives comes only silence.

The author deplors what he calls "this self-imposed intellectual and social celibacy," and he argues that businessmen make a serious mistake in shunting the national debate on vital economic and social issues—issues that are increasingly determining the well-being of our country and the conduct of our business enterprises.

Mr. Adler pleads his case as a lawyer and former corporate executive concerned with the broad role of business in our society. My own interest in the subject derives from my personal experiences over the past two years in broadening my contacts with government officials in Washington where the "executive silence" is often deafening.

For a few minutes this afternoon, I'd like to draw on these experiences and share with you some thoughts about the increasing need for more constructive dialogue between businessmen and government officials; the means for accomplishing this; and the benefits that can be realized from it.

As for the need, it seems to me that all we have to do is look around us. We see fully as many decisions being made on the future of business and banking in the halls of Congress these days as in corporate board rooms. Legislation on auto safety, air and water

pollution, packaging requirements, cigarette advertising and other issues has had a profound impact on scores of businesses.

What Congress and the Executive Branch do over the next several months in implementing President Nixon's proposals may possibly shape our national economy for years to come.

I might say, parenthetically, that—given the drift of inflation and the drain on our dollar reserves—I feel the President had little choice except to act as he did in the emergency. But it is well to recognize that the steps he has taken in Phase One will not, in themselves, solve our economic problems. They will do no more than provide a breather for the country, so it can deal more forcibly with the fundamental causes of its economic malaise. Because controls—and none of us like them—inevitably and rather quickly lose their effectiveness, they are seldom a satisfactory solution for the longer run.

Ultimately, cooperation is the key: cooperation abroad, among the leading currency nations of the world and cooperation at home among labor, business and government. Those of you who must compete regularly against the Japanese have some idea of what the labor-business-government triad can accomplish through cooperation.

At the risk of seeming somewhat naive, I'd also like to suggest closer cooperation between the major political parties in curbing inflation. Bipartisanship in this area is, I know, always easy to talk about and difficult to accomplish. Yet that's what people used to say about our postwar foreign policy until a determined band, led by Senator Arthur Vandenberg, showed that cooperation was possible in bringing to fruition the Marshall Plan and the Atlantic Pact. In my judgment, the need for a similar bipartisan approach to inflation control is presently urgent and may determine America's economic fate in the Seventies and even beyond. It is simply not possible to plan the course of an economy as vast and complicated as ours within a two-year election cycle.

Some of the main hazards facing the economy in the decade ahead are governmental. As Fortune Magazine pointed out recently, the U.S. cannot have a continuing healthy economy unless it improves the quality of its government. If we in business want to promote this improvement and have a voice in the decision-making process, we must come to know government officials and keep our point of view constantly before them, just as labor and other segments of society are doing.

So much, then, for the need.

What are the best means of meeting this need?

Surely, business associations such as Commerce and Industry perform an indispensable role in furthering better communications between businessmen and government officials. They can be highly effective in handling broad problems that may extend well beyond the reach of individual companies.

But business associations don't relieve the executive of his own personal responsibilities in the government relations area. The time is long past when top executives could rely entirely on others to do their work of communicating with the government.

This is a job that's become too important for top management to delegate. It has become a do-it-yourself project. The executive himself can be far more effective in presenting his company's views on major issues than anyone else can on his behalf.

During the past two years, as I indicated earlier, I've tried to practice what I preach by going to Washington every few weeks to talk with Senators, Congressmen and other government officials.

Washington has been described as a mar-

velous blend of southern efficiency and northern hospitality. Commuting to there may not be everyone's idea of fun. Nonetheless, it is the "Headquarters City" of the world's biggest borrower, biggest lender and biggest spender . . . a "Headquarters City" where each day decisions are made which profoundly affect our business and personal lives.

Moving around Capitol Hill and calling on Federal agencies in downtown Washington is the best way I know of getting a "feel" for which issues are primary and which are secondary. No matter how many "confidential" reports an executive reads, the only way he can absorb the mood of Washington is to be on the scene. Legislators have a pretty good grasp of public opinion, and today's vocal public opinion has an amazing way of becoming tomorrow's legislation.

I've spoken with some businessmen who acknowledge frankly that they are timid about calling on their Congressmen or testifying at Congressional hearings. I must confess that I myself started out with some trepidation, if only because the prime rate was then at its highest level since the Civil War! In fact, my associates wouldn't even let me call on Congressman Wright Patman until my third visit!

However, the reception has always been cordial and the conversation pleasant. You may have to cool your heels while a Congressman shuttles over to the Capitol to cast a vote, or has his picture taken on the steps with a visiting 4H Club from back home, but most lawmakers do welcome visits from concerned businessmen.

A California Congressman explained to me one reason why. "We can read a bill," he said, "and not see that it's going to hit a certain industry. You people know immediately that it would have an effect on your particular business or your community. That's when you should get on the phone or write a letter, or, better, come down to Washington."

As you know, members of our New York Congressional delegation all have offices right here in the area as well as in Washington, so you can often find them in town on Mondays and Fridays when they are home mending fences.

Well, you may ask, why would a Congressman want to meet me? What have I got to offer him?

For one thing, you have information—or ready access to it—and that's an extremely valuable commodity in Congressional circles. Too many businessmen assume that legislators are experts on every conceivable subject. That's an obvious physical impossibility, as the legislators themselves are the first to admit. After all, more than 15,000 bills and resolutions have been introduced in Congress just since January. The average Congressman's research facilities are considerably limited, so he's more than glad to have information that will help him do a more efficient job.

For example, I found one Congressman who was deeply interested in the various options open for funding public education, and our economists at the bank provided him with a cost-benefit analysis. A Congressional Committee wanted to know how many new manufacturing plants had been denied natural gas servicing over the past few years, and our Energy Division was able to come up with the answer. During one monetary crisis, a Congressman wanted to explain to his constituents what was going on, so I agreed to appear as "guest panelist" on his local television program.

Admittedly, these are areas that a bank would be likely to have more background on than other businesses. But if you take a hard look at your own field, the chances are you'll find many information sources that could prove very helpful to Congressmen and, at

the same time, provide a means of closer communication.

As Senators and Representatives are favorably impressed when businessmen do take the time to plead their case personally, the benefits can be well worth the effort.

This point was underscored a few weeks ago during the Congressional inquiry into the Lockheed case. When Chairman Wright Patman opened hearings on the legislation, no fewer than twenty-four bankers appeared to testify. Mr. Patman insisted that we give our name, rank and serial number. Virtually every man at the witness table was Chairman or President of his particular bank. Many Committee members commented approvingly on the willingness of senior executives to participate in the hearings themselves rather than delegating the task.

Another recent illustration of the benefits of personal contact involved the issue of interlocking directorates, a favorite target of corporate critics these days. The current best-seller, "America, Inc.," suggests that a handful of corporations, interlocked with large banks and insurance companies, control our pocketbook, our environment, our health and safety—and through political contributions—even the machinery of government.

Such extravagant charges and the legislative proposals growing out of them are based on the assumption that interlocking directorates are inherently evil and automatically imply the passing of "inside information." One section of the so-called Bank Reform Act would have made it virtually impossible for commercial banks like ours to attract outside businessmen to serve on Boards of Directors.

The banking community pointed out that, under the bill we would have Boards restricted largely to retired individuals and inside directors. By the very nature of their positions, the latter would be subordinate to the Chairman, so he'd have no real accountability. Many Congressmen saw the validity of this argument, and these features have now been modified considerably in the latest legislative draft.

However, the benefits of Washington liaison work should not be judged solely by the success or failure of one piece of legislation, but by the opportunity it affords to get your story across on a sustained basis. It is important—in fact, imperative—to reinforce the dialogue between business and government, especially when you are not asking for any favorable consideration. In that way the communications channels will be open for the inevitable occasions when you want a Congressman to support your position.

Now obviously, nobody becomes an expert on Washington in two years and I am no exception, but on the basis of what I've learned so far, I would offer two concluding suggestions.

One is that businessmen are likely to fare better on Capitol Hill if they state positively what they are FOR rather than harping everlastingly on what they are AGAINST.

If you approach a Congressman with constructive suggestions you are likely to get a much more receptive hearing. Particularly is this true if you call on him while a bill is in the formative stages, when changes can easily be made.

On two occasions recently, once in Washington and once in New York, Congressmen have discussed with me their initial thoughts on a piece of legislation and asked for comments and even language for the proposed bill. On other occasions our bank has worked closely with the Executive Branch to provide ideas on implementing Congressional action.

Several Congressmen have complained to me that one of the most common mistakes businessmen make is to wait until the last minute and then try to summon them off the House floor to talk just before the final

vote. Legislators resent this—and I suspect you and I would, too, if we were in their place.

The only thing worse is to say nothing at all during the weeks a bill is up for committee hearings and debate, then write your Congressman a brusque letter of complaint. More than one Congressman has noted ruefully that after having voted "Yea" on a measure on which his pre-vote mail had been running 5 to 1 in favor—he finds that the post-vote mail abusing him for his stand outnumbered the letters of thanks by 10 to 1!

My second and final suggestion, is that businessmen should be prepared and willing to speak out on social as well as economic issues.

One Congressman put it this way: "The only time I see or hear from businessmen is when there is talk of raising taxes or lowering tariffs. I'd like to see some of them when we're debating significant social issues that may not affect them directly, but will have a much greater indirect impact on their businesses, as well as their personal lives."

Business executives usually don't get where they are unless they are highly able, analytical and articulate about business matters. Why not then apply these same qualities to the world of social and political activity? The alternative may be further waves of restrictive legislation and further shifts of initiative from the private to the public sector.

In summary, I am utterly convinced that we need more activists in the top ranks of our business community—heads of corporations, who are willing to go to "Headquarters City" and become personally involved—thus replacing "executive silence" with raised executive voices on the great issues of the day.

VALUES OF LIVING IN A SMALL TOWN

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 27, 1971

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, one of America's leading newspapermen, Louis Cassels, a senior editor of United Press International, recently authored an article about the values of living in a small town. The article was published in the Washington Daily News of October 13, 1971.

Mr. Cassels, a longtime resident of the Washington area, recently moved to Aiken, S.C., which is near his former home of New Ellenton, S.C. New Ellenton, once a small and rural southern community, was wiped off the face of the South Carolina landscape when that area was selected as the site of the Savannah River plant.

During his long service with UPI, Mr. Cassels has become one of the most admired American writers on religious topics. His articles have contributed a great deal to the Nation's understanding of the many developments in the area of religion during the past several decades.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Cassel's article about the values of slow-paced living in a small community be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

IT IS SO NICE OUT THERE IN THE STICKS

(By Louis Cassels)

Moving back to a small town after living in big cities for 30 years is an ambivalent experience.

An ambivalent experience, according to my dictionary, is one that affects you two ways at once. It has both good and bad points. Some things you like, some you don't.

My wife and I recently embarked on this ambivalent experience because the doctors thought it would be better if, after a serious heart attack, I lived at a slower pace under less stress.

The place we chose for our new home is a true small town, not a big city suburb trying to pass itself off as a small town. The nearest big city is more than 200 miles away. Like every place on earth, my new home town has unique characteristics. But on the whole its way of life is, I think, fairly typical of thousands of other small towns and medium-sized cities all over America.

Living here certainly is far less stressful than the life we endured (and on the whole enjoyed) during our 30 years in New York and Washington. The difference is so striking I find it easy to believe the doctors' assurance that this move can add years to my life. The most striking difference we've noticed so far is in the way people treat each other.

Because their nerves aren't frayed by traffic congestion, overcrowding and the myriad other pressures of everyday urban life, people who live in small towns find it easier to make the extra effort required to be kind, helpful and friendly.

Nearly every day, my wife comes home from a shopping expedition or some other errand in a virtual state of shock to report some new instance of courtesy or thoughtfulness of the kind that city-dwellers long ago learned not to expect from clerks, repairmen, bank tellers, or public servants. Instead of snarling at you, people go out of their way to serve you promptly and cheerfully.

We've also been pleasantly surprised to discover that it's much easier to get things repaired, built, remodelled or removed in a small town than in a big city. You'd think it would be just the other way around. But almost any household job that requires skilled labor—from getting a TV set fixed to putting on a new roof—seems to turn into a hassle when you live in the city.

First, you have a hard time getting the big city guy to commit himself about what day (let alone what time) he's likely to show up. When he does get there, he's likely to be in a hurry and/or a bad humor. And when he leaves, he hands you an outrageous bill.

In a small town, you look in the yellow pages and call the likeliest-sounding number. In no time at all, out comes a friendly and competent young man. He fixes whatever's broken, quickly and efficiently, for an entirely reasonable charge. It's hard to believe, I know, but it keeps happening all the time so it can't be just a run of good luck.

There are, to be sure, disadvantages to our new life. Giving up my cherished season tickets to the Washington Redskins when they seem at long last to have a good chance of a winning season was a trauma comparable to amputation of an arm. My wife, who labored for years as an unpaid volunteer to bring the Kennedy Center into being, was disappointed to miss its opening season of concerts and ballets. We both find ourselves longing occasionally for the fine stores, restaurants, libraries and museums we frequented in Washington.

But if this is the price of peace—the kind of peace we already find seeping deep into our bones in this pleasant little town—we're willing to pay it.

It seems ironic. Thirty years ago I "escaped" from a small town seeking the good

life in the big city. Now I find it was right here all the time.

The Census Bureau's figures indicate about 100 million Americans have made the same mistake since 1940. Well, I'm not going to try to talk all of them into coming home to the hinterlands. They'd overcrowd the place and ruin everything.

But with those of you who've had all of the urban crisis you can stand, I feel duty bound to share my secret:

It's really awfully nice out here in the sticks.

The small town with which Mr. Cassels is enraptured is Aiken, S.C., population 13,033 in the 1970 census. He grew up in that area.

RURAL DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1971

HON. JAMES KEE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 27, 1971

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, along with several of my colleagues who are members of the House Committee on Public Works, I am today introducing a bill in support of H.R. 10867, a bill to provide for improving the economy and living conditions in rural America by the distinguished chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture, Representative POAGE of Texas.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, I attach a summary and comments pertaining to this proposed legislation.

As we look to the future, I am thoroughly convinced that this proposed bill, which was initiated in the Agriculture Committee, will be the most important one for the benefit of rural America.

The summary and comments follow:

SUMMARY AND COMMENTS ON H.R. 10867

The Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act (Public Law 83-566), as amended administered within the Department of Agriculture by the Soil Conservation Service, has been in operation for 17 years. In my capacity as Chairman of the Subcommittee on Conservation and Watershed Development of the Committee on Public Works in the House, I have had the opportunity to observe firsthand the impact of this fine program in meeting the water, land, and related resource needs in upstream areas.

During the past few weeks, our Subcommittee has held hearings at several locations as part of a planned study of the overall watershed program. It has been our purpose to establish whether the objectives of Public Law 83-566 are being met; to learn whether benefits have accrued as anticipated by the sponsors when the Act was passed; or whether they have fallen short or exceeded those contained in the original work plans. I must add that we have been greatly impressed by the testimony offered to date. Those hearings have also brought to light a number of deficiencies of the present law which prevent it from reaching full effectiveness in carrying out its mission.

Public support for this program has been outstanding through the years as demonstrated by the fact there are 1,050 projects approved for operation, 374 in various stages of planning, and a backlog of over 1,300 applications from responsible local organizations awaiting assistance.

I am today introducing a bill to further amend Public Law 83-566. The amendments proposed in this bill will broaden the authorities within the upstream watershed program so it may more effectively meet the challenges of the 70's. There are two related

areas in which the program can make a greater contribution toward meeting broad national needs. These are in dealing with problems relating to the total environment and rural development.

A summary of the proposed amendments follows:

1. *Restoring, Improving, and Maintaining Environmental Quality*—This amendment would provide for added purposes to the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act (Public Law 83-566), as amended. The proposed amendment would provide an effective means to plan and install in cooperation with public agencies and local organizations desirable measures and works that would restore, improve, and maintain the quality of the environment within the watersheds involved. It would provide a specific and purposeful response in the watershed program to the objectives and requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969. The specific purposes are described as follows:

a. *Water Quality Management*—This amendment would authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to share the cost of providing storage in watershed projects for water quality control.

This legislation is needed to encourage the reduction and control of pollutants and their adverse effects on the environment in small watershed areas. With this amendment, it will be possible to provide maintenance of water quality at the farthest upstream points where pollution may occur.

Federal cost-sharing for water quality management is authorized for mainstream developments under other federal programs but is not provided for under Public Law 83-566. The proposed amendment would remove this inconsistency and would permit the reduction and control of pollutants in waterways of authorized watershed projects and make possible feasible contributions to downstream water quality management.

b. *Land Utilization*—Agricultural land is being used increasingly for community livestock feedlots, grain storage facilities, livestock sales pavilions, landfills for disposal of various solid waste materials, sewage lagoons, and other uses. If well designed and properly built on suitable soils, they can be a definite asset and a desirable addition to a water disposal and land utilization system within a watershed project. Attention must also be given to possible pollution of ground water, proper drainage, and preservation of scenic values must be afforded. Financial assistance with PL-566 funds would help to assure the proper installation of these facilities.

c. *Agricultural Waste Management*—Agricultural wastes and odors often contribute to pollution of the overall environment through contamination of water supplies, streams, and land areas. Such enterprises can be detrimental to proposed development of watershed projects. Local interests may not be financially able to comply with water quality standards, if applied, and might otherwise have to go out of business. To provide for continued operation of these facilities to the benefit of the community, and not preclude development of the watershed project, PL-566 funds are needed to help finance relocation, modification, or to help with construction of sewage lagoons or other treatment facilities to take care of feedlot, barnyard, and other forms of agricultural wastes.

2. *Municipal and Industrial Water Supply*—This amendment would authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to bear up to one-half the cost of the storage of water for present use, for municipal and industrial water that may be provided in any reservoir structure constructed or modified under the provisions of Public Law 83-566.

Often the chief bottleneck to economic growth in rural communities is the lack of

adequate water supply. Broadening the authority of Public Law 83-566 to provide federal cost-sharing for water supply to rural communities can have a major impact in producing economic growth, providing jobs, and developing a more comfortable and a better way of life in many town and country areas. In addition, improvement of the economy of these areas should help to reduce the migration of rural residents to already overcrowded urban areas.

Cost-sharing for municipal and industrial water in town and country areas would do more in contributing to community development than any other amendment.

3. *Use of Available Federal Funds*—Currently, Public Law 83-566 only permits the use of federal funds for acquiring land rights needed for works of improvement for public recreation or public fish and wildlife developments. Current restrictions are causing local sponsors to forfeit grants assistance under other programs for which they may be qualified to receive. The proposed amendment would permit the use of federal funds available to local sponsors under other programs.

This would permit local sponsoring organizations to utilize any funds that may be available to them under other programs that might be used in the purchase of land rights.

4. *Long-Term Contracting in Watersheds*—This amendment would authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to enter into agreements for periods of not to exceed ten years with landowners and operators to share the cost of carrying out conservation plans within watershed projects. It would result in accelerated and intensified application of practices and measures to conserve and develop the soil and water resources of farms, ranches, and other lands in project areas. It would assist in bringing about orderly community and resource development.

Cost-sharing contracts between landowners and the Department of Agriculture would assure application of planned measures on a time schedule. This arrangement would accelerate establishment of needed land treatment and speed up scheduling of structural works of improvement. Similar cost-sharing agreements have already proved their effectiveness in the Great Plains Conservation Program.

THE OLD WYE CHURCH,
WYE MILLS, MD.

HON. J. GLENN BEALL, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 27, 1971

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, on Sunday, October 17, I was proud to attend the 250th anniversary celebration of Old Wye Church in Wye Mills, Md. The Reverend Charles Edward Berger, rector of All Saints Episcopal Church, Chevy Chase, Md., delivered the sermon. I ask unanimous consent that the Reverend Mr. Berger's inspiring message and the pamphlet entitled "A Short History of Old Wye Church" be printed in the RECORD, so that Senators may have the opportunity to read of this significant occasion.

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

GREAT AGE

Luke 2:36: "She was of a great age . . ." As I began to think of what I might say to the congregation here at Old Wye on this occasion, my mind turned almost immediately to this passage in St. Luke's Gospel about a woman named Anna. She was called "Han-

nah" by the Jewish people of her time; her name lost a couple of "h's" as it travelled from Semitic languages into English. The Evangelist tells us that she was a prophetess, the daughter of Phanuel, of the tribe of Asher. She was a widow, and the description of her given by St. Luke suggests that if she were with us now she would be President of the Episcopal Churchwomen of Old Wye as well as chairman of its Altar Guild. He says that "she did not depart from the temple, worshipping with fasting and prayer night and day." St. Luke also seems to say that she was 84 years old, but the Greek isn't clear, can be understood to mean that she was actually 106, and had been a widow 84 years! What is clear, at any rate, is that she was well up in years, and that like Old Wye, she had lived through enormous ordeals.

She was only a young woman when the little Jewish kingdom lost its independence, when the Roman empire builders found that they had to make the Mediterranean a Roman lake and that they had to control the land-bridge between Europe, Asia and Africa which in my youth we called "Palestine." She hadn't been a widow very long when Pompey made Palestine a Roman province, and she lived through the confused time in which the ambition of Julius Caesar changed Rome from republic to dictatorship. More immediately affected was she by the Idumean whom Rome made the king of her country—Herod the Great, who is mentioned in the story of the Wise Men—a ruthless, confusing man who was by turns compassionate and cruel; who once sold his treasure to feed his people, but did not hesitate to murder his wife and their sons when he was tricked into believing this necessary to his remaining in power. I am sure that Anna was shocked that such a man should be her king, and that she was appalled by his ambitious building schemes, especially over his readiness to build pagan temples and to sponsor pagan culture even as he tried to outdo Solomon and to please the Jews by building a temple in Jerusalem more magnificent than Solomon's was. The dismay brought to sensitive and pious Jews by such a man as Herod cannot be exaggerated, and it was this man who was king when Anna flashed across the pages of St. Luke. "She was of a great age," he tells us. She had endured many years and many ordeals, and it was remarkable that she had survived them.

I am sure that you realize far better than I that Old Wye's survival was remarkable, too. Its origin as a chapel of ease virtually assured its difficulty, for vestries with more than one church rarely escape the temptation to concentrate their attention and affection on the main one. This must have been more pronounced after the disestablishment of the Church by the Declaration of Independence ended the support of the Church by taxes, and along with all other churches, Old Wye was entirely dependent on those who chose to be generous. In the circumstances, its second-place status as a chapel of ease made its continuation more problematical, rather than less so. But somehow, Old Wye survived that.

I understand that by the time this church was little more than 100 years old, regular services of worship were no longer here. The building itself was all but done in by time and neglect, and would have gone completely but for three things. One was the solid work done by the bricklayers when the church was built. Another was the dismay of Bishop Whittingham upon his discovery in the middle of the 19th century that the church was being used as a stable. And the third was the response of the Vestry and people to the Bishop's urging that the church be restored. This third factor was the most important one, for after the Bishop reconsecrated this church on July 20, 1854, the congregation was stirred to such activity that within a

few years, Wye was accepted as a separate parish and got its own Vestry.

By 1910, however, the new life generated by the mid 19th century renewal had vanished. There were only occasional services of worship here, and the building began to fall into disrepair. It might ultimately have suffered the fate of the Vestry house, which had been so long gone that not even its location was then known, but for the inspired and generous proposal of Mr. Houghton, whose offer to restore the lovely old church was accepted with enthusiasm and great appreciation, and made us his beneficiaries today.

Age, however, is by no means a simple blessing, and if all that St. Luke could have said about Anna the prophetess was that she was either 84 or 106, she would certainly not have been so much as mentioned in the Bible. What was remarkable about Anna was that despite her advanced years, she thought that the best days were still to come. She did not believe that they were finished and done. She did not agree that the good was something that could only be remembered. She thought that it was still to appear, that it lay not only in the present, but even in the future. St. Luke tells us that Anna was looking for something—that she was looking for the redemption of Jerusalem. That's why we know about her; she wasn't simply rooted in the past. For when the mother of our Lord brought the baby Jesus into the temple, Anna the prophetess was there, and she saw him. His identity was revealed to her. She knew he was the Savior, and we are told that when she saw him, "she gave thanks to God, and spoke of . . . (Jesus) . . . to all who were looking for the redemption of Jerusalem."

It is a remarkable thing that Anna resisted the temptation merely to be old, for succumbing to that temptation is one of the worst dangers of age. Anna had successfully resisted the urge of the elderly to live only in the past, to give up on the struggle of keeping up with the times. Her outlook was not dominated by the notion that what is old is necessarily best because it is familiar. She had not tripped over the stumbling block which falls so many who have persuaded themselves that just because they are old they are also wise.

One of the most delightful people it has ever been my privilege to know was a woman somewhat older than Anna—if Anna was a mere 84! This dear person was in her nineties when I first met her about thirty years ago, and she was in failing health. But her intellect was undimmed by the years, and she could chatter away about current events, or jokingly tease a bridge partner about his misplay, as well as any of us. People over 60 years her junior found her most attractive.

I was among them, and I did not have to think long or hard to realize why. In a single sentence, it was because she helped us to forget her age, but she never forgot it herself. She was not sealed off in a past which we had never seen. She was not the prisoner of her memories. Despite her great age, she lived in the present and could share things with us. She never pretended to be no older than we were, for that would have made her ridiculous, and if she were alive today we may be sure she wouldn't even envy those who wear hip-huggers or blue jeans, much less wear them herself! But she wouldn't be critical of them, either. She was what she was—an old woman who was conservative both in dress and in speech, who was not in the least tempted either to pretend that she was young or to reject the ways of younger people. She was a happy blend of the past and of the present, and everybody found it a joy to be with her. She was old, but not merely old—not emotionally and intellectually so identified with the past that it appeared to be a divine oversight that she was not yet dead, already buried in the past but still unaccountably and uselessly alive.

Anna did not make that mistake, did not

let herself get buried, but was like my friend. Although of a great age, and doubtless with many treasured memories, she had room for the present and the future. She lived day by day in eager anticipation of the great day of the redeemer, which was still to come.

I perceive that Old Wye is like that—conscious of a great past, but pressing towards an even greater future, aware of the importance of avoiding being reduced to service as mere custodians of a lovely building, trying earnestly to translate the work of Anna the prophetess into modern terms by giving thanks to God, and by speaking of Jesus to all who are looking for the redemption of Jerusalem.

It is easy to despair over current events, and to be consumed with worry about the economy, or the Russians, or the Vietnamese, or the rebellion of youth, drug abuse, violence, polarization, or the radicalism of the angries and the crazies. But I think our time is neither more nor less dreadful than Anna's, who like Old Wye, was also "of a great age," and set the course for us all in thanking God for having found the Lord's Christ, and in speaking of him to all who were looking for redemption.

A SHORT HISTORY OF OLD WYE CHURCH, WYE MILLS, MD.

For more than two hundred and fifty years, OLD WYE has been a simple, rural church proclaiming by its very austerity the enduring quality of its people's faith in God. Today, it is still an active, though small, parish in the Episcopal Diocese of Easton, supporting a varied program of Christian activities as well as regular worship in its colonial house of God.

The present congregation numbers over one hundred interested persons of many faiths, seventy-five of them communicants of the Episcopal Church. Every year about two thousand persons visit the church and grounds, many of them making it a point to attend the eleven o'clock service on Sunday mornings.

Both parishioners and visitors realize that Old Wye has come to us as a hallowed trust, the fulfillment of the vision of a few generous and dedicated people and the place of worship for countless faithful souls throughout these many years.

In 1692, St. Paul's Parish, Hibernia in Mary Land was established for the colony as a part of the Anglican Church. The earliest records show that by 1694, St. Paul's had not only the "Mother Church" in Hibernia, but also was ringed with three "chapels-at-ease", chapels to which members could go with greater ease than attending the primary Church. Two of these chapels were called St. Luke's, one at Church Hill and the other at Wye. The third chapel was at Tuckahoe. One Vestry carried on the activities for the entire parish, a parish that extended some twenty miles in width and twenty-five miles in length!

In 1712, the Vestry of St. Paul's agreed to erect a formal chapel building at Wye, and matched the gift of the Rector for this purpose, some four hundred pounds of tobacco. Pews were auctioned off to the highest bidders, and gifts of the members for the construction were solicited. These gifts, one hundred pounds, sterling, and sixty thousand pounds of tobacco, stimulated enough interest to begin construction in 1717. It was not easy sailing, for the Vestry had much trouble collecting the gifts and legacies which had been promised and had to apply to the Governor and Council for help in having these pledges paid.

On October 18, 1721, St. Luke's Day, Wye was officially opened for worship. Improvements, such as a plank floor, window shutters, and fences, continued to be made after the formal opening of the church.

Inasmuch as tobacco had had such an influence on the whole life of the Mary Land

Colony, it seems fitting that we quote the following from the formal history of Old Wye as prepared by the Maryland Historical Society:

"By (the act of establishment) the county government paid to the vestry forty pounds of good merchantable tobacco for every taxable in the parish. A "taxable" was anyone over sixteen years old who was either a freeman or a male servant imported, or any slave, male or female. Clergymen and paupers were not taxable. In 1763 there were six hundred and twenty-nine taxables in St. Paul's, so the vestry had the disposal of twenty-five thousand one hundred and sixty pounds of tobacco. In that day, because the church was established and thus part of the government, vestries had many duties more governmental than churchly. Indeed, it is not too much to say that they were the local government for their parish. There was a law against adultery, a law with teeth in it. By its provisions, prosecutions for it began in the parish. A vestry must summon both the man and the woman who were charged with incontinent living, and admonish them thereof. Sometimes they appeared when ordered to do so, expressed regret, promised amendment and departed. Sometimes they did not come, or coming, invited the vestry to do its worst. Sometimes the same woman came twice with different men. If the vestry was not able to cope with the people, then the county court took up the case. But the vestry had to initiate it, it was not just sticking its nose into the private lives of its parishioners.

If tobacco was the wealth of the parish, it was also the source of its work and worry. It was for the vestry to appoint the counters of tobacco plants, and inspectors of tobacco; and, more often than not, they had trouble finding men willing to act as inspectors. For all that tobacco was a medium of exchange in colonial Maryland, and almost the only one, it lacked one of the most important characteristics of a good currency; it was not, and could not be, invariably uniform. When it was enacted that any person owing tobacco could discharge his debt at the rate of twelve shillings per hundred pounds, the clergy protested. Tobacco was worth often twenty-five or even thirty shillings if it was good, but they were paid twelve shillings, and the planter could sell his tobacco for twice that much."

The Church seems to have led a peaceful existence until the year 1755 when the Rev. Alexander Malcolm, mathematician and clergyman became the master of the Queen Anne's Free School on Tilghman's Neck Road. He evidently allowed his son to substitute for him on occasions and it was discovered that the son, Mr. Quinton Malcolm "did teach dancing in the said school, without a license (!) which visitors apprehend must necessarily tend to the hindrance of teaching reading, writing, etc. . . . also that unless the number of scholars increase, this shall be looked upon as mispending the publick money."

The Vestry House was built in 1761-1763 at a cost of three hundred dollars. With the coming of the Revolution the entire position of the established Church changed swiftly. The Continental Convention which opened on June 12, 1774 took over the government of the colony and it became the government of the State of Maryland. The Bill of Rights by the Convention of 1776 provided that, "No persons ought by any law to be compelled to maintain any particular ministry or place of worship but the churches and all such property belonging to the Church of England ought to remain to the Church of England forever."

The first meeting of the first non-established Vestry was held in June 1779, the Vestrymen being qualified to act by a Justice of the Peace . . . all of which was some

years before the "Protestant Episcopal Church" was chosen as the official name of this Church which really lost its name because of the Revolution. The Bill of Rights which took away the "forty pounds of tobacco per poll" did little more than leave the "Church of England" in possession of the property it held. It did, however, give the legislature discretionary power to "lay a general and equal tax for the support of the Christian religion, leaving to each individual the power of appointing his part of the tax to the support of some particular church or minister, or to the poor." Since the Vestry no longer had the power to appoint tobacco inspectors, or admonish parishioners of their incontinent living, it was obliged to spend more time on raising money for parish work. (A familiar modern note, indeed!)

After the Revolution, St. Paul's and Old Wye, together with all the other parishes, fell on evil days. Communicants as well as revenues almost vanished. Records, too, became scantier than ever before. Except as a place where notices were posted, Old Wye is not mentioned once between April 1774 and April 1789. From 1782 to 1791 there was no rector. In November 1791 a rector was appointed with a current salary per annum of one hundred fifty pounds current money—he agreed later to take whatever the Vestry could raise. Four years later the Reverend Elisha Rigg came to Old Wye—his tomb lies under the floor of the church. In the early years of our Republic, the church required constant repairs and it was with great difficulty that the building was kept open.

For half a century nothing was done to Wye Church. After 1829 regular services were no longer held at Old Wye; it was almost fallen down, half decayed but for the solid workmanship of the bricklayers a century before. At about this time, Bishop Whittingham on his way to catch an early steamer out of Queenstown to Baltimore, happened by Old Wye, and saw that the church had become a stable. . . . "The Episcopal party were greatly moved. They entered. They prayed. As they left they took fence rails and barred the door. The Bishop did not forget his visit, and he immediately began to encourage the Vestry to have the old building restored." By 1854, the Bishop's desires were being met. A new slate roof was put on, the outside stairs to the gallery were removed, and stained glass replaced the clear glass which had been broken out. Victorian pews replaced the original high-backed, square pews of 1721. The Vestry House, however, was not touched, because by this time it had completely deteriorated . . . and its precise location was unknown. Through the generosity of several parishioners, Old Wye was thus rescued from oblivion, and on July 20, 1854, the Bishop was pleased to be able to consecrate Old Wye under the name of "St. Luke's Wye." The reconsecration seems to have stirred the congregation into activity, for within a few years, Wye was accepted as a separate parish (including Queenstown) by the Diocesan Convention of 1859.

A year after Wye Parish was set up as a separate parish, Fort Sumter was fired on. As Mr. Dashiell told the diocesan convention in 1864, "In the changed circumstances of the times nothing but the goodness of God has enabled us to live . . . The members of the parish though few and having suffered more heavily in the loss of their labor have nevertheless shown a noble determination to sustain the Church and have endeared themselves to the Rector by a generous exhibition of their sympathy for him in his day of trial."

From 1867 to 1910 there was a succession of rectors at Old Wye. From 1910 on, there were only occasional services at Old Wye Church and the building fell again into dis-

repair. More than that, the changes made along the line had done great violence to the original building.

In the winter of 1947, Mr. Arthur A. Houghton, Jr. presented to the Vestry of Wye Parish a proposal to restore the old church. This very generous offer was accepted with enthusiasm and great appreciation. Even the Vestry House has been rebuilt on its old site. So long had it been gone that its very location was not known until a tractor plough cruising in the general area where it must have been, ran into a brick wall and subsequent search showed the outlines.

Old Wye Church was re-dedicated on July 13, 1949 at an impressive service conducted by the Bishop of Maryland and services have since been held in it every Sunday. In addition to the restoration work, a Parish House and Rectory were built.

And so Old Wye is a flourishing and strong parish. It bears eloquent testimony to the devoted Christian spirit and determination of its many members and friends over more than two centuries to maintain the Church as a going institution. Trials and tribulations have been many but today the building stands erect in all its beauty and simplicity.

This brief history cannot be concluded without a final tribute to Mr. Houghton and the meticulous care and devotion with which he directed the restoration.

CONGRESSMAN WILLIAM F. RYAN
FIGHTS FOR PREVENTIVE MEDICAL CARE FOR POOR CHILDREN

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 27, 1971

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, one of the greatest tragedies in Government occurs when the Congress gives lip service to disadvantaged Americans, then promptly forgets them. We have seen this sham too often in the past and are now, unfortunately, witnessing it again.

My colleague, WILLIAM F. RYAN, and the National Welfare Rights Organization are leading the fight to compel the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and the White House to issue the regulations necessary to implement the preventive medical care program authorized nearly 5 years ago. At the present time, only five States have established the free preventive medicine programs under Medicaid envisaged by the 1967 Social Security Act Amendments.

BILL RYAN hopes to block the Nixon administration's insensitivity to the needs of the poor in the United States. Thirteen million children are being denied adequate medical treatment because of bureaucratic callousness. An account of BILL RYAN's efforts to guarantee these children the medical care they so urgently need appeared in the Washington Post. I am pleased to share it with my colleagues.

The article follows:

POOR CHILDREN AWAIT MEDICAL CARE

(By Nick Kotz)

On Jan. 2, 1967, President Lyndon Johnson signed legislation requiring free preventive medical care for millions of poor children

who seldom if ever see a doctor. Now, almost five years later, the children still are awaiting for the government to start the program.

"These children are the forgotten victims of a society which applauds rhetoric, but is remissing action," says Rep. William F. Ryan (D-N.Y.) who has pushed for implementation of the Medicaid law.

The history of this child health care legislation provides a case study of creative ideas and noble intentions which are written into law, then lost in the bureaucracy, discovered again, and finally found to be too controversial or expensive to implement.

The law, providing for medical screening, diagnosis and treatment of children eligible for benefits under the Medicaid program, might have quietly disappeared in dust-covered sections of the Social Security Act, except for the persistence of the National Welfare Rights Organization.

After two years of fruitless negotiations with HEW, NWRO, which represents 120,000 welfare recipients, last week filed suit in federal court against HEW Secretary Elliot Richardson, demanding that he implement the 1967 law.

The law, part of the 1967 amendments to the Social Security Act, called for "early and periodic screening and diagnosis" of children eligible for aid and "health care, treatment, and other measures" to correct problems discovered in the medical exams.

Automatically eligible for these medical benefits are about 8 million children under age 21 who receive aid through welfare programs, and another five million low-income children eligible for Medicaid benefits. Many of these children now do receive Medicaid treatment for acute illnesses, but few are receiving the medical exams called for by the new law.

About 13 million children would be eligible for aid under the new law.

Many of these, because they receive help under one or more federal welfare programs, are already eligible for some Medicaid services, particularly for acute illness requiring hospitalization or surgery.

But the new program calls for a kind of preventive medicine now lacking in most Medicaid coverage—examining children for potential problems and then correcting them.

For example, a child diagnosed to have poor eye-sight would be fitted with glasses. Few state Medicaid programs now provide eye glasses either for adults or children.

HEW was supposed to implement the law by July 1, 1969, by issuing regulations to the states. The states were required to provide the preventive child medical care, or to lose their federal Medicaid funds. State and federal governments split the costs of this program.

However, HEW still has not issued regulations to the states and only five are voluntarily following the law. One of these is Mississippi, which has reported stark findings of disease in its first screening of poor children.

The Mississippi Medicaid Commission reported that its examination of 1,178 children revealed 1,301 medical abnormalities, including: 305 cases of multiple cavities, 241 cases of anemia, 97 cases of faulty vision, 217 cases of enlarged tonsils, 51 cases of hernia, 48 cases of intestinal parasites (mostly hookworm), 53 cases of poor hearing, and 32 other medical conditions requiring immediate treatment.

Mississippi, according to HEW officials went into the program only because it thought such action was mandatory and feared it would lose all its federal funds. Actually, mandatory action is not required by law until HEW issues regulations implementing the preventive medicine program.

The history of the unused federal law goes

back to 1967 when the House Ways and Means Committee was holding hearings on the Social Security Act. The committee was anxious to save money on welfare and Medicaid.

HEW Secretary Wilbur Cohen suggested that the best way to save money was to provide preventive medical care, heading off potential problems before they became acute and cost far more in hospital and medical bills as well as losses to the work force. The Committee accepted his idea and preventive medical care for welfare children became part of the law.

When HEW did not issue the regulations by July, 1969, advocates for the welfare poor began pushing the Department for action.

These efforts apparently yielded success in December, 1970, when HEW Secretary Richardson issued proposed regulations. If states didn't have the resources to take care of all children immediately, they were permitted to begin with children under age 6, and to serve all children by mid-July 1973.

But the proposed regulations, which were to become final after a 30-day period for public comment, have now disappeared from sight.

Howard Newman, director of HEW's Medical program, said numerous state officials wrote that they could not afford the program, State and federal government are now splitting about \$6 billion in Medicaid costs, and about \$1 billion of this amount is spent on children.

Newman says the original proposed HEW regulations would have cost federal and state government about \$900 million a year. HEW officials, he said, feared that states would merely cutback other welfare payments if forced to provide the preventive medicare care.

Congressman Ryan wrote Secretary Richardson in August, 1971, asking what had happened to his proposed regulations issued 9 months earlier—and 27 months after they should have been in force.

Secretary Richardson replied to Ryan on Sept. 21 that he shared his concern about the children but also was concerned about the fiscal impact on states. Final regulations were drafted, taking into account the states' problems said Richardson.

"I have signed the regulations," Richardson wrote on Sept. 21. "They will be published in the Federal Register very shortly."

That was more than a month ago, and HEW officials confide privately that the regulations now are being held up by the President's Office of Management and Budget, which worries that the program will cost too much.

HEW estimates the costs of its revised plan at between \$50 and \$100 million, far less than before, since care is limited to young children, and only a few medical services are authorized.

"I expect the regulations are going to be published in final form within a week," said Medicaid Administrator Newman, about regulations required by law 27 months ago.

NWRO officials agreed to withhold their lawsuit if they were given a definite date on which the regulations would be published. Jon Kinney, NWRO attorney, said HEW officials responded by warning that the lawsuit would stiffen the resistance of Nixon Administration officials and would produce meaningless regulations.

"We are sick and tired of going to HEW and being told that the regulations are coming soon," says Mrs. Margaret Hayes, chairman of NWRO's legal committee. They have been promising that for years. Now they can make their excuses in Court.

"This does not even save money, because by not acting to prevent disease in children now, states will have to spend more money for remedial care later."

MR. JOE BALTHAZER, ROCK HILL, S.C., UNSELFISH AND COURAGEOUS BLOOD DONOR

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 27, 1971

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, one of my fellow native South Carolinians has given much of himself in service to his fellow man. Mr. Joe Balthazer, of Rock Hill, S.C., has donated 11 gallons and 1 pint of blood through the Rock Hill Red Cross.

Mr. Balthazer, an employee of the Rock Hill Printing and Finishing Co., has given approximately 7½ times the body's capacity of blood.

This is indeed a courageous act, and he is to be commended for his unselfish contributions to humanity.

An article about Mr. Balthazer was published in the Evening Herald of Rock Hill, S.C., on September 8, 1971.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article entitled "O-Negative Blood Donor Surpasses 11-Gallon Mark," be printed in the RECORD.

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

O-NEGATIVE BLOOD DONOR SURPASSES
11-GALLON MARK
(By Betsy Perrone)

ROCK HILL.—A Rock Hill man who bleeds every time he gets a chance was presented a Red Cross pin today for having donated 11 gallons and one pint of blood to the Red Cross.

Joe Balthazer, 64, a "universal donor," with type O-negative blood, has been donating blood through the Rock Hill Red Cross since the chapter was founded. But, says his wife, "it's hard to know how much blood he's really given. Because he used to give to the hospital, whenever they called for blood, before the Red Cross was set up here."

On hand to present the award was Dr. Inez Elrod, medical director of the Piedmont-Carolinas Red Cross Blood Center, which serves, according to Dr. Elrod, "a large part of North Carolina, and a small part of South Carolina."

Since blood is given only in one-pint units, said Dr. Elrod at the presentation, Balthazer has given blood about 89 times. "He'll probably give one more pint, then we'll make him stop," she said. "So he will have donated 90 pints of blood through the Red Cross."

Balthazer holds the record for donation through the Rock Hill Red Cross. There are some persons in the Piedmont-Carolinas area who have given more, but, said Dr. Elrod, their chapters of the Red Cross have been in existence longer than the one here. So they've just had more time to give it.

Bill Grier Sr., president of the Rock Hill Printing and Finishing Company, where Balthazer works, said the donor has missed only five days of work in 38 years with the company. And those absence, he said, were due to deaths in his family, rather than to illness. So this man, who has given approximately 7½ times the body's capacity of blood, would seem to be unharmed by his tremendous donation record.

"The only time he felt like fainting," said Mrs. Balthazer, "was when he was giving a transfusion directly to a baby." "Yes, that's a kind of trying experience," he agreed.

Balthazer, who is totally deaf, "was taught a lesson," many years ago, according to his wife.

"I was real sickly," she said, "right after we were first married. I needed blood desperately, and there wasn't any available. It taught him to give blood whenever he could, because when you need blood, you need it, and there's no way around it."

O-negative blood can be given to someone with any other type of blood, and is usually used for total blood replacement when a baby is born with a blood type incompatible with its mother's.

A baby's blood is difficult to type correctly," said Dr. Elrod, "so, to be safe, O-negative blood is usually used."

O-negative is also used for patients in heart surgery, because of its compatibility. Persons with other types may be given their own type of blood, or O-negative, or in some cases O-positive. However, a person with O-negative may only receive that same type of blood in a transfusion.

NASHVILLE BANNER EXPOSES PROPOSED "SOCIAL ADJUSTMENT" PROJECTS OF HEW

HON. JAMES H. (JIMMY) QUILLEN
OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 27, 1971

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, the busing issue has become a matter of utmost concern to this entire country. Growing sentiment is no longer confined to the South, but to each and every geographical section of the United States.

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has received applications from Tennessee for more than \$1.8 million in Federal funds, most of them sought by private organizations which claim their projects would bring about social adjustment and improve relationships within communities that have been severely handicapped through massive busing decrees of the Federal courts.

The Nashville Banner has published a series of stories outlining the detailed plans of some of these proposed projects, and the facts contained in these stories should be of utmost concern not only to officials in the executive branch but also to every Member of Congress. Not only does it seem that our Federal tax dollars are being allocated to projects of questionable value, but also, in some instances, the funds sought actually would hinder the progress of local school systems to comply with the Federal courts' desegregation order.

Gov. Winfield Dunn of Tennessee has written an excellent admonition to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare urging that Federal tax dollars available to assist communities be dispensed through local school boards who carry the primary responsibility for compliance, instead of through private organizations which, however well intentioned, are not responsible to the public for the conduct of some of these outlays.

I commend both the Governor's letter and the series of articles and editorial in the Nashville Banner to every Member of the Congress and urge that appropriate steps be taken immediately to investigate

the widespread abuse of our tax dollars in worthless, if not hampering, projects. The time has come for each of us to make sure that governmental waste is minimized and that the expressed intent of Congress is carried out in the distribution of appropriated funds.

My congratulations to the Nashville Banner on exposing the detailed plans of some of the proposed projects under the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare—a job well done.

The article follows:

[From the Nashville Banner, Oct. 19, 1971]

ELEVEN PROGRAMS PROPOSED IN TENNESSEE—BUSING, SOCIAL ADJUSTMENT PROJECTS TO COST \$1.8 MILLION

(By Grady Gallant)

Eleven new "social adjustment" projects to attune public school children to massive busing and other "life experiences" encountered in the modern school environment are in the works for Tennessee at a cost to the federal government of \$1,829,067.35.

Of the sum, the project budgets show that \$1,230,795.40 would be dissipated in salaries for those laboring in the 11 adjustment projects, many of whom are open advocates of busing.

Travel expenses for these workers would eat up another \$92,160.

Total cost for salaries and travel of the project workers is \$1,322,955.40.

This leaves only \$506,111.95 for child adjustment and to attune them to sociological development.

The budgets show that most of this \$506,111.95 would be devoured by telephone bills, office rental and equipment.

Applications to implement the adjustment programs under the Emergency School Assistance Program (ESAP) have been sent to Gov. Winfield Dunn.

He approved seven of the proposals. The other four were neither approved nor disapproved by the governor. The Department of Health, Education and Welfare, which administers ESAP, will now approve or disapprove them.

A spokesman in the Governor's office said that Dunn relies on recommendations from the various communities involved as to what action he should take on these projects.

The spokesman said it was his personal belief that HEW will fund all 11 of the projects.

The projects present a community social problem and outline a plan designed to solve—or reduce—it.

For example, Memphis Community Education Project (MCEP) discloses that it is "a non-profit, tax-exempt, free-standing corporation of community-minded persons who are attempting to effectively improve the social conditions of Memphis and Shelby County."

To this end it has "four main foci of activity—housing, health, education and law."

"We have focused on these activities, not to provide separate service systems, but to help the black society become a true human community with the ability to relate to the white community, as peers and, therefore, bring about the sine qua non (essential) condition for true friendship and a stable society."

To accomplish this and other things, MCEP needs \$413,410 in federal funds under ESAP of which \$251,100 will go for salaries and \$37,800 for travel expenses.

The list of projects includes three to be conducted in Nashville:

1. Concerned Citizens for Improved Schools, 1922 Church Street, Second Floor Rear, requesting \$259,626.35.

2. University Council for Educational Administration, 29 West Woodruff Avenue, with offices in Columbus, Ohio, requesting \$78,741.

3. The Social Action Committee of Christians and Jews, Inc., 6401 Harding Road, requesting \$60,000.

The Concerned Citizens for Improved Schools states it has "functioned successfully and uniquely for the last two and a half years as a bi-racial group dedicated to affirmative community involvement toward ending all vestiges of a dual school system and the results of its accumulative patterns of discrimination."

The organization was "spontaneously created" in March 1969. Concerns in regard to "application of criteria for zoning the proposed attendance area for a newly created junior high school" and "racial isolation of all pupils in the Nashville-Davidson County schools" were the spurs which caused spontaneous organization of the group, according to the funding application.

Mrs. Kitty Smith, wife of Dr. William O. Smith of Nashville, is project director for Concerned Citizens. Dr. Joseph Yeakel, general secretary of the board of evangelism of the United Methodist Church is listed as the authorized representative of Concerned Citizens, not to be confused with Concerned Parents Association, Inc.

The University Council for Educational Administration under Dr. Jack Culbertson, Columbus, Ohio, proposes to "develop and test a simulation program for urban administrators, particularly as related to education and race," according to Dr. Elbert Brooks, Metro school director, in a letter endorsing the project.

The proposed program "promises much in relation to the development of reality-oriented materials for the upgrading of in-service training, professional growth and development opportunities for practicing administrators, and for the training of new administrators," he observed in a letter to Culbertson dated Sept. 21, 1971.

The project proposes to help school leaders in Nashville "deal effectively with desegregation problems," Culbertson says.

The Social Action Committee of Christians and Jews, 6401 Harding Road, proposes to establish two early-morning, free child care centers to help take care of children of working mothers between the time when the mothers must go to work and the children must leave to go to schools opening at 10 a.m.

Charles B. Myers, an assistant professor of history and social science education at George Peabody College for Teachers, is the project contact person with HEW.

All 11 projects plan to spend their funds in a year or less.

The organizations requesting ESAP funds and their cities are:

1. Concerned Citizens for Improved Schools, 1922 Church Street, Second Floor Rear, Nashville. Request: \$259,626.35.

2. University Council for Educational Administration, 29 West Woodruff St., Columbus, Ohio. Request: \$78,741 for work in Nashville.

3. The Social Action Committee for Christians and Jews, Inc., 6401 Harding Road, Nashville. Request: \$60,000.

4. The Unity Group Fund, Inc., 1348 Grove Street, Chattanooga. Request: \$372,970.

5. Memphis Education Project, Inc., 740 Court, Memphis. Request: \$413,410.

6. Memphis Urban League, 546 Beale Street, Memphis. Request: \$236,242.

7. Community Youth Playhouse, Inc., 1185 South Bellevue, Memphis. Request: \$61,580.

8. Memphis Panel of American Women, 5503 Gwynne Road, Memphis. Request: \$19,971.

9. Williamson County Citizens for Human Dignity, P.O. Box 423, Franklin, Tenn. Request: \$58,203.

10. The Civic Action Council of Jackson, P.O. Box 3002, Jackson, Tenn. Request: \$89,725.

11. The General Board of Christian Education, Christian Methodist Episcopal Church, 1474 Humber Street, Memphis. This organization requested a total of \$814,176, but proposes spending \$178,599 on a Chattanooga, Tenn., project, with the remainder being spent in cities of states other than Tennessee.

The other communities included in the proposal are Tupelo, Miss.; Phenix City, Ala.; Savannah and Chatham County, Ga.; and Morehouse Parish, La.

[From the Nashville Banner, Oct. 20, 1971]

FEDERAL GRANT OF \$259,626 SOUGHT FOR BUSING PROPAGANDA CAMPAIGN

(By Grady Gallant)

An intensive propaganda campaign using a "mobile van," week-end retreats, mass indoctrinational meetings and other devices is planned by Concerned Citizens for Improved Schools to attune public school children and their parents to "a new way of life" here.

To mount this "determined and creative campaign against negativism," the organization has applied for \$259,626.35 in federal funds, of which \$208,294.40 would be drained into employe salaries, services and benefits.

The mass media assault against "white ghetto mentalities" and for "integrating the desegregated schools" would include \$60,000-worth of monthly television specials and \$25,000-worth of billboards, radio and television spot announcements, all to be paid for from taxpayers' money.

Workshop consultants would be brought in at \$100-a-day and a "media consultant" would be hired at \$100-a-day for 96 days, for a total expenditure of \$9,600 for about 19 weeks of work, if he works a five-day week.

A community newsletter to be distributed monthly as planned will cost \$3,600 for circulation of its 5,000 copies. A monthly newsletter aimed at students would be circulated to 30,000 of them at an annual cost of \$9,400.

Students texts and handbooks would cost \$380 and students' workshop proceedings will dissipate if the plan is approved, another \$1,250. The parents' workshop proceedings would cost another \$500, and telephone and postage costs are forecast to be \$3,275 for the year.

Application for the more than a quarter million dollars in federal tax money was made through the Emergency School Assistance Program (ESAP: Pronounced E-SAP).

ESAP is administered by the Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Funds are given to groups and organizations which wish to help in the busing and integration of public school children.

Concerned Citizens for Improved Schools (CCIS) has existed for 2½ years. It is a bi-racial group "dedicated to affirmative community involvement toward ending all vestiges of a dual school system and the results of its accumulative patterns of discrimination," the organization notes in its request for tax refunds.

It was "spontaneously created," according to a description of its origin in the project application. Its membership is 75 per cent white, and includes some open advocates of busing.

Following spontaneous creation, the group became active in promotion of "community action for social change."

With its help, Clergy United for School Integration (CUIE), College and University Professors United for Integrated Education (CUPUIE) and (White) Nashvillians for Integrated Education were organized.

The application has cleared Gov. Winfield Dunn's desk, without his approval or veto, and has been sent on to federal officials.

"Invited members of CCIS testified on behalf of the plaintiff in the case finally adjudicated before (U.S. District) Judge L. Clure Morton (Kelley vs. Board of Educa-

tion)," it is noted by the tax funds applicant.

Last June, ESAP gave \$39,581 for CCIS to form what it called Volunteers in Action (VIA), an activity which involves 26 high school students who "inform the students, their own peers, about the indispensability and justice of school integration."

In explaining the need for expansion and continuation of the VIA program, CCIS notes that the "tense atmosphere" resulting from the busing issue of the recent race for mayor and "the transfer of senior students" from schools from which they would have been graduated "will make it somewhat difficult to secure understanding and acceptance of an integrated, unitary school system."

Being the "main beneficiaries of the opportunities for quality integrated education" the students "must be reached on a one-to-one basis and must have the opportunity for input to diffuse the tensions and create more genuine interaction within their own schools."

Reaching students of a one-to-one basis with Volunteers in Action is expensive. In the second application for federal tax money in less than a year, CCIS wants \$48,000 to pay 80 such volunteers \$600 annually. A week-end retreat for 50 volunteer trainees will cost another \$1,300. And a two-week training program for 50 VIAs at \$5 a week will cost still another \$500, according to CCIS figures.

"In an out-of-school atmosphere where students will feel free to express their ideas candidly and honestly, w. will use the workshop format for a two-day (week-end) discussion (just as soon as possible . . . within 30 days) on racism led by experts in the field, from several frameworks of reference," the application for federal tax money states.

"We will reach for an attendance of 600 or at least 30 students from 20 high schools."

"The curriculum would include information on how to distinguish between individual prejudice and institutional racism; racism as it manifests itself in America, as well as European and Latin American history documents; other serious literature; information on ghetto life and culture (black); about black in a white society; about white ghetto mentalities and how our society has caused and perpetuated racist patterns, etc.," the proposal states.

Volunteers in Action use such methods in achieving objectives as developing materials to "establish rapport with their own peer group," participating as speakers bureau panels and "dialogue groups" and "low key mobilizing of students who are supportive of integration and those who believe in affirmative involvement in projects."

They also implement "buddy systems within the school in order to diffuse tensions and establish (long range) more genuine relationships among all the students."

The volunteers also serve as "communications links" in the Urban League sponsored Unitary School System Assistance Center Rumor Control Center (USSACRCC).

Under its plan for intensive propaganda activities for busing and elimination of the neighborhood school, there would be a project director paid \$14,000 annually who would be assisted by an associate director making \$10,000 annually. A "media specialist" would be paid \$10,000.

A part-time community organizer would receive \$6,000 based on an annual salary of \$12,000, should he be full-time.

An administrative assistant would be paid \$7,000 annually, a secretary would get \$6,000 and a clerk typist would receive \$4,800.

Staff travel expenses are set at \$1,200 annually.

State-wide delegates to a workshop on Parents Organization—50 delegates—would cost \$7,500.

CCIS has budgeted \$5,000 for rental of four offices for a year, \$600 for workshop site

rental for two days and \$450 for the week-end retreat site for VIA trainees.

The group also proposes to buy \$8,276-worth of equipment such as a 16-mm projector (\$353), an electrostatic copier (\$1,345), a Polaroid camera and case (\$280), projection table (\$52.95), record player (\$50) and mailing meter (\$96). To lease and operate the mobile van for the community organizing teams will cost \$4,000.

Another \$2,100 would be spent for office equipment for three offices at \$700 for each office. The organization now has only one office.

Five hundred dollars will be paid to contract services of an auditor.

The bi-racial advisory committee of Concerned Citizens for Improved Schools are listed in the request for tax money from HEW as Dr. Thomas Ogletree, 3212 West End; Mrs. W. A. O'Leary, 5334 Overton Road; Mrs. Carol C. O'Neill, 1809 Morena Street; Inman Otey, 905 Lischee Ave.; Mrs. Rice Pierce, 5013 Stillwood Drive; Mrs. Prince Rivers, 1803 Morena St.; Dr. J. Tarleton, 1714 Windover Drive; Dr. Eugene Teselle, 2007 Linden; Donna Vaughn, 1818 Beech Ave.

Mrs. Elmer West, 3515 Granny White Pike; William White Jr., 1107 Kellow St.; Mrs. E. L. Whitmore, 3613 Batavia; Dr. Joseph Yeakel, 1014 Woodmont Boulevard; Steve Barefield, 540 Richmar Drive; the Rev. William Barnes, 1503 16th Ave. S.

Don Beisswenger, 235 Lauderdale Road; Mrs. David A. Bergmark, 922 17th Ave. North; Mike Bonnell 4510 Granny White Pike; Isaac Crosby, 920 Morengo Lane; James Curry, 1003 Battlefield Drive; Mrs. Leslie A. Falk, 1417 Clairmont Place; Mrs. John M. Frase, 1015 Noelton Lane.

Dan Graves, 302 Elmington Ave.; Nancy Hollomon, 815 Ramsey; Julius Jones, 3906 Kings Lane; Amy Kurland, 1805 Kingsbury Drive; Theodore Lewis, 1400 Acklen Ave.; Joyce A. Long, 1409 Chester Ave.

Mrs. Johnella Martin, 1704 Villa Place; Warner L. McCreary, 1820A Delta Ave.; and Mrs. Richard M. Morin, 812 Clematis Drive. (Thursday's article will report project plans of other Nashville groups.)

[From the Nashville Banner, Oct. 21, 1971]

EDUCATORS SEEK FUNDS FOR ADJUSTMENT, TOO

(By Grady Gallant)

Not only is adjustment necessary for parents and public school children involved in massive busing under the order of U.S. District Court Judge L. C. Morton, school administrators also feel acute adjustment needs as they face problems thrust upon them by radical school changes.

Tax money for sociological adjustment is obtained by various private groups and organizations wishing to help with public school children from the Emergency School Assistance Program (ESAP) of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

One of three ESAP project proposals for Nashville now pending before HEW has been submitted for funding by the University Council for Educational Administration, with offices located at 29 West Woodruff Ave., Columbus, Ohio. Jack A. Culbertson is executive director of this organization.

With the help of several staff members of Nashville Metro school system, "who have been involved in its development at all stages" Culbertson has come up with a proposal to develop and test a simulation program for urban administrators, "particularly as related to education and race."

GAVE ENDORSEMENT

In a letter to Dr. Culbertson dated Sept. 21, 1971, Dr. Elbert Brooks, director of Nashville schools, noted his endorsement of the proposal.

Dr. Brooks then wrote that this project "promises much in relation to the develop-

ment of reality-oriented materials for the upgrading of in-service training, professional growth and development opportunities for practicing administrators, and for the training of new administrators."

In plain language, the program intends to develop simulated (or imitation) situations and problems of the kind actually being experienced by school administrators and other leaders in Nashville.

Once these situations and problems are developed, they would be used in a series of workshops to illustrate incidents happening in the schools. Workshop participants would then discuss how they would handle such "problems of desegregation."

"The problems which have major implications for training will be selected, classified and related to significant administrative functions central to the Emergency School Assistance Program (that is: developing community programs; giving leadership to special curriculum revision programs; undertaking special comprehensive planning, and so forth)," the project outline reveals.

TO COST \$78,741

The creation of these artificial situations and problems in order to learn how to deal with the real things happening daily in the public schools will cost \$78,741, according to the project request for federal tax funds.

Salaries, consultants, travel back and forth between consultants, honoraria for directors and personnel benefits dissipate more than \$28,400 of the sum sought.

The heavy cost of administration of such a simple program as the one projected by the University Council for Educational Administration is reflected in employee salaries budgeted in the proposal to be paid by federal taxpayers:

"Director (1-5 time, 12 months at \$36,000 annually), \$7,200.

"Assistant director (1-3 time, 12 months at \$14,000 annually), \$4,700.

"Assistant (1-3 time, 12 months at \$10,800 annually), \$3,600.

"Assistant (1-4 time, 12 months at \$11,200 annually), \$2,800.

"Secretary (1-2 time, 12 months at \$6,000 annually), \$3,000."

This is a total of \$21,300 for five part-time workers.

In addition to this, they are budgeted to cost an additional \$3,608 for such personnel benefits as retirement, disability and hospital insurance—plus travel and per diem to Nashville and Columbus, Ohio, in the amount of \$3,500.

Added to their total of \$21,300 in salaries, the additional expenses just cited bring their cost up to \$28,408.

They plan to use only \$1,000-worth of office supplies and materials, however.

These workers would require the services of "consultants" to "plan, design and block-out simulation materials." This consultant service will cost \$3,500.

NEXT IN COST

The next most expensive item on the budget for this simulation program is the \$11,250 required for the filming "of six critical incidents."

Three one-week workshops, which include "per diem for 75 participants, honoraria for directors, plus travel and other expenses," whatever these "other expenses" might be—for they are not specified—costs \$8,000.

"Creation of 30 in-basket items" will drain off \$2,000. An "in-basket item" is described by a school official as written material describing a problem or situation which is placed "in the basket" on an administrator's desk.

The administrator then removes it, reads it and gives his comment as to how he would have handled the problem described.

Production of 12 "audiotaped simulations" would cost \$2,750, and another \$5,000 is re-

quested to produce "six problem-centered group exercises."

To plan and produce "support content" would cost \$3,000, and another \$3,000 tax dollars would be spent to "develop instructors manual, evaluation procedures and related materials."

Production of written materials and negatives for workshop use would require expenditure of \$5,000 more.

INDIRECT COSTS

A mystery "indirect costs," which are not itemized, are given under "other costs" as \$5,833. This heavy expenditure—more than that required for consultants to block-out and design simulation materials (\$3,000) and for creation of 30 in-basket items (\$2,000)—is just explained as being 8 per cent of \$72,908.

The \$72,908 figure is the cost of the project until 8 per cent (8% of \$72,908) or \$5,833, is added to it.

When \$5,833 is added to \$72,908, you get \$78,741, which is the figure given as the total cost of the project.

The funds are scheduled to be spent and the project completed in a year.

The proposal gives 11 stages through which the project would advance to its completion. Events "associated with desegregation" will first be monitored to "identify major problems encountered by school administrators," if the project receives the funds.

Instructional objectives then would be decided and the simulated situations to be developed would be determined. Background facts needed for the simulations will be gathered and the simulated situations and problems will be developed, under the proposal.

TRIED OUT

The materials would then be tried out "with selected personnel" from Metro schools. The materials would be revised, plans would be completed for the workshops and materials would be packaged for use.

By Sept. 1, 1972, the project is designed to conduct comprehensive continuing education programs "involving Metro school personnel and "community."

"An analysis of evaluation data" will follow "by Sept. 30, 1972," and by "Oct. 30, 1972, development of recommendations for refining the materials and for extending their use to other urban settings" will be done.

This appears to mean that the products of this year-long effort will be shown in other cities.

In its appeal for tax funds, the University Council for Educational Administration claims it has had "substantial experience in the development of simulated situations and other types of materials during the last 10 years.

MADE AVAILABLE

"It is estimated," the group states, "that during this period more than 30,000 practicing school administrators have experienced one or more of the 24 different simulations now made available for use for continuing education purposes.

"A number of professors have expressed an interest in developing the projected simulations bearing upon desegregation and equal learning opportunities.

"Since the University Council for Educational Administration is made up of 59 major universities, it is able to draw upon a wide range of training resources, not only in materials development, but also in the planning and implementation of workshops," the organization states.

FIRST GRANT

Local school officials say that this project was initially part of the \$9,098,864.72 Metro school 1971-72 ESAP grant proposal. It, along with other proposals, was denied, and of the total sum sought only \$1,418,368 was approved.

It has been resubmitted through the University Council for Educational Administration in a second try for the money.

The proposal lists the Biracial Advisory Committee of the Metro School System of the Emergency School Assistance Program here. This committee, unlike in other project proposals, is a committee which is a part of the Metro school system and functions as a committee in other Metro projects.

The committee membership is given as follows: along with the name of the organization which appointed them to the committee:

Mrs. Zenoch G. Adams, 1024 Kellow St., Metro PTA Council; Dr. Charles E. Kimbrough, 2600 Walker Lane, NAACP; Frank Bailey, 1116 Eighth Ave. South, ESA, Title 1, Advisory Committee; Mrs. James P. Carter 1000 Gale Lane, League of Women Voters; Dr. Roy Clark, 2130 West End Ave., Ministerial Association; Mrs. Beverly Bass, 1314 Fifth Ave. North, Model Cities Agency; Phil Eakes, 2609 Crump Drive, Inter-High Council; Dr. Dana Swick, Box 514, Peabody College.

Lloyd H. Griffin, 401 Union St., Nashville Area Chamber of Commerce; Mrs. Alexander Heard, 211 Deer Park Drive, Council of Community Services; Robert Horton, 107 Metro Court House, Metro Government (Mayor's office); Julius Jacobs, 105 Leake Ave., Metro Action Commission.

Ted Martin, 1710 Hayes St., Metropolitan Nashville Education Association; C. E. McGruder, 908 32nd Ave., North Nashville Citizens Coordinating Committee; Dr. Nicholas Sieviking, 300 Oxford House, Urban Observatory; William Stiffer, 614 Lynnwood Blvd., Committee for Unitary School Plan; Dr. G. J. Tarleton Jr., 1714 Windover Drive; and Dr. M. D. Williams, Tennessee State University, Nashville Urban League.

STATE OF TENNESSEE,

October 15, 1971.

HON. ELLIOT L. RICHARDSON,
Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: In recent days I have been called on pursuant to federal statutory law to review several applications for discretionary grants submitted by various non-public organizations for funding under the Emergency School Assistance Program.

Upon receipt of these applications my staff contacted elected officials and school superintendents in the localities from which the applications had come. With one exception, these local officials and school superintendents recommended that these applications be approved or that they be funded without approval. While one local official recommended the veto of one application, this was not a recommendation with which the school authorities concurred.

In view of the recommendations that I received from local officials and school authorities, I chose not to exercise my right to veto any of the applications that were submitted. However, this review did reveal that many local school systems in Tennessee are experiencing considerable difficulty in relating the independent programs envisioned by these projects to their own official efforts to overcome problems associated with desegregation. The availability of discretionary funds under this program to non-official organizations has created situations in which many of these private non-profit groups applying for discretionary funds view their role as one of competing with the local school system rather than working with it. As a result, existence of the discretionary grant program has tended to further complicate racial problems which exist in some communities.

Desegregation of our school systems is a legitimate and important objective, and we in state and federal government should apply ourselves to facilitating the efforts of the

local school systems to this end. For these reasons, I believe that all of the funds available under the Emergency School Assistance Program should be channeled to the local school systems which have the official responsibility for acclimating the student, teacher, parent and community at large to the changes either undertaken voluntarily or mandated by the federal judiciary.

I encourage you to recommend to the Congress that all Emergency School Assistance funds be channeled through local school systems.

Thank you for your consideration of this matter.

Sincerely,

WINFIELD DUNN.

[From the Nashville Banner, Oct. 21, 1971]
CONGRESS ALERTED, TOO—HEW SHOULD HEED
WARNING BY GOVERNOR DUNN

Timely and thoroughly reasoned is Gov. Winfield Dunn's urgent suggestion—to federal authorities, notably the Health, Education and Welfare Department, that money allotted from that source for school desegregation assistance be allocated to local school systems instead of to private groups.

If anyone is inclined to question logic of the preference thus expressed, doubt certainly can be put to rest by pondering specific requests by such private groups, for procedural inflection on the public school system of Tennessee—several of them notably for Metropolitan Nashville - Davidson County schools.

It is to enlighten readers, taxpayers and school patrons, that The Banner is running an informative series of articles by Grady Gallant. Some of the proposals shock. Some involve trespass—no less baleful because couched in good intentions. All would be financed by tapping the Federal till, to the stated aggregate of \$1,829,067.35.

That is not a bagatelle, even if there were assurance that every penny of it would be intelligently and conscientiously spent—with no faintest suggestion of bureaucratic treatment of it as a windfall.

Governor Dunn does not overstate it when he warns that the private groups now proposing that Treasury expenditure (by themselves) for social adjustment projects in Tennessee often compete with local school systems; and that they can impair, rather than ease, enlightened efforts to desegregate schools in an orderly manner.

In The Banner's judgment, some of these proposals should be vetoed flatly—and all should be closely scrutinized, by both State and Metro authorities, recognizing both the official responsibility and the dangers invited by any implied acceptance without a close look.

The Tennessee Chief Executive does not make a blanket indictment of all individual, private undertakings for reasoned school improvements; and for coming to grips in a practical way with problems confronted.

He is not opposing school desegregation. On the contrary he has advocated enlightened steps for it as a legitimate and important objective. As the Governor of Tennessee, and being on the scene, a competent and authoritative witness on the facts of the case, he has given his best judgment to HEW Secretary Elliot Richardson—it being that agency proposing to supply the funds in question.

Local authorities, and state authorities, know better than does any Washington-centered agency, how best to operate a local or state school system.

Courage and understanding and responsibility show in the Governor's statement, and the copy of it going to each member of Tennessee's congressional delegation, should bolster by their unreserved backing the weight and influence of this warning message.

AMERICAN EDUCATION WEEK

HON. NICK BEGICH

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 27, 1971

Mr. BEGICH. Mr. Speaker, this week has been proclaimed American Education Week 1971 by the President. He has asked at this time that—

Appreciation be given for the truly heroic efforts of our teachers and all education professionals upon whose humane skills so much of our greatness as a people depends.

While the term "heroic" denotes a quality attributed more often to those in battle, I could only agree that in Alaska we do have heroes for teachers. In Alaska's bush there are heroes for teachers because they have left universities and stimulating intellectual surroundings to spark the imagination of children in isolated villages. In Alaska's schools there are heroes for teachers because many have known what it is not to have the proper materials or even bare essentials for instruction.

Alaska's teachers and educational professionals are heroes because they speak out when their funds are cut, when their programs are reduced, when their only private university is in danger of closing its doors and when its only State university does not receive the necessary support in its promotion of educational excellence.

They are all heroes for they have taken the time and the trouble to see that children are given every opportunity to seek all that is possible in life.

In this session of Congress we have been busy with education legislation. The U.S. Office of Education appropriations bill was substantially increased over last year. The passage of the health professions training bill will give needed assistance to nursing schools, medical schools, and hospitals. The early childhood bill, passed by both the House and the Senate, would provide for expansion and coordination of Federal daycare services, and educational, nutritional, and health services for preschool children. Of particular interest in Alaska is the Indian education bill now before the House which would provide much needed funds to improve the quality of education available to American Indians.

We have a great deal of work remaining to do for education this year. Among this legislation is a bill calling for the creation of a Cabinet-level Department of Education, which I authored. I believe this is important and necessary for it would insure that this Nation's educational needs will be given the proper attention and the proper priority.

And today, we are considering the higher education bill that emphasizes grants and loans to low-income students.

President Kennedy said:

Our progress as a Nation can be no swifter than our progress in education.

I think Alaska is proving itself as an example of the truth of that statement. We have grown as a State because we

are learning. We are eager to prosper, but we will not risk the advances we have made. We are not yet wise, but we are learning. And we owe much of it to our teachers.

TURNING THE TAX TABLES ON POLLUTERS

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 27, 1971

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, we are choking on the air we are supposed to be able to breathe. Existing legislation has done little beyond rhetoric to actually clean up our air, and industry still finds it profitable to pollute.

Each time I drive from Washington to New York City, I am stunned by the pollution pouring out of factory and refinery smokestacks in northern New Jersey. It is usually necessary to roll up the car windows in order to breathe. It is time for Congress to tell the Nation's businessmen that they will no longer be able to go their own way, pouring contaminants into the sky.

That is why I am proud to be a co-sponsor of H.R. 10890, a bill which would tax fuels containing sulfur and sulfur oxide emissions. Unfortunately, money is the motivating factor in too many phases of our society, so it is necessary to hit industry where it hurts—in the corporate pocketbook—in order to impose a consciousness of what they are doing to the earth we inhabit.

Not Man Apart, the publication of the Friends of the Earth, carries an article in its November issue on pollution taxes as a powerful weapon in the fight to preserve our environment. I commend it to my colleagues.

The article follows:

TURNING THE TAX TABLES ON POLLUTERS

The Coalition to Tax Pollution has been formed to support an effective tax on sulfur emissions. The Coalition's proposal has five key points:

- 1) That the charge on sulfur emitted to the environment be set at 20 cents per pound, and that this level be achieved by 1975.
- 2) That the charge be applied uniformly throughout the nation, in order to avoid creating havens for polluters, and to keep the tax administratively simple.
- 3) That Congress, rather than an agency, set the level of the tax, so that the debate is out in the open.
- 4) That the revenue not be earmarked, so that no program's funding is dependent on a lack of pollution control.
- 5) That no subsidies be given to industries, but that workers laid off as a result of plant closure receive assistance in the form of retraining, relocation, and unemployment compensation.

Recently, the Coalition published a fact sheet, which answers the most frequently asked questions about the Pollution Tax. We print excerpts from the fact sheet below. (The full fact sheet may be obtained by writing to the Coalition to Tax Pollution, 620 C Street S.E., Washington, D.C. 20003.) The members of the Coalition are Environmental Action, Federation of American Scientists, Friends of the Earth, Metropolitan Washing-

ton Coalition for Clean Air, Sierra Club, The Wilderness Society, and Zero Population Growth.

POLLUTION TAXES

The purpose of pollution taxes is to make pollution abatement in the self-interest of the polluter, by creating a strong economic incentive for industry to stop polluting. A pollution tax system places financial responsibility directly on the polluter according to the amount of pollution emitted. For the tax to be effective, it must cost the polluter more than the expense of abatement.

Despite all the public effort and concern, pollution is getting worse. We need to try a tactic that will really work. As things stand now, pollution control agencies have the overwhelming responsibility of policing all violations, yet their usually inadequate staffs, they are unable to prosecute all violators. The result is selective enforcement, and the big polluters are usually overlooked because of their political pull. Even if enforcement agencies could prosecute all violators, there are so many opportunities for industry to delay compliance with standards that pollution can get much worse in the meantime.

Taxes and standards can and should be used together to control pollution, but taxes have four advantages:

1. The administration of pollution taxes much simpler: the burden of proof is on the polluter rather than on the enforcement agency. Individual legal proceedings do not have to be brought against polluters; all companies simply pay the tax on all their pollution. Enforcement centers on spot-checking, rather than on proof of guilt.

2. The creative energies of industry are turned inward to determine how to stop pollution, rather than outward to argue with the standard-setters and obtain delays. Industry itself takes the initiative in finding the most economical and efficient way to abate pollution.

3. The incentive to reduce pollution continues even after standards are met, because the last pound of pollutant is taxed just as much as the first pound. This encourages continuous research and development of pollution-abatement technology, to eliminate more and more of the pollution.

4. Under the present mechanisms of pollution control, delay is always to the advantage of the polluters, because in the meantime they can continue to pollute as heavily as before. Litigation is less costly for them than abatement, so they have a strong incentive to go through every legal channel, even if they expect to lose the case eventually. With pollution taxes, there is a strong incentive to avoid delay of any kind, because the taxes keep mounting up as long as the pollution continues.

Tax breaks and subsidies have also been tried, but they bias industries to make large capital expenditures on pollution control equipment, often on treatment measures, do not encourage research into more effective technologies to prevent pollution, and do not insure that the equipment will continue to function. Pollution taxes, on the contrary, are "technologically neutral"; they encourage technological progress at all levels, progress measured in terms of how much pollution is reduced rather than on how much money is spent on equipment. A charge based strictly on the quantity of pollution emitted makes industry seek the best long-term means of pollution control.

"LICENSE TO POLLUTE"?

Won't pollution taxes just give industry a "license to pollute"? Couldn't industry simply pay the tax, pass the cost on to the consumer, and accomplish no pollution control?

The pollution tax system is a way of making the goal of pollution control in the economic self-interest of the polluters. It is not a revenue-raising program, although it grew out of the conviction that the air and water

should not be free dumping grounds. If the tax is high enough, it will be an unambiguous incentive to abate pollution. It will make pollution control a less costly alternative than polluting and paying for it.

If industry thought it could avoid pollution abatement simply by passing on to the consumer the amount of the tax, it wouldn't oppose pollution taxes. Actually, if the tax is high enough, competition will force industry to control pollution, for the simple reason that abatement will be cheaper than paying the tax. A firm which chooses to reduce its pollution will have a competitive advantage over those which choose to pay the tax and pass the cost on to the consumer. Most firms will choose the minimum-cost alternative; out of self-preservation they will have to.

Industry has a long history of cutting production costs to gain competitive advantage—substitution of cheaper materials or cheaper labor, for example—there is no reason to expect industry to change the pattern in this case.

Industrialists themselves are telling us that pollution taxes will give them a license to pollute, and using this as a reason to oppose pollution taxes, as if they were unselfishly concerned about effective pollution control. They know, however, that if the tax is high enough, they will have to stop polluting, and that is what they are resisting.

CONSUMERS

But won't the consumer have to pay more for goods, even if industry chooses to stop polluting?

If industries choose to stop polluting instead of paying the tax, they will still have to pay for abatement, although this expense will be much less. This cost will be reflected in consumer prices. At the present time, goods that are produced in polluting processes are artificially cheap; part of their true cost is expressed in the form of environmental deterioration. Pollution taxes, by locating the cost of pollution and pollution abatement exactly at the source, cause goods to reflect more accurately the total costs that go into their production. But any effective pollution control will cause increased cost to the consumer, either in form of higher prices (as in this case) or higher taxes (as in government-subsidized pollution control). Pollution taxes, in that they encourage the most economical means of pollution control, will cause the least rise in consumer costs consistent with pollution control.

Although some products will cost more as a result of pollution control, in the case of sulfur pollution, consumers will actually pay less when the pollution ends. At the present level of sulfur pollution, the Environmental Protection Agency estimates that the health and property damage costs society 25 cents per pound of sulfur emitted. This amount, a conservative estimate, is far more than abatement will cost. Unfortunately, the costs of the long-term effects of sulfur pollution, even though they are very high, are hidden costs, and a rise in product cost will be obvious to everyone. In their fight against pollution control, polluters always cite the fact that consumers will have to pay more for their products. What they never mention is that pollution itself is costing the consumer far more than pollution abatement ever will.

WHICH POLLUTANTS?

Pollution taxes can be used on many pollutants, but they will prove particularly useful in cases where abatement will require a significant amount of technological research and development, and where the cost of abatement will be quite high. These are the situations in which, under the existing pollution control regulations, industry has a strong economic incentive to seek delay. These are also the situations in which industry needs the most incentive to carry out the needed research.

Sulfur oxides, one of the most serious and abundant air pollutants, fulfill these criteria. We propose a sulfur tax as a first objective. Other pollutants for which pollution taxes would be particularly appropriate are BOD (biological oxygen demand—a measure of water pollution) and nitrogen oxides (another serious air pollutant). The tax approach has also been suggested for non-returnable containers, for phosphate content of cleaning agents, and for solid wastes.

Furthermore, we might want outright prohibition of pollutants which are very toxic. But prohibition is a politically workable tactic only if there are a few economic benefits to be gained by emitting the pollutant, for example if alternate technology or substitute materials are readily available. However, in cases where prohibition would have a large economic impact, we encounter the same political, administrative, and economic factors which are nearly insurmountable in the regulatory strategy. If industry says it is "impossible" to completely stop emitting a pollutant, the likelihood of actually enforcing or even enacting a prohibition is very small. In this situation, a tax will be very effective, especially when used to supplement stringent standards. A prohibition not backed up by a strong incentive is prone to the same degree of delay, subversion, and avoidance used by polluters when pollutants are regulated by standards.

SETTING POLLUTION TAXES

Congress should be responsible for setting the level of pollution taxes. The level of the tax is crucial. The decision on the rate of the charge is the equivalent of a decision on an acceptable level of environmental quality. The debate over the level of pollution charges should be as visible as possible; many values, some not measurable, must be taken into account. Industrial and regional self-interest should have to face squarely society's demand for effective pollution control. Agencies in the Executive branch are much more susceptible than Congress to arm-twisting, since their debates take place behind closed doors by people who are not directly accountable to the public.

What revenue there is should not be earmarked. Since the object of pollution taxes is to stop pollution rather than to collect revenue, any program which depended on the tax revenue for its funding would be dependent on a lack of pollution control. The more successful the tax is, the less revenue there will be. If we totally succeed in stopping pollution, no revenue will be collected.

Pollution taxes should be applied uniformly throughout the nation. A variable tax would give industries an incentive to move to the areas where the tax was lowest. Even if they did not actually move, the opportunity to do so would give them leverage in their attempts to lower the tax in their areas. The notion of lower taxes in areas where there is less pollution implies that we are willing to tolerate more pollution in the areas that are clean now. On the contrary, citizens in regions of clean air are demanding controls strict enough to prevent any degradation.

AN INCREASE IN FEDERAL HABEAS CORPUS APPLICATIONS

HON. CHARLES E. WIGGINS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 27, 1971

Mr. WIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, the increasing volume of Federal habeas

corpus applications challenging convictions handed down by State courts has become a matter of great concern to the National Association of Attorneys General. In 1961 there were 1,020 such applications. By 1970 this number had increased to 9,063. According to the association, the problems which have resulted from this increase in applications have been productive of serious strains in Federal-State court relations, have caused lengthy delays in the finality of State court judgments, have brought about a trivialization of the "great writ," and have significantly increased the workload imposed upon the Federal courts and upon most State attorneys general.

At its meeting in Washington, D.C., on February 2, 1971, the association reviewed proposals to modify section 2254 of title 28, United States Code, which relates to the extension of Federal habeas corpus to State prisoners. These proposals were referred to an ad hoc committee on habeas corpus for study.

In Chicago, on September 24, 1971, the ad hoc committee drafted a bill to amend section 2254. Consisting of two sections, this bill seeks to further define the consideration required for a Federal judge to entertain an application for a writ of habeas corpus from a State prisoner and the conditions which must be met in order for a Federal judge to act favorably upon such an application.

The chairman of the ad hoc committee, Attorney General Evelle J. Younger of California, has requested that I introduce the association's proposals in the House of Representatives. I have consented to do so.

Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing this legislation and urge its prompt consideration by the Judiciary Committee.

**A COUNTRY THAT LOSES ITS WARS,
LOSES ITS PRESTIGE**

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 27, 1971

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the Nationalist Chinese, one of the founding fathers of the United Nations and one of the most faithful adherents to its charter have now been expelled from that organization. The Nixon administration must accept this diplomatic insult as the greatest defeat the United States has suffered in the history of our country. The Nixon administration must also accept its responsibility for having set in motion the forces which brought about the events which will lead to greater loss of confidence in the U.N. as an effective organization for world peace and eventual-ly the demise of that very organization.

Under its present makeup, the U.N. has deteriorated to nothing more than a common debating hall for the various Communist parties around the world, with the U.S. taxpayers picking up the tab to provide international bureaucrats

with the many comforts of life and the real estate in which to further the world Communist conspiracies which the U.N. leaders call peace.

The President, whose personal diplomacy, without the consent or approval of Congress, set the stage for this betrayal, has not said one word. He apparently prefers to manipulate his pawns from his sanctuary, at least until he can decide which way public opinion is mounting or until the opinion molders are able to mount a propaganda avalanche to vindicate his naivete.

At this time our President's influence is being exerted in three directions: To our Nationalist Chinese ally in Taiwan, he is extending his deep regrets and reassuring them his administration did everything in its power to retain their seat; he is trying to convince the Communists in Red China that it was the timing of his two-China policy and the act of sending Henry Kissinger to Peking to arrange for his visit which brought the issue up in the first place; and to the American people, his spokesmen are trying to give hollow assurances that we were sold out by our foreign aid recipients.

Billions of dollars of foreign aid have been poured out through the diplomatic trough since 1945, obviously intended to influence votes and friends in the U.N. In fact, the list of foreign aid recipients looks like the U.N. membership roll. The money, like all foreign aid, has proven only to make enemies who now become bitter at even the suggestion that their U.S. taxpayers' dole might be diminished.

But more especially, lack of confidence in the U.S. leadership must be laid to our military commitments which since 1945 have never been concluded.

Any nation which loses its wars can expect to lose its prestige and its influence with its so-called friends.

To date, no one can determine if the President's trip to Peking was politically worth the sacrifice of a charter member and a longtime ally in the U.N., but we can be sure that the cost of the trip to Peking has furthered the interests of world communism and now may give to the Communist powers the privilege of influencing the election, if not selecting the next President of the United States.

I include a list of our foreign aid recipients who cast their U.N. vote abstained from voting, or were absent, to expel Nationalist China and give its seat to Red China, along with the amount of U.S. foreign aid tax dollars of the American people, and a related news clipping in the RECORD:

TOTAL NET U.S. FOREIGN AID TO U.N. MEMBER NATIONS VOTING TO EXPEL NATIONALIST CHINA AND SEAT RED CHINA, FISCAL YEARS 1946 THROUGH 1971

| | |
|--------------------|---------------|
| Afghanistan | \$373,800,000 |
| Albania | 20,400,000 |
| Algeria | 176,100,000 |
| Argentina (1) | 341,100,000 |
| Austria | 1,218,400,000 |
| Barbados (1) | 700,000 |
| Belgium-Luxem. (1) | 1,742,200,000 |
| Botswana | 19,100,000 |

| | |
|--------------------|---------------|
| Burundi | 7,800,000 |
| Burma | \$158,600,000 |
| Cameroon | 33,500,000 |
| Canada | 46,500,000 |
| Ceylon | 176,600,000 |
| Chile | 1,281,800,000 |
| China, (2) Rep. of | 5,096,500,000 |
| Colombia (1) | 1,119,400,000 |
| Congo (B) | 4,000,000 |
| Cuba | 43,700,000 |
| Cyprus (1) | 22,400,000 |
| Czechoslovakia | 189,500,000 |
| Denmark | 873,300,000 |
| Ecuador | 296,700,000 |
| Equatorial Guinea | 300,000 |
| Ethiopia | 394,100,000 |
| Finland | 10,300,000 |
| France | 7,059,700,000 |
| Ghana | 264,800,000 |
| Greece (1) | 3,681,900,000 |
| Guinea | 113,000,000 |
| Guyana | 69,900,000 |
| Hungary | 13,300,000 |
| Iceland | 59,800,000 |
| India | 8,003,600,000 |
| Indochina | 1,535,200,000 |
| Indonesia (1) | 1,343,800,000 |
| Iran | 1,945,700,000 |
| Iraq | 90,600,000 |
| Ireland | 105,700,000 |
| Israel | 992,000,000 |
| Italy | 5,528,500,000 |
| Jamaica (1) | 92,400,000 |
| Jordan (1) | 710,000,000 |
| Kenya | 77,100,000 |
| Kuwait | 29,500,000 |
| Laos | 1,449,500,000 |
| Lebanon (1) | 98,000,000 |
| Libya | 221,600,000 |
| Malaysia | 72,600,000 |
| Mali | 30,000,000 |
| Mauritania | 5,000,000 |
| Mauritius (1) | 6,100,000 |
| Mexico | 451,600,000 |
| Mongolia | |
| Morocco | 731,800,000 |
| Nepal | 157,600,000 |
| Netherlands | 2,033,300,000 |
| Nigeria | 383,600,000 |
| Norway | 1,127,100,000 |
| Pakistan | 4,484,100,000 |
| Panama (1) | 242,300,000 |
| Peru | 465,200,000 |
| Poland | 437,300,000 |
| Portugal | 432,900,000 |
| Romania | 10,000,000 |
| Rwanda | 8,000,000 |
| Senegal | 40,100,000 |
| Sierre Leone | 44,100,000 |
| Singapore | 31,300,000 |
| Somalia | 79,300,000 |
| Southern Yemen | 200,000 |
| Spain (1) | 2,028,400,000 |
| Sudan | 91,000,000 |
| Sweden | 135,300,000 |
| Syrian Arab Rep. | 56,700,000 |
| Tanzania | 73,400,000 |
| Thailand (1) | 1,592,400,000 |
| Togo | 17,300,000 |
| Trinidad & Tobago | 49,700,000 |
| Tunisia | 699,400,000 |
| Turkey | 5,640,500,000 |
| Uganda | 42,500,000 |
| United Arab Rep. | 759,900,000 |
| United Kingdom | 7,209,100,000 |
| USSR | 186,400,000 |
| Yemen | 45,300,000 |
| Yugoslavia | 2,515,600,000 |
| Zambia | 6,100,000 |

Bahrain (1)

Fiji (1)

Qatar (1)

Maldives Islands (2)

Oman (2)

(1) Abstained from voting.

(2) Absent.

Data supplied from Report by: OTTO E. PASSMAN, Chairman, Foreign Operations Subcommittee on Appropriations.

[From the Evening Star, Oct. 26, 1971]
**U.N. VOTES PEKING IN, TAIPEI OUT; ALLIES
 DESERT UNITED STATES IN KEY TEST, 59 TO
 55; 76 TO 35 TALLY ENDS 26-YEAR RED
 CHINA ISSUE**

(By George Sherman)

UNITED NATIONS.—The General Assembly, in an historic move, has voted to expel Nationalist China and give the Chinese seat in the United Nations to Peking.

The decision last night in the crowded and tense assembly was the single greatest diplomatic defeat for the United States in the 26-year history of the U.N.

In the end, every Western ally of the United States deserted the dual representation position on China backed by Washington. The key vote was 59-55.

Red China refused immediate comment on the outcome.

On Taiwan, a Nationalist Chinese Foreign Ministry official expressed shock. Stocks fell on Taipei's stock exchange, the AP reported.

JAPAN SEES BENEFIT

Prime Minister Eisaku Satao of Japan said the U.N. decision in the long run will benefit Japan. He told parliament his government will "continue positive efforts" to normalize relations with Peking.

Foreign Minister Takeo Fukuda told the same session the Japanese people must be proud of their government for keeping faith with Nationalist China. Japan was a co-sponsor of the unsuccessful U.S. resolution to keep the Nationalist Chinese in the assembly, while admitting Red China and giving it the Chinese seat on the Security Council.

Prime Minister Indira Gandhi of India, visiting in Brussels, told a news conference that "it was unthinkable that such a large country with such a large population be kept out of the United Nations, whatever one might think of the regime. We welcome the U.N. decision as a just decision."

Just before the final vote the Nationalist Foreign Minister, Chow Shu-kai, took the rostrum and announced the end of participation by the Republic of China in the General Assembly. Minutes later, the 131-member body voted 76-35, with 17 abstentions and three absent, to give Peking the Chinese seat in all U.N. organs and "to expel forthwith the representatives of Chiang Kai-shek."

Later at a press conference, Chow Shu-kai formally announced that the Republic of China "has now decided to withdraw from the organization which it helped establish." The United Nations, he said, has "now degenerated into a circus." He warned that Communist China will transform it into "a battlefield for international subversion."

U.S. Ambassador George W. Bush, the politician turned diplomat, sat still and dejected during the last of the eight straight hours of debate in the General Assembly. Step by step, he witnessed the American strategy fall apart. If the U.S. formula for this year had been followed, Peking would have received the Chinese seat in the Security Council and a seat in the General Assembly but the Nationalists would have remained in the assembly, too.

The American ambassador, who had led the public campaign here, did not hide his bitterness about promised votes which never materialized.

Bush did not try to hide his bitterness or sense of betrayal at some of the votes.

"The commitments faded away into thin air," he said on television this morning. "There is such a thing as being given firm commitments, when people look you in the eye . . . those were firm commitments, where people just went back on their word. This troubles us," he said.

American officials, who refused to be named listed the governments which they say had misled Washington. They were Belgium, Cyprus, Tunisia, and the two tiny Trucial states

from the Persian Gulf, Katar and Oman—all five of whom had promised to vote yes but abstained instead, U.S. aides said.

IRISH VOTE UNEXPECTED

In addition, these officials said, Ireland, Trinidad and Tobago had been expected to abstain instead of voting against the United States on the important question. According to these calculations, then, even allowing for loss of one of the Trucial states the United States procedural resolution should have passed 59-57.

The decisive vote came on expulsion. The United States gained priority for a vote on its resolution to turn the expulsion proposal into an "important question" requiring a two-thirds majority. Since 1961, the United States has used this procedure to keep the Nationalists in and the Communist Chinese out.

But this time, the United States and 19 co-sponsors, including Japan and the Pacific allies, lost by four votes—55 to 59, with 15 abstentions and absent. That vote—denying "important question" status to the expulsion issue—effectively ended the 21-year debate over seating Peking.

The suddenness of this vote and the decisiveness of its outcome surprised everyone. Right up until the final day of debate yesterday, U.S. representatives were predicting there would be no vote until today, and that the United States would win on the important question by one or two votes.

Once the loss was registered, the bandwagon behind the Albanian resolution to admit Peking and expel Taiwan began rolling in earnest. Delegations rushed to register their support for Peking, and cheers broke out as such countries as Portugal and Israel swelled the final vote for expulsion of the Nationalists and admission of Peking to 76.

TANZANIANS DANCE

The uproar began after the first four-vote loss by the United States. African delegates cheered, some supporters of the Albanian cause danced and rhythmic applause stopped the proceedings.

"With all that wild emotion," said Bush later, "it was hard to discuss the thing rationally." Bush warned both before and after the vote that the United Nations would cross "a very dangerous bridge" by this unprecedented act . . . expulsion of Taiwan.

The appeals of Peking were too strong, these officials admit. For instance, yesterday morning the Belgian Cabinet reversed everything it had been telling Washington, and switched to abstention as a gesture to Peking.

The reason—Brussels and Peking announced today they are establishing diplomatic relations.

Special American fury is being reserved here, ironically, for an American ally in the struggle, the maverick ambassador of Saudi Arabia, Jamil Baroodi.

On his own, to the complete surprise of the American ambassador, Baroodi pushed for a postponement of any vote last night. The supporters of Peking seeking a quick showdown and fearing a clear U.S. majority of voting were put off until today, mobilized their own majority to defeat the Saudi Arabian, 56 to 53, with 19 abstentions.

U.S. officials believe this first procedural defeat, into which the United States was pushed, set the psychological climate.

U.S. officials admit, however, that the U.S. defeat also was built into the dual policy President Nixon has tried to follow toward Peking; while opening his own dialogue and preparing his own trip to Peking, he has sought to convince the world that the United States would insist on keeping Communist China out of the United Nations rather than pay the price of expelling Nationalist China.

Peking answered repeatedly that it would not come to the United Nations while the government on Taiwan was here.

"WHY WAIT?" ATTITUDE

"The American argument just wouldn't wash," said one U.S. adviser. "No matter how hard we tried, governments just wouldn't believe that the United States was prepared to keep Peking out. 'If not this year, then next' for the entry of Peking, they argued, so why wait?"

Late last night, after the session was well behind him, Bush issued a far more sober statement than his immediate comments about the expulsion. There had been "virtual unanimity," he said, about giving Peking a seat.

"The decision to deprive the Republic of China of representation is in our opinion a serious mistake," he said. "At the same time, no one can escape the fact, unpleasant though it may be, that the votes which had just been passed, do, in fact, represent the views of the majority of U.N. members."

Nothing that has happened, he added, would affect the ties between the United States and the Republic of China. The security treaty between the two nations is considered by most observers to be more crucial to Taiwan than a U.N. seat. It is not affected.

UNITED STATES STUNNED; U.N. VOTE STIRS NEW UNCERTAINTY

UNITED NATIONS.—Sober stocktaking is the order of the day in this skyscraper complex on the East River.

The party is over. The drama of the voting on the China issue has passed.

For many, there is a feeling of genuine accomplishment. Everyone realizes that the decisive ouster of Taiwan and the stunning setback for the United States has ended an era.

After 26 years, the last vestiges of the hold the United States and the united Western front once had over this world organization have been erased.

But the heady elation of the majority of last night is also giving way to calmer reflection, for the new era ushered in by the admission of Peking is full of uncertainty. More questions are being asked than answered about the impact of the vote on the United Nations and world politics.

Peking has gained respectability in the international arena at last. Its isolation had ended. But no one knows for sure whether this gain for Peking—and what seems to be its more moderate policy—has been achieved in a way to undercut still further the eroding United States support for the United Nations.

The blow to American prestige has been enormous. An all-out campaign of arm-twisting and persuasion by the American superpower has failed against some of the tiniest states in the world.

President Nixon's pronounced policy of ending Peking's isolation without sacrificing Nationalist China has failed, too. For the first time in the memory of observers, every Western ally of the United States—including Britain, Canada, the Scandinavian nations, and all Western Europe deserted Washington on a major vote.

Among Pacific nations, Japan—already upset by Nixon's surprise visit to Peking and the U.S. surcharge on imports—suffered still another blow from Nixon policy. With obvious reluctance, Japan became the major co-sponsor with the U.S. effort to save Taiwan's seat in the General Assembly.

Last night, U.S. Ambassador George W. Bush tried to put the best light possible on the vote. The United States could take care of itself, he said of the apparent setback in prestige. But he admitted that the American public and Congress would be "greatly concerned" about what the General Assembly had done.

What happens next is clearly up to Communist China, U.S. officials said privately. Peking can either give the United Nations new vitality or cripple it—perhaps for good.

Albania and Algeria, the spokesmen for the Peking cause here, publicly portrayed Peking as the new champion of the underprivileged, underdeveloped world in the Security Council. In this view, Peking will use the Chinese power in veto against "superpower collusion" of the Soviet Union and the United States.

If that's what the Peking role becomes, U.S. officials said, then the disturbing trend away from meaningful political discussion is bound to accelerate. The United Nations can only become more of a debating society, while Washington, Moscow and Peking seek solutions to problems through more traditional power diplomacy.

But a large group of experts here said they believe Peking will act with extreme caution. For example, it is not expected—as many have predicted—that a delegation from the Communist Chinese embassy in Canada will arrive here in the next two days to take over responsibilities.

Peking, it is argued, while pushing its self-proclaimed role as ally of the third world, will maneuver very carefully between Moscow and Washington. By paralyzing the Security Council, this argument continues, Peking would simply force Moscow and Washington closer together in their search for peaceful solutions.

The Communist Chinese will have plenty of opportunity to show their hand before the end of the year. Secretary General U Thant has served firm notice that he intends to retire when his term expires Dec. 31. Moscow and Washington are now beginning separately to choose their candidates, and the Peking representative is expected to join the search.

The U.N. Secretariat employs some 150 Chinese in professional positions, half of them from Taiwan. Since all of these officials have tenure, it is not expected that Peking will immediately push for their removal. On the other hand, Thant is expected to take notice of Peking's admission by giving a new top advisory position to someone from the Chinese mainland.

But all these—and answers to a flood of questions—must await the Peking response to the General Assembly vote last night. Until that comes, delegations here are left with uncertainty about the future of the United Nations.

AMTRAK REVOKES PRIVILEGES OF MANY

HON. MANUEL LUJAN, JR.

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 27, 1971

Mr. LUJAN. Mr. Speaker, with the advent of Amtrak, many of my constituents were deprived of one of the privileges they assumed was theirs for life—their right to ride the railroads of the United States for free or reduced rates.

Under Amtrak this is no longer true. Many of the free lifetime passes have been revoked and these people have been told that they will have to pay. They believe, and rightly so, that they paid with the years of labor they put in working for the railroads. They only expect that which they deserve.

Therefore, today I am introducing a bill which would, if passed, reestablish their rights in this area. My bill would reinstate the passes under the terms in force before the creation of Amtrak. I doubt that many of us had this revocation in mind when we created this cor-

poration, and I am sure that all of us would want to return to these people that which is justly theirs. I am looking forward to early enactment of this legislation.

HON. HASTING KEITH'S WASHINGTON REPORT

HON. HASTINGS KEITH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 27, 1971

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, at the moment, I am sending the people of the 12th Congressional District of Massachusetts the latest report on the highlights of my recent legislative activities and of the services available to them through the staffs of my Washington and district offices.

In the interest of exchanging information, with particular reference to the types of congressional activity of particular interest to the people whom I am privileged to represent, I ask permission to enter my Washington Report of October 1971 into the Record.

In 1970—200 million Americans used 68.8 quadrillion BTUs of energy (68,800,000,000,000,000).

In 1980—234 million Americans will use about 100 quadrillion BTUs of energy (100,000,000,000,000,000).

This rising dramatic increase in demand is the problem confronting the Power Subcommittee on which I am the Senior Minority Member.

Any fool could vote for a bill to set up new power plants—even nuclear power plants—and then go back home and tell his constituents that he has solved their energy problems.

Any "know nothing" could vote for unduly restrictive pollution standards—then go back home and claim to have resolved the pollution problem—without saying how much these unreasonable standards will raise the price of fuel and increase the cost of goods produced with that fuel.

During recent subcommittee hearings on Power Plant Siting, a witness said: "We all favor the objective of a cleaner environment. But the problem is that the rest of the world is lagging behind us in pollution control, and I fear the added financial burden (of these unduly restrictive standards) to American industry could weaken our competitiveness in world trade."

It is worth noting that our August imports were 260 million dollars more than our exports. It marked the first time in this country that the United States ran a trade deficit for five straight months!

These are the sort of problems which consume much of my time. There's no easy solution. Hopefully, we will approve a bill which will make us competitive in the world markets and permit a healthy economic and environmental climate.

Ten years ago, The Cape Cod National Seashore, which I co-sponsored with Senators Saltonstall and John Kennedy, was finally enacted into law . . . It was intended, primarily, to preserve for posterity vast reaches of the outer beach and upland of the lower Cape. (We're still concerned, on the Cape, with the erosion problems.) . . . Senators Brooke and Ted Kennedy and I are now exploring ways to protect Martha's Vineyard and the other islands being threatened by this same erosiveness of man and sea. . . . We must find a way to resist and, perhaps, reverse, this ravaging of these islands which are so rich in the beauty and history of our nation.

In addition to power plant siting, the House and its Committees have considered these items of particular interest to the 12th District:

Conserving wildlife . . . We began hearings on 36 bills to protect ocean mammals. Anti-cruelty spokesmen, including the distinguished author, Cleveland Amory, testified regarding the "total immorality and senselessness" of the "killing of a single mammal." Sportsmen and commercial interests argued that a certain amount of killing is "good conservation." The Committee, of course, will continue to press for humane treatment and protection for the survival of these endangered species.

Assuring boat safety . . . We finally passed the Federal Boat Safety Act of 1971. It sets national construction performance standards for boat builders and assures small boat buyers that their boats and equipment will have maximum sea safety.

At last, one of my favorite projects, the Air-Deliverable Anti-Pollution Transfer System, won Congressional approval. ADAPTS can transfer 140,000 gallons of oil from a disabled tanker, to a huge floating plastic balloon—before the oil can pollute a coastline.

In July, I introduced the House-accepted motion to kill the Congressional effort to cite CBS's President for contempt in connection with "The Selling of the Pentagon" probe. *Newsweek* said: "The powers of the government and the freedom of the press seemed bound for a head-on legal collision . . . then, at the last moment, swerved into a relatively mild sideswipe . . . Hastings Keith . . . filed a truth-in-broadcasting bill . . ."

Here and there—Gus Wagner, of Bourne, who, for almost two years, has been representing me throughout the entire Congressional District, will resume, on a part-time basis, the practice of law, turning over much of his assignment in Plymouth County to John C. Eldridge, of West Bridgewater . . . Jack has been with the United Shoe Machinery Corporation for 34 years, is very active in many community affairs, and has been Moderator of West Bridgewater since 1952 . . . Gus will continue as consultant throughout the District on any projects which require legal expertise or specialized knowledge of Federal or State government . . . Bob Couto, of New Bedford, has joined my New Bedford staff to work with Gus on projects and related matters of interest to the people of the New Bedford area. Bob distinguished himself as a newsman with an unusual dedication to the welfare of the area. In August, he resigned his position with radio station WBSM to train in Washington for his New Bedford assignment . . . Mark Wirzburger, of Plymouth, an American University sophomore, and Karen Kelley, of Hingham, a Trinity College junior, are working part-time in my Washington office. Mark and Karen are doing a good job and are learning much about the many ways a Member of Congress and his staff must, and do, serve the people whom the Congressman is elected to represent in Washington.

Mrs. Keith and I are enjoying the new Kennedy Center. It is a living memorial to the performing arts and the bipartisan support of four Presidents, the Congress, individuals, corporations, and foreign nations in tribute to the importance of the arts. In 1958, President Eisenhower signed the legislation which created the long-needed national cultural center. In 1962, President Kennedy approved a design change to the gleaming white modern edifice which now graces the Potomac's banks. In 1964, President Johnson signed legislation to rename the Center "The John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts." In 1971, President Nixon formally inaugurated it. The opening was one of the greatest social and cultural events in Washington's history. Mrs. Keith and I urge all of you to include the Kennedy

Center in your next visit to our Nation's Capital.

It has been said that a "politician is one who thinks of the next election—a statesman is one who thinks of the next generation."

Generally speaking, I have believed that all of our Presidents, in their foreign policy decisions, have had the next generation in mind. Without repeating the Vietnam arguments—pro and con—do we, as the Congress, tell the Executive Branch that we are sick and tired of the present rate of withdrawal of our forces—and that we demand a definite date for ending our military presence?—or, do we say, again, to the President, you know best about all the factors; You, as the Commander in Chief, have to make the determination as to when, how and in what manner we extricate ourselves from Vietnam.

As your Congressman, I would appreciate your advice and comment.

HIGHER EDUCATION BILL

HON. ALBERT H. QUIE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 27, 1971

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, the House is just about to consider H.R. 7248, the Higher Education Act of 1971. In the past several days I have received hundreds of letters and telegrams expressing points of view on this legislation.

Dr. Clark Kerr, chairman of the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, and one of America's great educational leaders, recently wrote to me concerning the issues of student assistance, institutional aid, and the proposed national foundation on higher education. Because I know many of our colleagues value Dr. Kerr's views on these matters, I would like to insert a copy of his letter.

I have also been pleased at the response of students to the effort I intend to make on the floor to provide greater equity and predictability in our education opportunity grant program. Dozens of letters have been received from students attending proprietary schools. Because a student should have the widest possible choice in where he wants to pursue further education, I believe our student assistant programs should be available to students who attend vocational and proprietary institutions as well as private and public colleges and universities.

Following is Dr. Kerr's letter and a small sample of other letters and telegrams supporting the education opportunity grant amendment:

CARNEGIE COMMISSION ON
HIGHER EDUCATION,
Berkeley, Calif., October 14, 1971.

HON. ALBERT QUIE,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN QUIE: H.R. 7248, The Higher Education Act of 1971, may soon be put to the vote in the House. The legislation which may result from this vote and from the subsequent conference with the Senate, which has already passed S. 659, will be of historic importance, greatly affecting both higher education and American society. The resulting legislation can, at the same time, give both greater support to institutions of higher education and greater assurance of

equality of opportunity to all young Americans.

H.R. 7248 is, in many respects, an admirable bill. It would be greatly strengthened if it were amended to:

More directly target student financial aid to the neediest students.

Provide an entitlement to low-income students for financial aid so that prospective students could count on the aid in advance of their selecting a college.

Base aid on a national standards so that students with similar need would receive similar grants.

Continue the preference for low-income students for the work-study program.

To strengthen the institutions that undertake the education of low-income students, I urge adopting a program of instructional allowances or cost-of-education supplements to accompany student aid and to provide institutional support funds.

Minimum appropriations of about \$500 million each in the initial fiscal year for opportunity grants and for institutional support are urgently needed.

One further high priority is the establishment of a National Foundation for Postsecondary Education. This is, I believe, crucial for bringing about the academic reforms needed in higher education.

Sincerely,

CLARK KERR.

LANSING, MICH.

HON. ALBERT H. QUIE,
Rayburn Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Strongly support new EOG proposal. Much more realistic regarding student needs. Student selection more equitable. Broader funding base. Student will know amount of EOG support. First time recognition of halftime student needs. Eliminates State allotment formula.

THOMAS P. TOWNSEND,
Student Government President, with
executive commitment endorsement,
Lansing Community College.

RURAL HALL, N.C.,
October 12, 1971.

HON. ALBERT QUIE,
The House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE QUIE: I am enrolled at Winsalm College, a private business college in Winston-Salem, North Carolina.

I am writing to let you know that I am in favor of the proposed Quie Student Aid Amendment to the Higher Education Bill, H.R. 7248. If I had help of this kind with the tuition costs, I would have gone to a four year college. The proposed amendment is a good thing and I have written my congressman to urge him to vote for it. I'm glad you want to help students who need this help.

Thank you.

Sincerely yours,

MISS ALITA BOLES.

WINSTON-SALEM, N.C.,
October 21, 1971.

DEAR MR. QUIE: I am a student at Winsalm College and if your bill goes through it would help me out to acquire one of my goal's in life. An education to get a job and help my country, not hinder it.

So I ask you to vote yes and save thousands who want an education get one.

Thank you.

Peace,

ROBERT CADY.

Representative ALBERT QUIE,
House Office Building
Washington, D.C.:

Have sent telegram to Representative Fulton in Tennessee's Fifth Congressional District Requesting his vote and influence for

the Quie student aid amendment to the Higher Education bill H.R. 7248. Passage of this bill with amendment is greatly needed for all undergraduate students.

C. W. DAVIDSON,
President, Draughtons College.

PASADENA, CALIF.
Representative ALBERT QUIE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I have sent a telegram to Rep. John Rousset asking him to support the Quie student amendment to the Higher Educational Bill, H.R. 7248. I feel the amendment will make a more effective educational bill and such a bill is definitely needed.

V. J. L. VONHOLTZER, JR.,
Vice President, Sawyer College of Business.

WINSTON-SALEM, N.C.

OCTOBER 22, 1971.

DEAR MR. QUIE: As a teacher at a private business college, I am very much in favor of your amendment to H.R. 7248.

I have written to my Congressman asking him to support the amendment.

Sincerely,

Mrs. EVELYN B. HAUSER.

HEW CLOSES DOWN THE CLINICAL RESEARCH CENTER AT FORT WORTH

HON. JAMES A. BURKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 27, 1971

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I wish to associate myself with the comments offered by my distinguished colleagues on the floor of this House last Wednesday, the Honorable majority leader, HALE BOGGS, of Louisiana, JIM WRIGHT, of Texas, PAUL G. ROGERS, of Florida, and JACK BROOKS, of Texas. They were speaking, I am sure for the majority of this House in their criticism of the incredible action taken by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare on Friday, October 8, in closing down the clinical research center at Fort Worth, a vital center in our Nation's drug rehabilitation program.

Within 24 hours, 92 narcotics patients were turned out onto the streets, presumably to remain there to find a cure to their problem on their own. This action would have been deplorable and justifiably warrant the criticism of alert Members of this House under any circumstances, but the circumstances surrounding this particular action were especially deplorable. The order went out from the HEW even while a House-Senate conference committee was meeting to iron out differences between the House and Senate versions of Concurrent Resolution 6.

This resolution, in fact, addresses itself to the future of both the Public Health Service hospitals around the country and the center at Fort Worth. If successfully reported out of the committee, it would have indicated the will of both Houses that this center not be closed. The fact that the committee was unable, as the New York Times reported the next day, to reach agreement on the future of the narcotics treatment and research

facility in Fort Worth should not in any way dispell the serious questions that have been raised about the propriety and the timing of the HEW order to close the facility down.

Considerable concern has been expressed in this House in recent months on any of a number of fronts about increasing executive department usurpation of the powers the Constitution specifically entrusts to both Houses of Congress, the legislative branch. This precipitate action by an executive department while the legislative branch of this Government was about the business of passing legislation in this very area will long serve, as far as I am concerned, as a very good example of just how far the executive branch of this Government is prepared to go in the face of congressional opinion.

The fact of the matter is that this House had voted overwhelmingly to keep the facility open some months before. The department of Health, Education, and Welfare could not but have been fully aware of this action in arriving at and executing its decision. As the honorable gentleman from Texas has so eloquently pointed out, we are talking about human lives here not just budget figures.

HEW, in its decision to close the center down, is clearly using the patients at the institution as "pawns in a power-play to thwart the will of Congress by presenting us with a fait accompli."

With one breath, the administration professes its deep concern for the alarming drug problem the Nation is faced with. Conferences are being held at the White House with legislative leaders as part of a massive attack on the problem and yet, with the other breath, the Government Department entrusted with the welfare and health, with the lives of our citizens closes down one of the only two national Federal drug treatment centers in the Nation. On August 2, that is the date, this House voted by an incredible 370 to 4 in favor of a resolution expressing the sense of Congress that certain U.S. public health services remain open, specifically including the clinical research centers in Fort Worth, Tex., and Lexington, Ky.

In view of the obvious determination on the part of forces in the Office of Management and Budget and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, to fly in the face of expressed congressional intent and work their will, it is time that all concerned Members of Congress make their views known and stand up and fight before it is too late, for those of us who have been in this struggle for the past 10 months, and more, to save the whole public health service in this country have been given an excellent lesson in just how far the administration is prepared to go to work its will in this area. The Public Health Service hospitals in this country have been serving this Nation well for close to 175 years.

I take particular pride in representing Boston in this House, where the first of these hospitals was founded to care for this Nation's merchant seamen, and later our coastguardsmen and their dependents, active and retired military per-

sonnel and their families, as well as other Federal employees. What good does it do for Congress to pass resolutions, appropriate funds in the HEW budget—an additional \$14 million for fiscal year 1972, to be precise—if the administration is going to act as if Congress had not even addressed itself to the question under consideration?

The administration should know in advance that it is treading on dangerous ground if one of these hospitals is closed in the near future, for on this, both the House and the Senate are clearly in agreement. The conference committee report on Concurrent Resolution 6 of October 19, 1971, makes this point crystal clear. I hope the administration has not heard the last word on this problem with this speech and that, instead, it will serve to keep the issue alive for as long as necessary.

A REALISTIC LOOK AT OUR CONTRIBUTION TO THE UNITED NATIONS BUDGET

HON. DAN KUYKENDALL

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 27, 1971

Mr. KUYKENDALL. Mr. Speaker, the action of the United Nations General Assembly on Monday needs no further hair-tearing nor breast-beating from me. Even though we may not agree that the Peoples Republic of China qualifies for membership under the "conduct of nations" clause, nevertheless the vote itself was entirely legal and aboveboard, by the U.N.'s own rules of procedure.

What is needed, Mr. Speaker, is something that has been needed for years, and is no more timely after the Red China vote than it was before it. And that is a realistic look at our contribution to the United Nations budget.

It is unnecessary to recount the figures. We all know, the entire taxpaying public of the United States knows, that for years Uncle Sugar has been paying the lion's share of the U.N. bills. Other nations have been remiss in their assessments, delinquent in their payments, somewhat cavalier about their back bills. And we, in our zeal to make the U.N. work, to bring about a harmony of nations, have been too tolerant for too long.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the time is ripe for us to say, in all candor, that the U.S. apportionment of the U.N. budget is due for an agonizing reappraisal. A more equitable means of financing this heavy load must be found.

Several weeks ago, when President Nixon allowed the dollar to float in the world market, the timid economists wrung their hands and said:

Oh, what will our allies think of us, for such a horrible thing?

Well, Mr. Speaker, you know and we all know, that our allies thought no less of us, and their only wonderment at all was what took us so long to do it.

The proposal I make today has much the same characteristics. Either we will be roundly damned in the capitals of the

world, or we will be quietly admired for having the courage to draw a line. I sincerely believe it will be the latter.

What I propose, Mr. Speaker, is simply this: That the U.S. portion of the United Nations budget, and the portion of all its members, be recalculated on a formula based on the gross national product of that member nation. It would be unrealistic to make an assessment on the basis of population, and I would oppose any proposal to do so. But the GNP base is a fair economic yardstick, and it is the best way I know to find out whether the other nations of the world want to maintain the U.N., or if they merely wish to continue using it only so long as it is there and so long as it costs them nothing.

With this reassessment, Mr. Speaker, I would add one other important proviso: That sanctions be proposed by the General Assembly for nonpayment of the club dues, and that we be the first member nation to serve notice that if the other members are remiss, we will be, too. We could simply say, that we will pay exactly that percentage of our assessment that is paid by the total membership of the assembly. If everybody else pays, we pay 100 percent. If 80 percent of the members pay, then we will be 20 percent delinquent.

This is the kind of language our people understand, Mr. Speaker. And I think the rest of the world is just as capable of understanding it.

TRANSATLANTIC BRINK

HON. BARBER B. CONABLE, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 27, 1971

Mr. CONABLE. Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, we have begun the long-overdue task of reshaping the international economic order as a result of President Nixon's initiatives in imposing a 10-percent surcharge on imports and floating the dollar. The President's actions have forced our trading partners to recognize the necessity of dealing now with the problems which exist and of fashioning new economic relationships. The response of our European partners has been hesitant and uncertain, however, and Mr. Jean Monnet of France, a longtime advocate of European unity, has pointed out to his colleagues the need to develop promptly a response reflecting their continuing unity. Mr. C. L. Sulzberger has written in today's New York Times of the importance of this continuing unity, both to the United States and Europe, and I submit his article for the consideration of all the Members of Congress.

The article follows:

TRANS-ATLANTIC BRINK

(By C. L. Sulzberger)

PARIS.—Unless the six members of the Common Market, combined together with Great Britain, join swiftly in a collective action fixing currency parities and negotiating as a single unit with the United States, a trade war may erupt in the Western world.

This is the opinion of Jean Monnet, generally regarded as the Father of Europe. Monnet, who has been pressing steadily toward his goal of unifying the West ever since he worked in the League of Nations secretariat, warns of trouble in the event of no action—in time.

"I think everyone in Europe and the United States is against a trade war," he says. "But the danger of such a development will only come if the monetary problem endures too long. Personally I am optimistic enough to think it can be settled by the end of this year.

"Europe, including Britain, although it isn't yet a member of the market, must decide on its own stable monetary parity. After that, acting as a single group, the Common Market countries plus Britain can discuss the issue with the U.S.A."

Monnet stresses that before the European countries approach the United States on negotiating a new basis for financial and economic relationships they must "prove to themselves and also to the world that they form a unit.

"After they have done so the seven—the Common Market plus Britain—can create an executive organization along the lines mentioned by French President Pompidou in order to deal with the various currency reserves. Only in this way is it possible to bargain with the United States and to determine how Europe will deal with the dollar problem."

What Monnet means is that if the seven "Europeans" don't deal with the present fiscal crisis as a single unit they face the possibility of splitting into national segments and entering into damaging national commercial competitions—or a trade war—as implied in the recent action of Denmark. Denmark imposed an import surtax similar to that of the U.S.A. Monnet points out:

"The situation that produced the present crisis has been dormant for years—and it was a good thing that Nixon took action. But the action he took—above all the 10 per cent surtax on imports—could open the door to other capitals doing the same thing, as we have just seen in Copenhagen. It would be very bad if such a trend were to continue."

He warns: "Some people believe Washington would prefer to deal separately with the European countries, as for example West Germany. The seven must work in unison. We need an agreement on this as soon as possible between Pompidou and Chancellor Brandt. The Nixon action was necessary but it opened the door to discrimination unless the proper actions are taken.

"The process started by Nixon in August is part of a great international change. The world is getting a new face. But whether the measures now being applied on currency will lead to something better or worse is something we do not yet know.

"A monetary agreement is imperative and, to achieve this, it is necessary to have an accord between Paris and Bonn before the end of 1971. A trade war will not happen if action on parity is taken quickly and followed up by discussions with the United States. While the latter are taking place, 'Europe' can set up its own controlling body as foreseen by Pompidou. But there is no time to waste."

The way Monnet expresses his opinions is mild. But his calm manner doesn't obscure the apprehension felt here that unless there is speedy united action to get accord on one basic program for Western Europe, which would then negotiate a new relationship with the U.S.A., a disastrous trade war could break out.

Were that to happen, the entire concept of Western unity as expressed by NATO would be threatened. Neither Americans nor Europeans are dramatically interested in fiscal or commercial problems.

Nevertheless they will be forced to realize during the next two months that if they cannot get together and arrange a new trans-Atlantic business relationship, their mutual political and defense relationships could fall apart. The subject is dreary but vital; and the time is short.

PRAYER AMENDMENT

HON. CHALMERS P. WYLIE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 27, 1971

Mr. WYLIE. Mr. Speaker, a recent letter written by the Honorable JOHN E. HUNT to Rev. M. M. Billman in his district eloquently states some of the merits and reasons in favor of the amendment which would permit nondenominational prayer in public schools. I commend this letter to my colleagues' attention:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., October 22, 1971.

Rev. M. M. BILLMAN,
Camden, N.J.

DEAR REVEREND BILLMAN: This will acknowledge the materials you sent opposing the proposed amendment to the Constitution that would permit the recitation of voluntary, nondenominational prayer in the public schools.

I would first point out that I am a sponsor of such a proposal and I did sign the petition to discharge the House Judiciary Committee from further consideration of the legislation. In consideration of the broad and unrestricted religious freedom we enjoy and our religious heritage, I find it difficult to believe that "separation of church and state" was intended to mean that our children could not participate in voluntary prayer exercises in school. I am not troubled by the Supreme Court decisions which say that no official, governmental body can formulate and dictate any particular prayer that might be observed, but I find the Court's construction of "state neutrality" more than strained when students are forbidden to voluntarily assemble on school grounds, prior to regular school hours, to participate in a reading of the daily prayer that appears in the Congressional Record.

It is stated in one of the enclosures you sent that "These factors combine to operate with indirect coercive force on young and impressionable children to induce them to take part in these exercises, despite a freedom to be excused from participation". It is these same young and impressionable children who, I believe, in the absence of the right insured by the proposed amendment, will have indelibly etched in their minds the hypocrisy of an adult world, observing daily prayer in its highest institutions of government, that denies its youth of the opportunity to participate in this same type of observance. The young as well as a large number of responsible adult citizens have been unable to grasp the subtle distinctions if, in fact, there are any of substance.

The Constitution provides for amendments and, as you are well aware, the process is very tedious. Even should the proposed amendment be approved by a two-thirds vote of both the House and Senate, it would then have to be ratified by three-quarters of the State legislatures. I have no hesitation in expressing my belief that the controversy that was stirred in this field by the U.S. Supreme Court, revived repeatedly as school boards, States, churches, and lower courts strain with a myriad of interpretations of the Supreme Court's intent, more than justifi-

fy taking the debate to the people and to the State legislatures which represent them. If it is feared that the proposed amendment will eventually result in widespread, acrimonious controversy and litigation—as the statement you enclosed indicates—my greater fear is that the evil that has pursued the confusion emanating from the Supreme Court's prayer decisions might go unchecked.

I have confidence in the constitutional amendment process and its safeguards against hasty action. At the same time, I have great faith in the ability of our people to meet the challenge of intelligent debate on the issues and to decide wisely. It is apparent that the religious leaders who now oppose this move are the prophetic generals without their armies. They have failed to alleviate the widespread disagreement with the Supreme Court's interpretations of the First Amendment which they (religious leaders) believe is the product of misunderstanding. It is indeed ironic that almost 10 years after the Supreme Court's first prayer decision, it was not until Congressman Wylie's discharge petition was signed by the requisite number of 218 Members on September 21, 1971, that I received the very first repudiations of the proposed amendment from scattered members of the clergy. Frankly, I am not swayed in my belief that the debate on the Prayer Amendment should now be taken to the people, and that will be accomplished by the submission of the amendment to the State legislatures upon the approval of two-thirds of the Members of the House and Senate.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN E. HUNT,
Member of Congress.

RADICALS GATHER FOR HATCHET JOB ON THE FBI

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 27, 1971

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, this Friday and Saturday, at Princeton University in New Jersey, a group calling itself the Committee for Public Justice is holding a conference sponsored by the Woodrow Wilson School at Princeton, ostensibly to take an objective look at the FBI. Undoubtedly, this event will attract a great deal of publicity, particularly in certain segments of the news media which glory in any anti-FBI expression, regardless of its source.

Mr. Speaker, it is essential that the people of this country be informed of the background of those involved in this so-called objective review of the FBI. A column by Alice Widener, released October 22 by U.S.A. Syndicate, is most revealing. In it, she catalogs the radical associations of the "independent scholars and experts" who will convene to perform this hatchet job on Mr. Hoover's organization. This information is vital to an understanding of what will really transpire at Princeton this weekend, and I insert her article in the Record in its entirety today:

PROFESSOR WITH A STICKY IDEA
(By Alice Widener)

NEW YORK CITY, October 22, 1971.—It isn't at all surprising that Professor W. Duane Lockard, Chairman, Department of Politics, Princeton University, told the press, "I was the guy with the idea" for the upcoming

Conference on the FBI to be sponsored jointly at Princeton, October 29-30, by the Woodrow Wilson School and the ultra-liberal Committee for Public Justice.

Both of Prof. Lockard's daughters, Leslie Katherine and Janet Frances went to Cuba with the pro-Communist, radical New Leftist Venceremos Brigade; Leslie in December 1969, and Janet from March to May, 1971. Of course it may be that Prof. Lockard disapproves of his daughters' radical activities. But his sanction of the so-called "scholars" and "experts" invited to submit papers on the FBI shows his definite predilection for New Left "scholarship."

Among the papers scheduled to be presented at the Princeton kangaroo court hearing on the FBI are "Political Uses of the FBI" by longtime radical Leftist I. F. Stone; "Informers" by Frank Donner, notoriously pro-Communist New York lawyer who has taken the Fifth Amendment about his Communist Party activities again and again during Congressional investigations; "Selling of the FBI" by Robert Sherrill, writer for the radical Nation magazine and an editor of "Mayday," which described itself as dedicated to revolutionary guerrilla journalism. Another "scholar" scheduled to present an "Insider's View" of the FBI is William Turner. A special FBI agent for ten years, Turner was dismissed from the FBI in 1961 for "lack of truthfulness" among other charges. He sought reinstatement through the Civil Service Commission and lost; he took his case through the U.S. courts all the way to the Supreme Court and lost.

That gives you an idea, dear readers, of the kind of objective political scholarship concerning the FBI that will be offered at Princeton this month.

The co-sponsor of the Conference on the FBI is the Committee for Public Justice formed in November 1970 by prominent ultra-liberal and radical Democrats alleging that our nation has entered "a period of political repression" under the Nixon administration. On April 28, 1971, the Washington, D.C. Evening Star reported that spokesmen for the Committee for Public Justice held a press conference to announce that the "private group" would meet at Princeton to conduct "a scholarly serious study of the FBI." They chose the university as a meeting place, they said, because the conference would be held "in an atmosphere removed from the pressures of politics."

But politics, in my opinion, is exactly what the conference is all about—ultra-liberal and Democratic New Left politics mixed with pro-Communist politics.

Two of the leading spokesmen for the Committee for Public Justice are Burke Marshall and Roger Wilkins, both former Kennedy Administration aides. On the Committee's executive council are radical Leftists such as Lillian Hellman, playwright; Robert B. Silvers, formerly on the national council of the notorious and discredited National Conference for New Politics in 1967; Norman Dorsen, general counsel of the "anything goes" American Civil Liberties Union. The politically ambitious left-leaning Democrat former U.S. Attorney General Ramsey Clark is on the Committee's executive council. The Committee's membership list is star-studded with radicals such as Leonard Bernstein, musician who raised funds for the Black Panthers; G. Van Woodward, a Socialist Scholar; Ronnie Dugger and Martin Peretz, both former members of the executive board of the Communist-collaborating National Conference for New Politics in 1967.

What really is the underlying motive for the Conference on the FBI at Princeton this month?

Obviously it is a move by a Leftist coalition among Democrats to try to stick the Nixon Administration with an unfounded charge of using the FBI to create "political repres-

sion" in our nation. In my judgment, the phony charge won't stick. Neither regular Democrats nor the vast majority of Americans will go along with it. They know the FBI never has and does not now play party politics. We also know the FBI is justly world famous for its efficiency, integrity and decency.

Prof. Lockard of Princeton will soon find out he has a sticky idea that won't stick.

SICKLE CELL ANEMIA PREVENTION ACT

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 27, 1971

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, sickle cell anemia kills half of its victims before their 20th year, and most of the rest by age 40.

This painful and deadly blood disease is inherited when both parents carry the sickle cell trait. Approximately 2,500,000 black Americans carry this trait and pass it along to their offspring. Approximately one black child out of every 400 to 500 born in the United States inherits this often fatal disease.

What is the solution? How can we attack this killer?

There are techniques for examining individuals to detect whether the sickle cell trait is present. The most common technique is the Sickledex test which costs about 50 cents per blood sample to perform. However, for those who have the disease no completely satisfactory cure is presently available. The reason for the lack of information on sickle cell anemia is inadequate funding.

Simply to fund a Sickledex test for the residents of the City of Compton, Calif. would cost about \$27,890.

Mr. Speaker, the bill I am introducing today, the National Sickle Cell Anemia Prevention Act, would create a preventive program in the National Institutes of Health.

To assist the communities in the establishment and operation of voluntary sickle cell anemia screening and counseling programs; the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare would be authorized to spend \$75 million over the next 3 years.

The bill also authorizes \$45 million over the next 3 years to promote research in the diagnosis, treatment, and prevention of sickle cell anemia.

In order to provide detection, counseling, and treatment for black veterans and members of the armed service; the Administrator of the Veterans' Administration and the Secretary of Defense are directed to establish voluntary programs.

Mr. Speaker, we must direct our immediate attention to the problem of sickle cell anemia, and we must make every effort to cure this severe health problem. An effective national program, such as envisioned in this bill, would produce a significant benefit to the black community, specifically, and our entire country, generally.

QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS

HON. ROBERT F. DRINAN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 27, 1971

Mr. DRINAN. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted that a very large number—a total of 11,292—of my constituents responded to the questionnaire sent in the recent past to all of the households in the Third Congressional District.

A large number of very significant conclusions emerged from this questionnaire. Among the many noteworthy conclusions I would like to call attention to the following:

Almost 63 percent of all of those who replied are in favor of a comprehensive national health insurance plan paid for by payroll deductions similar to social security. I am consequently very pleased that I am a cosponsor of the Kennedy-Griffiths bill which is designed to do precisely this.

I find it most significant that 82.2 percent of all those who answered feel that the present level of military spending should be reduced. I think that the reply to this question ties in with the 62.8 percent of the respondents who feel that the draft should not be continued. It is notable that among young people who answered, 81.8 percent feel that the draft should be eliminated. I have voted to cut down on military spending wherever possible and have cast a ballot not to extend the draft.

I was not surprised that 64.8 percent of those who replied favor withdrawal of troops from Vietnam immediately or no later than December 31 of this year. I have voted consistently for any resolution or law which would terminate American involvement in Vietnam.

Of those who answered, 81.9 percent would favor a law requiring the registration of all handguns. This overwhelming majority gives me reassurance and courage to continue to press forward as a member of the Judiciary Committee for the enactment of Federal legislation to control handguns.

Of the almost 12,000 people who responded to this questionnaire, 75.1 percent are opposed to the use of electronic surveillance devices to secure information on individual citizens. I am encouraged to remain firm in my opposition to any claimed inherent power by the Federal Government to wiretap or otherwise secure information without court authorization.

No clear consensus emerged with regard to what, if anything, should be done concerning the penalties for the use of marihuana. Similarly, no consensus appeared from the answers to the questionnaire with respect to the level of appropriations for space research and the NASA program.

I find it very significant that the top priorities by all groups, and by a large margin, are the ending of the Vietnam war and the control of pollution. I shall continue to work as diligently as possible to achieve these objectives.

in similar circumstances, will bring about a worldwide depression. Japan cannot expect its 100 million people to be kept by the marketplace of other countries.

Nations must not expect to profit from joblessness and unemployment caused by their exports. Somewhere in this great Nation of ours there must be someone who can awaken our sleeping leaders to the most serious challenge of our existence as a Nation.

One of the industries that is indispensable in peace and war is being slowly, but surely, choked to death by imports in an area of production that no industrial nation can ever allow itself to become nonself-sustaining. This is the steel production industry, manufacturers of specialty, stainless, and tool steel. This industry is threatened by two political policies of our Government: One is the embargo of Rhodesian ore, making it unavailable to American industries in direct contract with Rhodesian mines, and forcing American industries to pay premium prices to middlemen Nations—such as Japan and the Soviet Union—why buy the same ore we are not permitted to buy and then ship it to the United States.

The second politically inspired policy is the State Department's use of international trade as an arm of diplomacy. It has never worked in the history of the world and it has caused more bitterness, loss of life and destruction to personal property than any other single international endeavor. The inexact science of diplomacy has never been able to blend smoothly with the exact science of economics.

We are no longer fighting for protectionism; we are fighting for survival. Unless we do something drastic and set a definite time period to recapture our own domestic market, the crop of youngsters coming into the labor market in the next 2 or 3 years will create the worst unemployment conditions this or any other nation has ever seen.

For all intents and purposes, we may as well forget the so-called free trade philosophy, and the great prattle about lowering barriers in other nations so we can sell our goods to them. Thanks to the United States, they have pretty well taken care of their own needs, without our products. In view of the wage differences: U.S. wages are \$4.18 per hour, while Japan pays 95 cents per hour, barriers on competitive goods are red herrings. This means that a \$100 will buy 105.3 hours of labor in Japan, while it only buys 23.9 hours of labor in the United States. We cannot sell automobiles, radios, televisions, and so forth, to Japanese consumers in the volume that Japan sells to our consumers since we cannot match their labor cost and sell as cheaply.

While the words isolationism and protectionism have been tossed around loosely by the self-serving free traders, I would like to think that Industry Week of October 4, 1971, told it not like it is but like it should be when it said:

We need a new foreign economic policy that is pragmatic and businesslike.

You and I had better think along these lines.

THE "CONSTELLATION" NINE

HON. RONALD V. DELLUMS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 27, 1971

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, on October 1, nine crewmembers of the aircraft carrier *Constellation* refused to go aboard when the ship left San Diego for a sixth tour off Vietnam.

The nine men all took sanctuary in Christ The King Church. Naval officials termed the men deserters and seized them in the church and returned them to the *Constellation*.

I have recently received two letters from persons involved in the *Constellation* incident, and I would like to share them with my colleagues. I do this because I believe that these men exhibited extreme moral conviction and courage by their act, and while I would never encourage any person to break the law, I think it important to understand why laws are not followed.

The letters come from the parents of one of the *Constellation* "Nine," Scott Flanagan, and from a group of supporters of the "Nine." They are eloquent documents and they speak for themselves.

The documents follow:

CONGRESSMAN DELLUMS, when the historians write about this era in our history it will no doubt be the most depressing era of American history. It will show that while our government officials, military hierarchy and apathetic public sat on their hindside, our youth rose to the occasion and stopped the most asinine war in our history. Maybe our spirit hasn't been killed but it has been severely impaired. Not until the courageous youth of our nation stood up to be counted did we awaken to just what is going on. The absolute defiance of the rights of our young people to think, act, and respond to a country they would like to be proud of.

We continue to send them to a police action in which we play a game of give and take, not with checkers but with their lives. Young people who are subject to the most unfair drafting method on earth today. A method that can be beaten by the affluent and intelligent and therefore a gross injustice to the poor and not so well educated.

Yes, the Connie Nine case is one in which the navy, in order to save face, must show its ill gained and absolute power over our sons. I firmly believe the youth of today will win against the most trying odds, and I'll be the first to cheer them to exhaustion.

Look into the Connie Nine, talk to the Connie Nine, and listen to our other courageous young men and women to our youth. They are trying to do a job at which we have failed. They can win without us, but we can all win if we help them.

Everything the Connie Nine did, they did in the open and the public was never denied in the Sanctuary, as witnessed by many official government people who were present. Why then can't the Navy be as open in their trial and punishment of the men who asked for and was denied a General Court Martial, in order to keep all their trial and punishment at sea aboard the Connie. The reason given as stated by our sons was, a full court martial is too expensive.

Thank you for hearing us out.

Sincerely,

Mr. and Mrs. JAMES D. FLANAGAN,
SAN DIEGO, CALIF.

2143 MARKET ST.,

San Diego, Calif., October 15, 1971.

HON. RONALD DELLUMS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DELLUMS: On October 1, 1971, nine men from the attack aircraft carrier U.S.S. *Constellation* refused to sail with that ship on its sixth bombing mission off the coast of Indochina. They are: ABEAN Charles Andrews of Greensburg, Pennsylvania, SA David M. Clay of Stockton, California, ETR3 Carl Scott Flanagan of San Diego, California, ABEAN John Daniel Hoag of St. Louis, Missouri, FA Darryl Larrabee of Duluth, Minnesota, SM3 Charles M. Lawson of Midlothian, Texas, SN Ronald P. McLeod of Little Rock, Arkansas, FN James Mickell of Screven, Georgia, and AT3 Jon C. Obe of Ellsworth, Iowa. These men instead took sanctuary in Christ the King Catholic Church in San Diego, California.

These men have been called traitors to their country. They are not traitors. These men have deeply felt moral and religious convictions which make it impossible for them to reconcile their consciences with sailing on that ship. Such conscientious objection is not an un-American act. America was founded by individuals seeking just such religious liberty. America, unlike a totalitarian state or dictatorship, provides individuals with the right to express the feelings of their consciences. This freedom of expression means little without the freedom to act on the ideas and ideals expressed. America, as a free country, supposedly welcomes people of all beliefs and persuasions, for such divergence of opinion is what keeps a democracy alive and functioning.

The nine men of the *Constellation* who took sanctuary and refused to sail with that ship were exercising that freedom of conscience. They were saying no to a war which the majority of Americans want ended; a war judged to be illegal and immoral; and a war which both the President and the Congress of the United States say we are getting out of. These men have strong feelings against what they see to be senseless destruction of Southeast Asian lives and land; destruction which the U.S.S. *Constellation* sailed to continue, with a cargo of six million pounds of bombs, and at a cost of two million dollars a day.

These men have tried every means open to them to prove their opposition and sincerity: they have requested conscientious objector discharges; they have refused to sail with the ship; they have refused to work on the ship; they have refused to eat on the ship. Still, the Navy insists on keeping these men on board.

These men had the courage to make a public statement of opposition to the *Constellation's* bombing mission. The Navy chose to ignore this sincere statement, and flew them, immediately after apprehension, back to the ship. Since on board, the nine men have been denied legal counsel, denied a court martial, and sentenced to the brig. Their presence, the Navy claims, requires the time, expense, and energy of constant surveillance by marines and Master-at-Arms; their refusal to work can in no way contribute to the maintenance of the ship; their continuing hunger strike will mean added medical attention and expense to the ship. It is an inhuman, expensive, and absurd punishment to keep these men on the U.S.S. *Constellation* when their consciences prevent them from in any way contributing to the physical operation or morale of that ship. The only contribution these nine men will make to the U.S.S. *Constellation* is to serve as a vocal, ever-present reminder to the other sailors on board of the real meaning of the *Constellation* and its cargo of bombs.

It seems beyond comprehension that the Navy would find it beneficial to its public

image or in its financial interest to keep these nine men on board the U.S.S. Constellation. We, the supporters of these men, urge their immediate transfer from that ship.

Sincerely,

CYNTHIA O'HARA,
For the supporters of the Constellation Nine.

THREE GERMANYS

HON. JOHN G. SCHMITZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 27, 1971

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, President Richard Nixon, in his inaugural address, January 20, 1969, said:

We are entering an era of negotiations.

From Paris, where we negotiate with arrogant Vietnamese Communist while we have the necessary military force to compel them to do anything we wish; to Helsinki, where the SALT talks serve as a rationalization for failing to respond adequately to the massive Soviet nuclear buildup; to Panama, where we discuss changing the status of the Canal Zone which is undeniably ours by any objective interpretation of treaty law; to Communist China, where our new policy amounts to outright betrayal of a long-time ally; to Berlin, the subject of this newsletter—this "era of negotiations" is now underway.

The recently concluded four-power agreement between the United States, Great Britain, France, and the Soviet Union on the status of Berlin adds weight to the suspicion that our "era of negotiations" is nothing less than an era of unparalleled concessions by the free world. As Congressman John E. Hunt, of New Jersey, recently put it, with reference to the new Berlin agreement:

I detect in government policies of late a very discouraging tendency to engage in retrogression while labelling it progress.

After 17 months and 77 negotiating sessions the Soviets managed to persuade the West to sign an agreement which, in effect, returns Berlin to the 1945 status quo—minus. Specifically, it has these results:

The wording of the accord constitutes de facto U.S. recognition of East Germany as a sovereign state. This abandons the Western Powers' long-maintained position that only the freely elected Government of West Germany has the right to represent all the German people, and accepts the permanent legitimacy of an illegal Soviet puppet Communist regime ruling East Germany.

The new Berlin accord abrogates the arrangements for West German administration of West Berlin instituted in 1949, denies that West Berlin is a constituent part of West Germany, and eliminates any German self-administration in West Berlin. West Berliners can no longer participate in the election of the President of West Germany, who can no longer exercise any real constitutional power over West Berlin as his acts there can now be

vetoed by the Soviet consul residing in Berlin. The Bundestag—lower house of the West German Parliament—can no longer meet in West Berlin.

In place of these attributes of sovereignty, West Germany will be allowed to perform consular functions, thus accepting the implication that West Berlin is foreign soil. It should be mentioned here that the separation of West Berlin from West German authority has long been a Soviet goal.

The Soviet section of Berlin—East Berlin—becomes officially a part of East Germany, thus legitimizing the Berlin Wall.

The Soviet Union is allowed to establish a consulate in West Berlin. While the West gives up all claim to East Berlin, the Soviets are now allowed the same rights in, for example, the U.S. section of West Berlin that the English and French have there.

This means that for all practical purposes there are no longer two Germanys, one recognized by the United States as legal and one as illegal, but three: West Germany—our ally—East Germany—now recognized as a legitimate sovereign state—and what is known as "the sectors of West Berlin."

What did the West receive in return for all these concessions? West Berliners are to be allowed to go more freely into East Berlin—but under the earlier four-power agreements—broken by the construction of the Berlin Wall—there were to be no barriers whatever to travel by Berliners to any part of their city. "Transit" from West through East Germany to West Berlin is to be allowed—subject to East German regulations, which means that previous harassment of access could resume at any time.

Therefore, it is the simple truth to say, as an authoritative English journal of foreign affairs bluntly stated in commenting on this agreement, that what the Soviet Union "actually did was to give back a little of what it has taken illegally step by step over the years. The removal of some of these artificially created obstacles is now called concession."

Thus, in yet another case, the "era of negotiations" is shown to be an era of appeasement.

DISCHARGE PETITION NO. 10 TO RESCIND AND REVOKE U.S. MEMBERSHIP IN THE U.N.

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 27, 1971

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, I want to inform our colleagues that I have now lodged discharge petition No. 10 at the Clerk's desk to discharge H.R. 2632, a bill by Mr. SCHMITZ of California, to rescind and revoke membership of the United States in the United Nations and the specialized agencies thereof and for other purposes.

The effect of passage of H.R. 2632 by the House would be to remove the United

States from the U.N. and the U.N. from the United States, thus freeing our people from the ever-tightening yoke of international controls and the erosion of national sovereignty and constitutional government.

The recent debacle of the expulsion of Nationalist China should bring home to every Member the failure of the U.N. to even abide by its own charter and that its present composition has degenerated into a circus for the various Communist parties around the world, as a command post for international subversion of free peoples and democratic institutions.

I urge all of our colleagues who recognize the threat of the U.N. Organization to our country and our people, as do Mr. SCHMITZ and myself, to sign discharge petition No. 10 so that we may have an opportunity to remove this cancer from our shores and our leaders from this contagious infection before it becomes fatal.

The American dream is freedom—not peace at any cost.

Discharge petition No. 10 represents a bipartisan effort on behalf of Mr. SCHMITZ who is a Republican and myself, a Democrat.

The signing of discharge petition No. 10 offers a chance to weed out the internationalists from the Americans.

I include a copy of H.R. 2632 in the RECORD at this point:

H.R. 2632

A bill to rescind and revoke membership of the United States in the United Nations and the specialized agencies thereof, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That from and after the effective date of this Act the ratification by the Senate of the United States on July 28, 1945, of the United Nations Charter, making the United States a member of the United Nations, be, and said ratification hereby is, rescinded, revoked, and held for naught; and all Acts and parts of Acts designed and intended to perfect and carry out such membership of the United States in the United Nations are hereby repealed.

SEC. 2. That from and after the effective date of this Act all Acts and parts of Acts designed and intended to make the United States a member of the specialized agencies of the United Nations, or any of them, are hereby repealed; and all executive agreements, international undertakings and understandings, however characterized and named, designed, and intended to make the United States a member of the specialized agencies of the United Nations are hereby rescinded, revoked, and held for naught.

SEC. 3. That from and after the effective date of this Act any and all appropriations for defraying the cost of the membership of the United States in the United Nations or in specialized agencies thereof are hereby rescinded and revoked; and any unexpended and unencumbered balances of any such appropriations shall be covered into the general fund of the Treasury of the United States.

SEC. 4. That the International Organizations Immunities Act of December 29, 1945 (59 Stat. 669; title 22, secs. 288 to 288f U.S.C.), be and it is repealed; and any and all Executive orders extending or granting immunities, benefits, and privileges under said Act of December 29, 1945, are hereby rescinded, revoked, and held for naught.

SEC. 5. This Act may be cited as the "International Organizations Rescission Act of 1969".

MEDICARE'S SECRET DATA

HON. DAVID PRYOR

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 27, 1971

Mr. PRYOR of Arkansas, Mr. Speaker, Mal Schechter, the Washington editor of *Hospital Practice* magazine, has recently brought to the public's attention the serious question of the prohibition of disclosure of medicare survey and inspection reports.

As one who has always believed that the ultimate safeguard in a democratic republic is the people's right to be fully informed and to make decisions based upon that information, I think that Members of the House should be concerned that older Americans are barred from information which is essential to them.

I am, therefore, including in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the article "Medicare's Secret Data" which appeared in the *Washington Post* on September 26, 1971.

The article follows:

MEDICARE'S SECRET DATA

(By Mal Schechter)

In 1939, the fledgling Social Security System warned Congress of a problem vitiating its objective of humane aid to the poor. Political candidates in some states acquired, legally, the names of Old-Age Assistance recipients and deluged them with campaign propaganda, promises and warnings. Tradersmen also used the lists. A few states actually required publication of the names to deter the poor from seeking relief.

Social Security Board Chairman Arthur Altmeyer asked Congress for authority to require confidentiality of records. Not only to protect assistance recipients but also individuals in the payroll tax program of old age and survivors insurance, Congress agreed.

Section 1106 of the Social Security Act to this day ranks as one of the most sweeping secrecy provisions in any federal program. It forbids disclosing "any file, record, or other paper or any information" obtained by the system or provided for official use, except as the Social Security commissioner expressly allows.

A quarter century after Altmeyer's plea, Medicare began.

There lies the rub. For Section 1106, implemented by Regulation No. 1, covers relationships hardly imagined in 1939.

Medicare deals with hospitals, nursing homes, clinical laboratories, physicians, health departments, and insurance companies. What Congress intended as protection of payroll taxpayers and beneficiaries has been extended to Medicare's corporate servants. The "authority to refuse to disclose"—as Regulation No. 1 puts it—has mushroomed, and this restricts the public's right to know about the quality of care it receives and the quality of Medicare's administration.

Much information on specific facilities is not open to the public, such as reports on Medicare-financed inspections of nursing homes and hospitals. These surveys contain information bearing on patient health and safety which could be important to families trying to place a relative. Or to newsmen, students of health care and public administration, or anyone who wants to know how good or bad a community is served by the health establishment.

But nobody can get these reports from Social Security.

In New York State, on the other hand, information on institutional deficiencies gath-

ered by the state is, by law, public information.

Social Security Commissioner Robert Ball says he realizes that deficiency disclosure could help the public and patients, but he emphasizes "undesirable effects." He insists Medicare doesn't certify a facility endangering the patient's health or safety. Therefore, public disclosure of lesser deficiencies in certified institutions "might create unwarranted concern" or an "adverse public reaction (that) could severely hamper an institution's efforts to maintain patient loads while effectuating needed improvements."

SHORTCOMINGS SHIELDED

That serious deficiencies exist under Medicare is hardly hallucination. Federal auditors repeatedly have found Medicare homes lacking complete fire protection programs, required nursing attention, required physician attention, necessary emergency electrical service, and complete nurses' call systems.

Which ones? Don't ask the Social Security Administration.

Medicare certification is hardly an infallible guide to quality. Of some 4,500 Medicare nursing homes mentioned in a Senate Finance Committee report, nearly 3,300 had significant deficiencies, some tolerated for years in the category of "substantial compliance" with standards. The public never is told which homes are in "full" and which in "substantial" compliance. The Finance Committee says administrative legerdemain permits disregard of many standards.

The nation has the word not only of auditors but also of President Nixon that something is seriously wrong with federally subsidized care in nursing homes. Much of the President's recently announced effort to tighten up federal supervision of nursing homes appears directed at officially tolerated abuses—perhaps in good measure tolerated behind a screen of nondisclosure.

Although Social Security has some good words for disclosure, it has backed off from an innovative proposal by the Finance Committee. Last year, the committee proposed that Medicare publish information on deficiencies if an institution fails to correct them within 90 days. The proposal is still pending. Social Security has come up with many reservations to the plan without acknowledging the public's right to information. Ball has argued that "widespread and indiscriminate dissemination of information about deficiencies" may have some undesirable effects.

The public's right to know may be forever in conflict with such official paternalism, whether altruistic or self-serving. Often considered one of the better bureaucracies, Social Security has a record on Medicare nondisclosure that goes beyond nursing homes. It was reluctant to name insurance companies that it found to be poor Medicare fiscal agents, including District of Columbia Blue Shield. It declined to disclose results of a Medicare survey of Boston City Hospital after discreditation by the Joint Commission on Accreditation of Hospitals; nondisclosure prevented an attempt to compare certification systems. Social Security is silent on revealing the names of Medicare nursing homes that have highly inflammable carpeting. It has stopped a state agency from describing the administrative process that permitted a leading clinical laboratory to be certified for four years without meeting key standards.

Even reimbursement information has been played close to the vest. When first asked for specific payments to hospitals, the agency said nothing doing; Regulation No. 1. Fortunately, Ball relented because "there is not the same validity in withholding information concerning the payment of public funds to institutional providers of Medicare services as there is in the case of information on Social Security payments to individuals."

Ball made the data available and amend-

ed Regulation No. 1—but only to disclose institutional payments, not deficiency data. Alas, the hospital payment data turned out to be inadequate for comparing institutions on costs related to patient load. This raised questions about Medicare's capacity to analyze costs and influence development of cost controls amid medical-hospital inflation. A promise that good comparative data would be furnished regularly remains unkept.

Given specific hospital payment data, the extent to which Medicare financed certain racially discriminating Southern hospitals was assessed by *Hospital Practice*. The report led to tightening up of a Medicare loophole. There was no difficulty obtaining specific civil rights data from the Office for Civil Rights of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; that office said the records were public information.

SOOTHING THE INDUSTRY

The application of Regulation No. 1 to Medicare may be a historical result of the health industry's opposition to enactment of the program—and especially to its chief spokesman, Wilbur Cohen, then HEW under secretary. After enactment, Cohen, prodded by the White House, emphasized consultation and conciliation. Consumer representatives, including organized labor, followed Cohen. Much of the regulatory work was confidential from the very start. In this atmosphere, Regulation No. 1 was handy.

The bureaucrats who moved over from the cash-payments and disability payments programs had matured at the knee of Regulation No. 1. A history of early Social Security days points to the founding policy of shunning political controversy at almost all costs. This meant a tight lip on information that might stir things up even more for a young social program in the hostile 1930s. The system had to be above reproach and suffer its pains quietly.

These themes may have figured in the application of Regulation No. 1 to Medicare. The commissioner could have excluded the new relationships from nondisclosure. Psychologically, 1966 may have been 1936 all over again in the bureaucracy. Whatever the reason, frankness with the public has not been a Medicare hallmark where controversy portended—neither under the Democrats nor under the Republicans, who, the bureaucrats are aware, have special ties to protect in the health establishment, especially insurance companies.

Some officials argue that it is enough that congressional committees get information. Still, information on deficiencies does little practical good to the man in the street when deposited on the Hill under a "confidential" stamp. Nor, one might argue, should congressional oversight delimit the public's right to information. Medicare records probably are a mine of information for communities on the quality of medical-hospital care. Disclosure might generate healthy corrective pressures in localities.

The dangers of secrecy, some officials argue, are outweighed by the dangers of disclosing undigested technical information. Raw data might do the public little practical good. The proper rejoinder may be that government must provide the context to give data meaning, with other sources free to comment on the facts. The HEW Audit Agency has such a pattern so readers can judge for themselves.

THE CHANGES NEEDED

A few steps could give the public access to Medicare information. First, Section 1106 should be replaced by a simple statement limiting confidentiality to taxpayer-beneficiary-patient records. All other information should be subject to the 1967 Freedom of Information law.

This statute assumes that all information in federal hands belongs to the people and is disclosable, with certain exceptions—such as internal policy memoranda, trade secrets and patient records. Unfortunately, the 1967

law exempts any antedating statutory authority for secrecy, such as Section 1106. Also lamentably, the law has been laced with bureaucratic interpretations that have created or widened loopholes.

The information law should be amended to narrow the loopholes, especially to make clear that factual material must be disclosed on request in timely fashion. Where doubt exists about "confidentiality," the matter should be examined by a board including non-bureaucrats. For example, the President might name such a board from newsmen, public representatives and bureaucrats. Among other things, they might have power to release the substance of documents after "sanitizing" to preserve necessary patient-beneficiary confidentiality. The board should work rapidly. Its decisions should be subjected to immediate court review.

Further, in the current debate over national health insurance all proposals should carry an explicit requirement for freedom of information, avoiding secrecy from the start. The debate over forms of health insurance, quality of care, economics and efficiency of services, and governmental-versus-private roles might be better informed today if the people had the facts.

Finally, the Senate Finance provision on releasing deficiency information should be enacted without delay. Anyone seeking to learn about the quality of a facility should be able to look it up at a district Social Security office. The same information on institutions in Medicaid and other government programs should be public, as should results of hospital accreditation inspections which form the basis for joining government programs.

Thomas Jefferson once said, "Give the people the facts and they will know what to do."

Medicare should do no less.

VFW POST URGES RESTORATION OF NOVEMBER 11 AS VETERANS DAY

HON. GOODLOE E. BYRON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 27, 1971

Mr. BYRON. Mr. Speaker, many veterans' organizations are disturbed over the new Monday holiday schedule which put Veterans Day on October 25 this year. I would like to share with my colleagues a resolution passed by the William D. Byron, VFW Post No. 1936 in Hagerstown, Md., and later ratified by the Veterans of Foreign Wars, Department of Maryland:

Whereas: November 11 is a date inscribed in the hearts of all American veterans, living and dead and commemorated by their spirit; and

Whereas: November 11th symbolizes the end of American's first great foreign war which generated our first large group of veterans of foreign service; and

Whereas: November 11th through intervening years and on following wars has been associated by the American public for remembrance of the U.S. veteran; and

Whereas: November 11th is significant only through the sacrifice of the veteran population of our great country . . . a beacon for the improvement of the veteran's image; now therefore,

It is hereby resolved that our Congressmen and Senators be urged and petitioned to restore November 11th as the "Day of Recognition" to the veterans of the United States . . . Not, as presently in force, a day of convenience for business and other interests.

TRIBUTE TO JAY HAYDEN

HON. EDWARD HUTCHINSON

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 27, 1971

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I was deeply saddened to learn of the passing of a highly respected Michigan newspaperman. For 49 years, Jay Hayden served as a reporter for the Detroit News and bureau chief for the Detroit News Washington bureau.

He began his career as a printer's apprentice for a weekly newspaper in his hometown of Cassopolis, which is located in my congressional district. In 1916, he came to Washington and reported for the Detroit News until he retired in 1965.

This gentleman earned the respect of Government officials as an outstanding reporter who was dedicated to his profession and qualified to interpret the activities of the Government.

I remember Jay Hayden as a man who derived great enjoyment from his work and was dedicated to getting the job done. He was recognized by the Washington Press Corps as a highly skilled craftsman.

He recognized that being a reporter was a huge responsibility that not only touched the lives of Michigan's congressional delegation, but the lives of the readers of the Detroit News.

Jay Hayden was a natural-born professional journalist. He will be missed. We can console ourselves, however, that we had the good fortune of having known him and worked with him.

The following appraisal of Mr. Hayden's career was written by Will Muller, himself a highly respected columnist for the Detroit News, as Jay Hayden entered the eighth decade of life. Ironically, Mr. Muller died before Mr. Hayden on September 3, 1971, at the age of 64. I also include the announcement of Mr. Hayden's death as it appeared in the Detroit News October 25, 1971:

A NEWSPAPERMAN FOR 66 YEARS—JAY HAYDEN WON WIDE ACCLAIM
(By Will Muller)

Jay G. Hayden, Washington correspondent of The Detroit News for a half-century and a newspaperman for 66 years, was a legend in his profession.

At the time of his retirement in March, 1965, Mr. Hayden's wide readership, enduring service and proximity to national and world events had probably made him Michigan's best known newsman.

He won national recognition early. He had been a member of the Gridiron Club, that professional association which admits only the newspaper elite of Washington, since 1920 and was the club's president in 1930.

Mr. Hayden's career had started in the print shop of the weekly Cassopolis Vigilant, at Cassopolis, Mich., in 1900.

From there he went on to personal and professional relationships with nine presidents, starting with Woodrow Wilson. He was known and recognized by statesmen of other nations in the world's most tumultuous half-century.

He was one of three American newsmen accredited to witness the signing of the Treaty of Versailles which ended World War I. His blunt assessment of that agreement as a breeder of future wars won him the re-

spect of Premier Georges (the Tiger) Clemenceau who honored him with appointment as an Officier de l'Instruction Publique of France.

The years may have changed government and countries but they had a minimum impact on Jay Hayden. The twang in his voice, his sturdy physique unsubdued by well tailored clothes, his sly humor coupled with practicality, all identified him as a Midwesterner whether at an inaugural ball or a back-room political conference.

There was an almost boyish exuberance about him into his last years. His curiosity never flagged. His thirst for experience and growth and for everything new was matched only by a rare courtesy and a tolerance even of fools.

He played left-handed golf and two-fisted poker. He took martinis for lunch, sipped bourbon in senatorial suites, and embellished Washington parties as one of the most gifted raconteurs of his day. He had a phenomenal memory for detail that extended backward like an illuminated picture to his beginnings.

That was a long way. He was born in Cassopolis to James Girt and Ruth Kingsbury Hayden, Dec. 8, 1884. He spent his early years with his family on a farm near his birthplace.

Through his years and his honors, Mr. Hayden obeyed a personal creed. It was to get a story, get it if possible before the other fellow, get it right and get it to his readers.

A Hayden hallmark was the care exercised never needlessly to injure anyone.

The span of his experience is emphasized by the changes he saw. He arrived in Washington for The News on the day after Christmas in 1916 by train. It took five weeks for his car, a Model T, to follow him on a flat-car.

Washington was a somnolent Southern town with plenty of time on its hands. Correspondents, often in spats and carrying canes, were cavalier fellows who held personal conferences with the occupants of the White House and Cabinet members.

"The whole cost of the federal government for the fiscal year 1916 was \$734,156,202," Mr. Hayden reminisced in one of his last stories. "There was great commotion when for fiscal 1917 President Wilson asked for appropriations slightly exceeding \$1 billion."

Mr. Hayden in succeeding years saw the city bulge from the impact of two world wars until much of it extended into states bordering the District of Columbia. He watched the nation's budget brush \$100 billion and the national debt approach \$300 billion.

It was a world of the written word when he entered the news profession. Reporters suffered no competition from radio or television. Stories were moved by Morse code over telegraph wires. Pictures traveled, not by electrical impulse, but by express. National campaigning was done by train.

Mr. Hayden's seniority in Washington outran that of all but one member of Congress. That was Senator Carl Hayden who started his career in the House in 1912 when his state, Arizona, was first admitted to the Union and who served until 1968. He is now 94. They were not related.

"The most important single difference between 1916 and the present is the phenomenal growth of federal government," Mr. Hayden observed recently, "not only in personnel, physical establishment and expenditure, but in activities affecting the lives of all Americans."

Mr. Hayden became chief of The News' Washington Bureau in 1918, two years after arriving to work there. He succeeded the late George Miller who left to become an editor of The News.

In 1919, Mr. Hayden organized a London bureau for The News. That year he wrote from England, Scotland, Ireland and the continent.

In 1926, he traveled to the Philippines, China and Japan and wrote stories from Asia. He covered the 1930 London Naval Confer-

ence and the 1933 London Economic Conference.

He was best known, however, for his coverage of national government and politics.

All his life he held to the conviction that statesmen, presidents, policy makers and world troublemakers were just people like his readers and it was his job to interpret one for the other.

The changes which altered maps and governments and political philosophies in the world's fastest century never shook that conviction. His adherence to it gave his stories a rare insight and flavor that cut through complexities and myths.

He started his newspaper career as a \$2-a-week printers' devil. After four years at the *Vigilant* and after completing high school he went to the University of Michigan.

His experience got him a job as foreman of the university's library print shop. Restless after a year there, he took a job as a composing room foreman at the *Escanaba Daily Mirror* (defunct long ago).

He tried a job in a North Dakota print shop but the 40-below weather drove him back. He worked briefly at *Evart, Mich.*, then returned to Cassopolis where he took a job as assistant postmaster and wrote for the *old Detroit Journal* as a stringer.

There was a great hullabaloo there one night when sheriff's deputies and federals chased one Whirly Jones, a reputed counterfeiter, into a swamp. Hayden telephoned the story to what he thought was the desk of the *Journal*.

By an error in the telephone exchange, he gave the story to *The News* which printed it with pride. It caught the eye of the editor, and Jay Hayden came to work on a metropolitan daily.

On *The News* he developed rapidly, covering general assignments, City Hall, then the State Capitol. Always his driving interest was politics.

He left *The News* briefly at the request of the late Mayor James Couzens to become executive secretary of the DSR. He returned and was offered the city editor's chair but chose instead to go to Washington.

W. Steele Gilmore, a retired *News* editor now living in Princeton, Ind., sat down with his pencil in 1957. By that date, he figured, Mr. Hayden had written 18,250 columns.

Mr. Hayden's political reporting reached back to the Bull Moose convention which nominated Theodore Roosevelt in 1912. He was the confidant and often the mentor of Senator Couzens and the late Senator Arthur H. Vandenberg.

His friendships were infinite and varied and precious to him. The only limitation he placed on them was loyalty to his paper and obligation to his profession.

Twenty-one years ago, he was honored with a Doctor of Laws degree from George Washington University. The words said of him then by Dr. Cloyd H. Marvin, university president, applied to the end and—in the past tense—serve him well as an epitaph:

"He was patient, modest, steadfast to preserve high standards of journalistic interpretation, both national and international . . . a healthy curiosity against a background of real and human understanding and high purpose."

FORTY-NINE YEARS IN DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FOR NEWS—JAY HAYDEN DIES; NOTED AS REPORTER

Jay G. Hayden, foremost interpreter of Washington news for readers of *The Detroit News* for nearly a half-century before his retirement in 1965, is dead. He was 86.

Death came in his sleep early yesterday at his home in Kensington, Md., near Washington, where he had known and won the respect of every president from Woodrow Wilson to President Nixon.

He began his career as a printer's apprentice for a weekly newspaper in his native

Cassopolis, Mich., in 1900 but had won international regard in his profession by 1920.

He went to Washington for *The News* in 1916.

He was one of only three reporters from the United States accredited to cover the signing of the 1919 Treaty of Versailles and summed that up for *The News'* readers as "a breeder of future wars."

Among those who expressed their sorrow over Mr. Hayden's death were both Michigan U.S. senators and other state political leaders.

President Nixon was among those who expressed condolences to the family.

Survivors include his wife, Ruth; a son, Martin S. Hayden, vice-president and editor of *The News*; two stepsons, Peter and Claus Felfe; his sister, Mrs. Charles Gower, of East Lansing; a brother, Robert, of Cassopolis, and three grandchildren.

Mr. Hayden had been twice widowed before his third marriage, to the former Ruth Haberland Felfe, in 1953.

His first wife, the former Marguerite Scholl, mother of Martin S. Hayden, died in 1924. His second wife, the former Loretta Taylor, whom he married in 1926, died in 1930.

Funeral services, with the Rev. Edward Latch, chaplain of the U.S. House of Representatives, officiating, will be held at 8 a.m. Wednesday in the Gawler Funeral Home, Washington. The body will be cremated. His ashes will be interred in Cassopolis.

Of his death, Senator Philip A. Hart, Michigan Democrat, said:

"He was one of journalism's early pathfinders in Washington. He set unflinchingly high standards and left his profession a valuable legacy."

Senator Robert P. Griffin, Michigan Republican, said:

"Jay Hayden was a highly respected statesman in the field of journalism. He will be missed, but long remembered by the many in all stations of life who were fortunate enough to know him."

U.S. Rep. Gerald Ford, of Grand Rapids, House Republican leader, called Mr. Hayden "one of the real greats in Washington, not only as an outstanding reporter and columnist, but as an individual."

"He had a way of making complicated issues readable and understandable," Ford said. "He was a man one could trust and one who told the truth, even when it was unpleasant to his news sources."

"He wrote from a perspective of history that was matched by few and admired by many."

Former Gov. George W. Romney, secretary of housing and urban development (HUD) said:

"Jay Hayden was one of the most respected and admired journalists of his time, both for the accuracy of his reporting and for his keen insights into domestic and foreign affairs."

"He was greatly loved by many, in and out of public life. He was a man whose kindness and concern for people was genuine, active and unflagging."

U.S. Rep. Martha Griffiths, a friend for more than 20 years, called him "one of the best reporters in Washington," adding:

"Jay Hayden was the newspaper business at its very best."

Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, on which I serve, has been holding extensive hearings on legislation concerning the fight against cancer, the second greatest killer of American citizens, and probably the most dreaded. Especially in view of the number of lives and the amount of human suffering at stake, some of the political maneuvering on this issue borders on the scandalous.

Very early in this year's congressional session, Senator EDWARD KENNEDY introduced with enormous fanfare a bill (S. 34) grandiloquently entitled "The Conquest of Cancer Act." Its formula for conquering cancer was very simple, if a bit shopworn: set up a new Federal bureau with lots of money.

Assuming—quite correctly, as it turned out—that opposition to the "Conquest of Cancer Act" would promptly be labeled as tantamount to being in favor of cancer, President Nixon got in line with his own "Conquest of Cancer Act," differing in no essential respect from Senator KENNEDY's bill, but carrying a different number (S. 1828). This bill passed the Senate by the lopsided vote of 79 to 1.

The "railroad" was on, and the American Cancer Society, in full-page advertisements in the *New York Times* and the two major Washington papers, had the unmitigated gall to state that "objections to the bill have come mainly from people who do not have expert cancer knowledge." My files bulge with statements from some of the outstanding scientists, physicians, and cancer researchers in the United States opposing the Kennedy-Nixon grandstand play, including one signed by no less than four Nobel prize winners in medicine.

Meanwhile, in southern California, full-page advertisements also appeared in support of the "Conquest of Cancer Act," featuring a statement by that noted national defense expert, Ann Landers, that "the lion's share of the tax dollar is going to defense" and therefore that more should be directed to the Conquest of Cancer Agency this bill would set up. As readers of this newsletter are well aware by now, the "lion's share of the tax dollar" has not been going to defense for some time—it is more like the lamb's share.

I am proud to say that despite pressures such as this, the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, without a dissenting vote, rejected the "Conquest of Cancer Act" and instead adopted and reported out a bill of its own—H.R. 10681—fully recognizing the fact—attested by many witnesses of unimpeachable medical and scientific credentials who appeared before our committee—that a cancer cure is far more likely to come from a broad spectrum of biomedical research than from a "crash program" in the present state of our knowledge of cancer.

Advocates of the "crash program" compare their brainchild with the Manhattan atom bomb project and the Apollo moonshot program. But at least we knew where the moon was to be found and how the atom could be split, before we launched these projects. We do not know yet, for sure, even the cause of cancer, to say nothing of its cure. Another sprawling bureaucracy is not going to

THE POLITICS OF CANCER

HON. JOHN G. SCHMITZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 27, 1971

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, for the past 6 weeks, the Public Health and Environment Subcommittee of the House

find either cause or cure any faster. More likely it will actually hamper the search for them, by "locking in" the present preconceptions and biases of researchers specializing strictly in this field.

Helping to find a cure for killer diseases is, I believe, a legitimate function of government, whose duty it is to protect the lives of its citizens. But we are not going to conquer cancer simply by setting up a new agency with that as its name.

THE OMNIPRESENT DANGER OF METHADONE

HON. JAMES F. HASTINGS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 27, 1971

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I recently addressed myself to the potential dangers of methadone and my reluctance to see the new drug application approved without first enacting necessary statutory regulations.

The full potential of the therapeutic value of methadone can be realized only if its abuse is prevented.

It has been brought to my attention that in one city, Detroit, the incidence of child methadone accidents has reached alarming proportions. As a matter of fact, Dr. Sheldon L. Brenner, of Detroit Children's Hospital staff, is quoted by the Detroit Free Press as recommending that all methadone now on the market be recalled and its future manufacture and distribution be more closely regulated.

I enclose the entire text of the recent Detroit Free Press article concerning the child poisonings.

The article follows:

[From the Detroit Free Press, Oct. 20, 1971]
ADDICTS' CHILDREN POISONED BY METHADONE
IN ACCIDENTS

(By Roberta Mackey)

The increasing use of methadone in Detroit's fight against heroin addiction has produced a dangerous side effect: The accidental poisoning of young children in numbers approaching epidemic levels.

This is the judgment of Dr. Regine Aronow, director of the Poison Control Center at Children's Hospital, where 40 children have been treated after accidentally swallowing methadone they found around the house.

One child has died. An autopsy showed, however, the death might have been related to a previous brain injury. But 40 percent of the children treated at the hospital's emergency room were in a comatose state and some had stopped breathing. Their average age was two years.

Methadone poisoning has become such a serious problem that Dr. Sheldon L. Brenner, of the Children's Hospital staff, recommended Tuesday that all methadone now on the market be recalled and its future manufacture and distribution be much more closely restricted.

Brenner said the distribution should be paper delivered in Chicago Tuesday to a meeting of the American Association of Poison Control Centers.

Brenner said the distribution should be limited to specially licensed clinics. (Private doctors can now prescribe methadone in emergency conditions). He also suggested

that the strength of each tablet containing the drug be reduced to a level that won't be toxic to a patient who is not an addict and doesn't have the high narcotic tolerance an addict has.

The first public methadone clinic in Detroit was opened in March, 1970. Two months later Children's Hospital treated its first case of methadone poisoning.

Within nine months, 17 more children were treated, and within the past seven months, 22 were treated.

Officials at the hospital say the rate of incidence is increasing.

About 3,000 addicts are being treated with methadone in Detroit, which means one child has been poisoned for every 77 adult patients.

Methadone, originally produced as potent pain reliever, is used in treatment programs as a substitute for heroin. Although it relieves the addict's physical discomfort and need for heroin, it doesn't produce the euphoric high that heroin produces.

Administered in proper doses, methadone nullifies the effect of heroin, so that even if an addict does shoot up with heroin, the drug has no effect.

Methadone itself is addicting. It costs about 10 cents a dose, is taken orally once a day, and is intended to allow an addict to return to a fairly normal life while gradually reducing his dependence upon methadone.

But the dose that will comfort an addict, according to poison control authorities, is often enough to kill a child or anyone who doesn't have a tolerance built up from prolonged use of narcotics.

Although the dose for an addict usually ranges from 60 milligrams per day to 100 mg., one or two 10-mg. tablets may endanger the life of a non-addict, Dr. Aronow says.

Depending upon a child's size and what's in his stomach, he may have no more than half an hour from the time he swallows a methadone tablet until he stops breathing, according to the Children's Hospital officials.

The pupils of the child's eyes usually become mere pinpoints, his breathing more and more depressed, and he sinks into a coma.

Although even a small dose of methadone can kill a child, the federal government requires neither precautionary labels nor safety caps on the containers in which methadone is dispensed.

Children's Hospital officials believe those safety measures should be taken.

In pointing out the reason for restricting methadone's availability, Dr. Aronow noted that at least half of the cases seen at Children's involved methadone which was obtained in street sales.

Only two of the doses were traced to recognized clinics, and the remainder came from drugstores or private physicians.

Methadone is usually administered to adult addicts at the clinics. But sometimes—in the later stages of treatment or over weekends or holidays—the addicts are permitted to self-administer the drug at home.

Dr. Aronow and Dr. Brenner agreed that since only two of their cases can be traced to clinics stricter controls are needed on methadone's availability beyond the clinics.

They also criticize the federal government for not requiring methadone bottles to be labeled nor requiring that the drug be packaged in child-proof containers.

"We can't even tell from the bottles what dosage the child has ingested," Dr. Aronow said.

Since April, new federal regulations have prohibited pharmacists from dispensing methadone for long-term treatment of heroin addicts, although it can be dispensed as a pain killer and as an emergency treatment for withdrawal.

Five of the children treated at Children's Hospital had chewed on large, salmon-colored Diskets manufactured by the Eli Lilly Co. at the special request of the Department of Justice for purely experimental use in spe-

cially controlled situations. Each Disket contains 40 mg. of methadone.

"Those wafers are completely experimental and they should only be dispensed in a clinic, but obviously they have found their way onto the street," Dr. Aronow said.

"Fortunately," she says, "methadone has gained social acceptability. People don't mind saying that they have it around the house, and so we don't have much trouble getting case histories."

The histories show that in 22, or more than half of the child cases, the source of the drug was one or both parents. An aunt or uncle was the source in another 11 cases; in 6 cases it was friend or babysitter; and in one case the source was unknown.

Children, in their inquisitive way, find methadone the same way they do other poisons, by emptying out mother's purse, by picking the bottle off a table or out of a cabinet, or, as in one case, by digging it out of a flower.

Once the problem is identified as methadone poisoning, an antidote may be administered which acts immediately to revive the child but the antidote is effective only for two hours or so, and the effects of methadone poisoning may continue to reappear for as long as 48 hours.

Even so though the child seems healthy and completely recovered, he must be watched with great care for two days, and his hospital stay will be longer if he suffered ill effects from the poisoning episode.

The antidote has its own problems. If methadone actually is not present, the antidote can cause breathing difficulties, and since there isn't time to run clinical tests, the doctors have to rely on the child's parents to tell them if methadone is likely to be the cause of the emergency.

Although comprehensive national figures aren't available, Detroit appears to have an unusually high incidence of cases of methadone poisoning. However, members of the District of Columbia Medical Society have already stopped giving prescriptions for methadone, and the D.C. Pharmaceutical Society is co-operating by asking its members not to honor methadone prescriptions.

In neighboring Maryland, the health department is moving to outlaw prescribing of methadone or the filling of methadone prescriptions.

These actions would not affect licensed, hospital based or community-based drug treatment programs, but they are designed to dry up illicit sources.

WORLD FEDERATION OF DEFENDERS OF THE HUNGARIAN NATION

HON. DONALD W. RIEGLE, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 27, 1971

Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. Speaker, at the request of one of my constituents, I would like to insert the following material concerning the World Defenders of the Hungarian Nation into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

WORLD FEDERATION OF DEFENDERS OF THE HUNGARIAN NATION,
Hollywood, Calif.
PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES,
1600 Pennsylvania Avenue NW.,
Washington, D.C.

Sir: A group of degenerated Hungarians is planning to present a picture to President Nixon, with a group of Hungarian Freedom Fighters at the "Andau-Bridge-Head."

However none of the people, posing in the picture, are Freedom-Fighters, and were not

there with President Nixon at that time. In reality, some of them were members of different Communist Organisation, and have in fact, received monetary and other awards for their excellent and faithful services from the communist government.

This painting was done in Los Angeles, and this group of traitors paid the artist to substitute their pictures in place of this real Freedom Fighters, who actually were with President at the Fall-time of 1956.

This lifesize picture is to be presented to the President in the Falltime only the 15th anniversary of the Hungarian Freedom-Fight, by the so called "Federation of Hungarian Freedom Fighters."

To immortalize this persons with President Nixon, in a historical painting, creates such a false and bizarre situation, that the persons are planning to smuggle this falsified picture to the President, keeping it from the Hungarian-American-Community, afraid to their reaction.

We are asking You Mr. President, to acknowledge the above mentioned facts, and refuse this falsified painting, which perpetrates a "mockery" on the meaning of the Freedom Fight and the psychological presence of President Nixon.

Respectfully Yours:

GÉZA GÖRGÉNYI.

SCHOOL PRAYER ISSUE REKINDLED—SUPPORT GROWS FOR CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT

HON. CHALMERS P. WYLIE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 27, 1971

Mr. WYLIE. Mr. Speaker, letters have come in, in great volume from all over the United States in support of a constitutional amendment which would assure prayer in public schools.

A headline appearing in the Arizona Republic rather sums up public reaction. The headline read "School Prayer Issue Rekindled—Support Grows for Constitutional Amendment."

Among the letters I have received is one from Miss Helen Chan, of Provincetown, Mass., which I hope all Members of Congress will read. It says a great deal.

PROVINCETOWN, MASS.,
September 23, 1971.

DEAR MR. WYLIE: I listened to WEEI this past Thursday evening while you presented your program to reinstitute Prayers in school, and to several of the people who phoned. For the time I could listen, it seemed that your cause was assailed by Devil's Advocates, and not too much helped by what the Queen in Camelot referred to as "the simple people"—churched but not too well schooled. From what one hears on WEEI one has the suspicion that Boston abounds with just those two opposites. The well-intentioned but not too well informed, and the informed to a degree on the shallow, specious side; and not at all well intentioned. Too often the latter are fendishly articulate.

Falling somewhere between these two prevailing categories, I do want to assure you that your statistic of 80 per cent on the side of Prayers again would include many like myself; not reached by polls, not given to loud acclaiming over the phone. There must be many such; quiet, inclined to be devout, often unchurched, and therefore all the more aware that religion is not so much a matter of a service on Sunday as a constant, daily effort to "Do unto others . . ." plus a

realistic awareness of our dependence on the Grace of a Supreme Deity, and full hearted gratitude for help and blessings bestowed . . . if we are but humble enough to notice them. I might add that in my own case I suffer a sense of shame for living in a country which makes sure God is mentioned on our money, calls on Him in times of war, but will not allow Him in the schools where the children are!

The minister-school-teacher struck me as so typical of the type of mind that thinks it thinks, and can be so all-fired glib and confident. Of such are school teachers who turn off the Young in droves! They are much aware that there is more in the Reality of Life than meets the eye. He mentioned something about there being far more compelling issues for a Congressman to busy himself about. As if there could be anything more compelling than an abiding realization that this Universe did not just happen; out of chaos it was Created. Scientists of any true stature are aware of the marvel of intricate symbiosis that is the evolutionary process. Teilhard de Chardin, the mystic-paleontologist, made it all clear in his "The Phenomenon of Man." This is the man the serious Young are reading!

There is one point that is rarely touched on in this prime need to bear witness to Faith in God . . . Jehovah . . . Buddha . . . Krishna . . . Mohammed . . . which ever the many names of the All Pervading Creative Force. And that is in this objection that all such teaching, praying, bearing witness, "should" go on at home or in churches.

The stark fact is that in these materialistic, technocratic, hedonistic times there is no such teaching by the parents who are equally remiss in sending their children to church. Very much then, if it is not offered at all in the schools, there will never be, anywhere in all their formative years, that guiding influence that makes children aware of the Reality behind all being. To have the spiritual aspects of our nature totally neglected is worse than any crippling, any deprivation, any disadvantaging. Every last one of us needs constantly to be reminded of our Source. One thing is certain, if we have not the saving grace of gratitude in us for Life itself, we can not have it for parents, country . . . which means no capacity for kindness, love, loyalty . . . all the attributes that are part of our own evolution from animal to man to our destiny: Divinity.

God Bless!

HELEN CHAN.

HEARINGS SET ON FEDERAL JURY SERVICE BILLS

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 27, 1971

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to announce that Subcommittee No. 5 of the Committee on the Judiciary has scheduled public hearings for Wednesday, November 10, 1971, on three measures relating to Federal jury service.

One of these measures—H.R. 8829, which I have sponsored—would lower the minimum age qualifications for Federal jury service from 21 to 18 years of age. Another bill—H.R. 2589, introduced by the gentleman from Illinois—Mr. McCLOY—would amend the Federal Jury Selection and Service Act of 1968 by requiring prospective jurors to furnish information as to race on jury qualification forms. A third bill—H.R. 10689,

which was introduced at the request of the Judicial Conference of the United States—would make it a criminal offense to discharge an employee because of his Federal jury service.

The hearings will be held in room 2141, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, D.C., beginning at 10 a.m. Parties interested in offering testimony or submitting statements for the hearing record should contact the committee.

A RADICAL-LIBERAL OPERATION FROM START TO FINISH

HON. DEL CLAWSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 27, 1971

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. Mr. Speaker, Princeton University in New Jersey will soon be the scene of a conference of self-appointed judges of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. This Friday and Saturday, a group ostentatiously dubbed the Committee for Public Justice will hold a conference cosponsored by Princeton's Woodrow Wilson School to investigate the investigators. Their conclusions are a foregone conclusion, as a quick look at the background of the conferees will show. All have in common an undying hatred of Mr. Hoover and all his works.

A perceptive column by Robert S. Allen, which was released by the Hall Syndicate on October 22d, pinpoints the political aims and affiliations of the conferees and clearly reveals the direction the conference will take. The American public, which will undoubtedly be treated to much favorable publicity about this seminar from members of the press who are sympathetic to their viewpoint, should be alerted to the prejudices of these "scholars and experts." Colonel Allen's column is therefore inserted in the RECORD at this point.

PRINCETON "SEMINAR"

(By Robert S. Allen)

A singular two-day "seminar" is taking place at Princeton University next week that is being characterized in official circles as a "hanging without a trial."

A radical-liberal operation from start to finish, it is part of a nationwide drive to disparage and asperse the FBI and to "get" its noted Director J. Edgar Hoover.

Announced theme of the October 29-30 affairs is "The Role of the FBI in American Life." Strikingly indicative of the highly biased and prejudiced nature of this discussion is that without exception every speaker, panelist, and other participant is a harsh foe and critic of the FBI and Hoover—most of them of many years' standing.

Several other revealing and significant facts about them are:

(1) All are left of center in varying degrees, ranging from militant liberals and New Leftists to communists. (2) Without exception they are vigorous opponents of the Vietnam war and vehement denouncers of the so-called "military-industrial complex"—although in most instances they also are clamorous advocates of more arms and credits for weapons to Israel.

Proclaimed sponsor of this carefully staged, one-sided kangaroo court is the Committee for Public Justice, headquartered in New York and headed by an Executive Coun-

oil as leftist and hostile to the FBI as the program and participants of the Princeton seminar.

Graphically illustrating this are the following leaders of the Council:

Norman Dorsen, general counsel of the American Civil Liberties Union, who has a long record of denouncing the Justice Department in particular and the Federal Government in general, and championing far-out liberal causes and crusaders.

Burke Marshall, deputy dean of Yale Law School and Assistant Attorney General in the Kennedy Administration, and long in the left-of-center forefront.

Blair Clark, aggressive dove and campaign manager of former Senator Eugene McCarthy's stormy but futile scramble for the 1968 Democratic presidential nomination. During that campaign, McCarthy and Clark assailed the FBI and Director Hoover and unavailingly tried to make an issue of them.

Ramsey Clark, Attorney General in the last phase of the Johnson Administration, during which, at a meeting of FBI men, he lauded Hoover to the skies. Since leaving office, Clark has become a strident critic of the FBI and a liberal activist. Earlier this year, he indicated harboring presidential ambitions but they seem to have evaporated in thin air. Last fall, in reply to snide remarks by Clark, Hoover derisively characterized him as a "jellyfish" and the "worst" Attorney General he ever worked for.

MORE OF THE SAME

Reportedly, the Princeton seminar will consist of two parts:

In Part I, a number of "papers" will be presented on patently angled topics by equally biased authors. Examples: "Political Uses of the FBI" by I. F. Stone, long-time leftist and publisher of "I. F. Stone's Biweekly"; "Informers" by Frank Donner, New York attorney, who has been the lawyer of Communist Party functionaries and has been associated with communist front organizations over the years. In 1959, he pleaded the Fifth Amendment when questioned by the House Committee on Un-American Activities regarding Communist Party affiliations and activities.

Also "Insiders' View" by William Turner, one-time FBI agent who was dismissed on charges including lack of truthfulness, accuracy, and responsibility. He appealed this ouster, but it was sustained by the Civil Service Commission, the Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, and the Supreme Court. He has written several books and a number of magazine articles castigating the FBI and Hoover; "Selling of the FBI" by Robert Sherrill, one-time newsman and prolific critic of the FBI, President Johnson, and former Vice President Humphrey. Sherrill labeled Johnson as "The Accidental President," and Humphrey as "The Drugstore Liberal."

Part II of the seminar will consist of panels aimed at exposing and castigating FBI methods and practices.

One panel will be made up of former Justice Department officials, among them Burke Marshall and Roger Wilkins, an assistant of the late Robert Kennedy. Another panel will comprise former FBI agents, including Turner, John Shaw, Sr., and Robert Wall, both ousted under charges.

A third panel will consist of individuals characterized as "FBI informers," who will be selected by Donner, the New York attorney who has represented Communist Party officials.

Prominent among those listed as members of the Committee for Public Justice are actors, writers, and artists long associated with leftist, radical, and peace causes of various kinds.

Foremost among them is Leonard Bernstein, symphony director, composer and supporter of the crime and murder-ridden Black Panthers. Also movie actors Marlon Brando,

Shirley MacLaine, Paul Newman, and Warren Beatty with long records in leftist causes.

Writers who are Committee members include Victor Navasky, ardent Kennedyite and author of the recently published book "Kennedy Justice," a laudatory account of Robert Kennedy's administration of the Justice Department; and Walter Pincus, another Kennedy partisan who has written numerous articles hostile to the FBI and Hoover. In a three-part series published in the Washington Post last June, the paper was forced to print a retraction of some of Pincus' charges.

THE WAR AND THE YOUNG

HON. ABNER J. MIKVA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 27, 1971

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, this country has been at war in Southeast Asia for the last 10 years without the expressed consent of Congress. It is the longest war in American history, and the toll has been awful: 55,000 U.S. soldiers have been killed, \$150 billion has been wasted, the economy of this country has been ruined, and our national priorities have been thrown into disarray. There has been at least one other disastrous result of this war—the country has been seriously divided. The Government has not seen fit to trust the people, and the people, especially the young people, have returned that mistrust.

The bitterness and frustration that many young people feel is expressed most readily in their opposition to the draft. They refuse to serve in the Army because they believe the Army is engaged in an immoral and an illegal war. Two recent newspaper stories in the Hammond Times by Eloise Henkel provide a good illustration of that feeling. They are about a young man who has refused to register for the draft. He was 9 years old when the first U.S. troops went to Vietnam. My colleagues might find the newspaper stories interesting, and I have attached their texts.

The articles follow:

DRAFT REJECTER TELLS WHY

(By Eloise Henkel)

HAMMOND.—A Hammond youth who was 9 when the first U.S. troops were sent to Vietnam and who would probably never have been drafted told today why he refused to register for selective service.

Palmer Singleton III, of 6326 Forest Avenue, is a junior in college who works part-time as a laborer on the swing shift at an East Chicago mill.

He is the first youth from Lake County to openly refuse to register for the draft.

When he was 17, he wrote to Selective Service headquarters in Washington and to his draft board in Hammond telling them he was going to refuse to register for reasons of conscience.

Had he registered, he would have had a number over 300 and probably never been tapped; only numbers up to 125 are currently being drafted in Hammond.

As a full-time college student, he could have received a student deferment.

With his strong Quaker leanings and opposition to all wars, he could have sought classification as a conscientious objector.

Instead, he openly refused to register and faces a possible maximum sentence of 5 years in jail and a \$10,000 fine.

Singleton said he didn't register for selective service because "By registering, you are saying that the draft is legitimate, that it has a place in society, that it has a right to channel people and direct them into militarism."

"I oppose the draft, the war and militarism in our society."

"I want to be human, to work for a more human society based on honesty, trust, simplicity and compassion."

Singleton said he believes in nonviolence, and this involves not only not killing people but not inflicting injury to anyone in any way.

"Violence complicates issues rather than clarifies them," he said. "Guns kill people but not ideas."

"There is a beauty and strength in pacifism. Pacifism is the constant attempt to resolve conflict through raising issues and then dealing with them in a creative manner."

"We need to develop new responses to our political, social and personal problems."

"After six years of mobilizations, after millions have voiced opposition to the killing, after a clear 73 per cent of the people see the need for immediate withdrawal from Indochina, the war goes on."

"Out of a sense of desperation, one asks why."

"The only thing I can come up with is that it is because we continue to perpetuate the very institutions that caused it."

"The only way I know to stop it is by not cooperating with selective service and the other institutions that perpetuate war, by speaking truth to power, by saying 'no' to the ways of life and things that allow us to be inhuman."

"We must affirm our affinity with other human beings and oppose injustice."

Singleton, who was a leader of the McCarthy campaign in Hammond, told the judge in Federal court last week, "In a certain sense, Congress makes the law."

"But in a more important sense, each time the individual confronts the law, his actions are making that law."

"The law is only legitimate and has power if that person agrees to obey it. When he openly refuses to obey it, the law no longer has power."

"People saw during Prohibition that the law did not determine whether people drank or didn't drink. Human behavior is based on other factors."

"The highest form of order that could exist would be when men would answer to reason and justice rather than to dictate law."

"We must struggle to base a society on sincerity and concern, something that's never been done."

"Through Gandhian civil disobedience, by openly breaking the law and accepting the punishment, we raise the issues challenging the legitimacy of the forces that determine our behavior."

"My hope is that people in America, in China, in the Soviet Union, in all countries will go beyond their government and develop new patterns of living that will allow them to be human."

"It isn't easy."

"Trying to be human is a very revolutionary act."

"But we can't make compromises. If we do, we become as unjust as the society we're trying to change."

A YOUNG MAN OBJECTS TO WAR

(By Eloise Henkel)

HAMMOND.—"What do you think I should do with you?" the judge asked the youth standing before him in Federal court.

It was an unusual question in an unusual arraignment.

Standing before Judge George Beamer in

the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Indiana was a 19-year-old Hammond youth who had failed to register for selective service.

It was the first case in Lake County in which a youth had openly refused to register and was voluntarily confronting the government.

Palmer Singleton of 6326 Forest Ave., a Hammond H.S. graduate and a student at Sarah Lawrence College, was challenging the legality of the law.

He asked the judge to depart from routine courtroom procedures to listen to him as one person to another.

The young man was accompanied to the stand by his father, Palmer Singleton Jr., who has practiced law in Hammond for the past 21 years.

"My son," he told the judge quietly, "is determined to act on his own behalf, and I will act in an advisory capacity."

"The only thing I regret," the father said, "is that we, by our silence and inaction, have allowed conditions to exist that force 18 and 19-year-olds to make these grave decisions regardless of the personal consequences.

"At 19 my son has more courage, conviction and concern for other human beings than I have at 50. I am proud of him and support him."

He stepped aside. The younger Singleton took the stand.

He told the judge the case has "social and moral implications," and that it might be necessary for the court "to go beyond the scope of legal conviction."

"We'll have to take your plea," the judge said.

"I think it'll be a lot easier if you let me finish," the youth pleaded. "A lot of what we hope to show in this trial," he said, "is that there's a distinction between the way people act as people, and how they act in institutional roles."

The judge asked him if he understood what he was being charged with.

"I'm indicted for failing to register," he said.

"But I really don't think what I'm on trial for is violation of the selective service system.

"When I was 18, the government put me on trial and asked me if I was going to affirm life . . . or if I was going to deny life by going along with a machine whose only purpose is death.

"I'm trying to challenge the legitimacy of the draft and militarism in American society."

"You are talking about political questions which by law I cannot decide," the judge said.

"The courts don't make the law. You should be directing your objections to the legislative branch of the government.

"If you want to make a speech about the propriety of the law," the judge said, "you will be making it in the wrong forum."

The youth said he didn't want to make a speech, but "we want to end the war. We've worked through the political system, we've demonstrated, we've tried all ways. It hasn't worked.

"It seems to me," Singleton said, "that only by not cooperating with the institutions that make the war can we end the war."

The judge asked him if he knew what the penalty for failing to register could be.

"Yes; five years in jail and a \$10,000 fine."

"What do you think I should do with you?" the judge asked him.

"That's for you to decide," the youth said. "I'm more concerned with what you are going to do with yourself."

"My decision was made" the judge said, "when I took an oath to uphold the law. The justness of a law is decided by the Congress. We decide if it fits in our constitution. This law has been declared constitutional."

The judge asked him if he thought each

person has the right to decide what law he will obey and not obey.

He said he doesn't believe that the law determines how people behave—whether they kill or shoot heroin.

"You think the law is not perfect?" the judge asked.

"You and I are not perfect," he said. "That's why we have rules," the judge told him.

"They're not based on trust and compassion," Singleton said. "There's not a man in jail for a crime that governments haven't done."

"Are you against killing?" the judge asked him.

"Of course," he said.

"If I had the time, I'd like to continue this discussion," the judge said. "But you're not going to convince me, or I, you. I have to take a plea."

"I don't know what to plead," Singleton said.

I have openly refused to register; "I know that I've broken your law, and I'm willing to accept the consequences. I don't want to plead guilty because I haven't done anything wrong. And I want a trial."

The judge entered a "not guilty" plea.

He asked the youth if he wanted a jury.

He said "yes."

"I respect you," he told the judge. Thank you for talking to me."

He asked about a pre-trial conference.

The judge said he would like to have one.

"As your father and I know," the judge said, "law has come to be a complicated, specialized thing. Before you get through this case, you may need representation."

"I'm not trying to be an attorney," Singleton said. "I'm trying to be a person. My father and I will be together. He will be my father, not my attorney."

The judge said he would schedule a pre-trial conference.

The Singleton family and friends left the courtroom and the court resumed its normal routine.

Father and son went sailing together on Wolf Lake.

A NEW COURSE FOR THE AEC

HON. JOE SKUBITZ

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 27, 1971

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, those of us in Congress who have had occasion to deal with the Atomic Energy Commission in recent years, are most gratified with what appears to be a change in policy under the agency's new chairman, Dr. James R. Schlesinger.

That change places the public interest ahead of private interests. It says that instead of being an advocate for private power companies, the AEC will now be a referee; that it is deeply conscious of environmental problems and its operations hereafter will reflect that awareness.

We in Congress are not alone in recognizing and applauding the new AEC policy and Dr. Schlesinger. This morning, the Washington Post commented editorially on this point. I ask that the text of this editorial, for which I congratulate the Post, be printed following my remarks. This past Monday evening, WMAL-TV in a news editorial also took occasion to praise Dr. Schlesinger for this new policy.

Dr. Schlesinger first enunciated his belief of what the appropriate role of the AEC should be at the Atoms for Peace Conference in Geneva, Switzerland, and I promptly congratulated him. Subsequently, he reiterated and made more clear and positive his views at the Bal Harbour, Fla., Forum for Nuclear Power. I was pleased with Dr. Schlesinger's unambiguous declaration and at the risk of gilding the lily, again wrote him expressing my approval and thanks. I insert my letters of August 30 and October 22 to Dr. Schlesinger in the RECORD following the Washington Post editorial.

(The articles follow:)

A NEW COURSE FOR THE AEC

The new chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, James R. Schlesinger, has been in office less than three months but he obviously has set out to change the AEC's approach toward both the nuclear power industry and the public. In a remarkably tough speech in Florida last week, Mr. Schlesinger laid it on the line to the power industry which is already distressed at the new attitude emerging in Germantown. The Commission, he said, has a responsibility to the public as well as to the industry and in some fields it will perform in the future as a referee rather than as an advocate in disputes involving nuclear power plants.

Mr. Schlesinger's words are most welcome and they ought to be listened to carefully by the companies which build nuclear reactors and power plants. He is right in describing this industry as one with great potential for growth but only if it can produce a safe, reliable product in which there is widespread public confidence. At the moment, public confidence in the safety of nuclear power plants and in the determination of the AEC to enforce adequate safety standards is at a low ebb. This situation may or may not be justified; it is extremely difficult for non-experts to make exact judgments on many of the matters within the AEC's orbit. But it is a situation that has developed because of the basic conflict in the AEC's dual roles of promoting the use of atomic energy and of setting the safety standards for the plants that produce it. Too often the AEC has seemed to be pushing particular nuclear projects towards fruition while treating cavalierly its function as the public's protector.

It was this basic conflict that led us to suggest several months ago that perhaps it was time to split the AEC into two distinct agencies—one to push the development of atomic energy; the other to regulate the industry. Operating under the existing law, Mr. Schlesinger seems to be trying to do the same thing in a different framework. He says the task of the AEC in promoting atomic energy ends when it has helped develop new technical options and bring them to the point of commercial application. Once that occurs, he told the power industry, the AEC should not be in the business of solving the problems that may subsequently arise but should be serving the public interest by arbitrating the disputes that arise. It remains to be seen whether he and the rest of the Commission will be able to make this distinction work in practice and, just as importantly, convey to the public a sense that it is working.

It is true, no doubt, that there is widespread unhappiness inside the nuclear power industry with some of the recent actions of the AEC. The Commission ignored many recommendations from that industry when it responded admirably to the Calvert Cliffs court decision by setting out new standards of review for atomic projects and suspending work on many of those under way until new reviews are conducted. But that was a vital

first step in getting the development of atomic power back in line with the public's renewed concern about safety and pollution. We assume from Mr. Schlesinger's remarks in Florida that he and his colleagues on the Commission intend to take the rest of the steps that are needed to assure the country that this vital source of energy can be handled without endangering either the public or the environment.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., October 22, 1972.
Dr. JAMES R. SCHLESINGER,
Chairman, Atomic Energy Commission,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: May I again express my gratification with certain specifics of your address in Bal Harbour, Florida, earlier this week as reported in The New York Times of October 21.

Your enunciation that the Atomic Energy Commission, like any government agency, exists to serve the public interest restates the policy view that I had occasion to compliment you on in my earlier letter of August 30. It is, nevertheless, heartening and refreshing to have it stated again as firmly and unequivocally as was apparently done in Bal Harbour.

May I assure you that your view of what the correct policy of the A.E.C. should be will, in my judgment, receive general approval in Congress. There has been a widespread belief that for too long the A.E.C., and thus the Government, has been acting as technical expert, lawyer, advocate, defender of and nursemaid to private business interests and that such a policy has unfairly burdened the taxpayer and forced a government agency into positions that none should ever be in.

I look forward to a cordial relationship based on mutual trust and my belief that those of us who ask questions premised on the welfare of their constituents will no longer be treated as interlopers.

Sincerely,

JOE SKUBITZ.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., August 30, 1971.

Mr. JAMES R. SCHLESINGER,
Chairman, Atomic Energy Commission,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I have read with great interest and approval the newspaper accounts that quote you as saying that the AEC intends to be in a position to be responsive to the concerns of environmental groups and to other members of the public.

May I take this opportunity to compliment you on this recognition of the welfare of the public. It is a refreshing departure from prior AEC attitudes that seemed to reflect primary interest in private power companies agreeing to build nuclear power plants. Your personal view also seems to indicate the possibility that the AEC may not always be correct; that its positions are not sacrosanct and that perhaps we who have had dealings with it may now expect a shade less arrogance from some of its personnel.

I am particularly pleased with your comment in recognizing the Court of Appeals decision that the new regulations make the AEC directly responsible for evaluating the total environmental impact including thermal heat effects of nuclear power plants. It would be my hope, and I am sure that of the Governor of Kansas and others concerned, that this concept be made applicable to the atomic waste plant in Kansas. The AEC's Final Environmental Statement gave

scant attention to the thermal heat effects of atomic wastes on the Kansas environment.

Sincerely,

JOE SKUBITZ.

COMMUNITY COLLEGE WEEK

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 27, 1971

Mr. LONG of Maryland, Mr. Speaker, Governor Mandel of Maryland has proclaimed this week "Community College Week" in recognition of the services provided by Maryland's community colleges.

America prides herself on providing an educational opportunity for everyone, and for achieving this goal these schools are a great asset. Graduates of community colleges continue their education in 4-year colleges or technical schools, serve our country in the military, or are employed in full-time jobs.

The three community colleges in my congressional district, Harford Junior College, Essex Community College, and Dundalk Community College, also serve as centers for music, art, drama, and lectures on a wide variety of issues.

Community colleges provide a stairway of opportunity in the best tradition of the American educational system. They deserve the highest praise and our continued support.

SENATE—Thursday, October 28, 1971

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. ELLENDER).

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou eternal God our Father, in whom alone we can find our strength and hope, inspire us each new day with a longing to lead humanity out of its imperfections of conduct and agony of spirit into the splendor of a new day. Give us wisdom to use all of the moral and spiritual resources available to us as we strive to bring to fulfillment a social order wherein dwelleth righteousness and peace. We pray that we may never lose heart or lose hope, never yield to doubt or despair.

"In simple trust like theirs who heard,
Beside the Syrian Sea,
The gracious calling of the Lord,
Let us, like them, without a word
Rise up and follow Thee."

—Whittier.

Hear us in the name of Him who came to set men free. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceed-

ings of Wednesday, October 27, 1971, be dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia, 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.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO 10 A.M. TOMORROW

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

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

VACATING OF ORDER FOR SENATOR NELSON TO SPEAK TODAY

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order which was entered into on yesterday for the recognition of the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. NELSON) today be vacated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

A PACHYDERM ON CAPITOL HILL

Mr. SCOTT, Mr. President, it is planned, on the third day of November, following the election—so that we may avoid any partisan imprint—that the two distinguished Senators from Maryland will present, for temporary use and occupation, one available pachyderm, furnished, I believe, without charge—under eleemosynary inspiration—by the Ringling Brothers Circus. This pachyderm will be ridden by the generally inexperienced-in-that-art Senators from Pennsylvania, who will, however, rise to the occasion as high as may be necessary to achieve that end.

The whole operation is known as Operation Pirate, or a means of marking with suitable ceremony the victory of the Pittsburgh baseball team in its achievement of the world's championship in that art.

Since the Pittsburgh Pirates have proved themselves superior in skill in the game of "rounders" over any other competing agency or assortment, we thought there should be an appropriate celebration.

My appreciation is extended on behalf of my junior colleague, Mr. SCHWEIKER, and myself to the distinguished Senators from Maryland (Mr. MATHIAS and Mr. BEALL) for having sprung to the