

lates to amendments that might be presented prior to 5 o'clock, during the day.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I thought I said "by or before 5 o'clock."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct. The Senator from West Virginia asked that all amendments offered in writing before 5 o'clock be in order, and that they be disposed of before we start to vote on the two titles.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Yes. Let me just conclude by saying this, Mr. President:

While we have been operating under the time-limitation agreement, no point of order has been raised to the offering of amendments to title 10 prior to the vote on title 9. I would hope that no point of order would be raised, because there are no precedents, and I would hope we could avoid having to face that problem.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The unanimous-consent agreement would take care of it.

Is there objection to the request of the Senator from West Virginia?

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, do I understand that the potential point of order difficulty that has been identified is taken care of and disposed of by this unanimous-consent agreement, whether it relates to 5 o'clock or a time prior to 5 o'clock?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Is there objection to the request of the Senator from West Virginia? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I apologize for imposing on the time of the Senate, but I think this discussion has been helpful and could prevent some brouhaha on down the road.

Now, Mr. President, I proceed with the program for Tuesday.

The Senate will convene at 9 a.m. on Tuesday. Whether there will be any 15-minute speeches or early morning business is indefinite as of now. In any event, if action has not been completed on the Revenue Act of 1971, the Senate will resume the consideration of that measure.

If action on that measure has been completed, the Senate will proceed to the consideration of the Defense appropriation bill, and, no doubt, there will be rollcall votes on that day.

On Wednesday, November 24, the Senate will convene at 9 a.m. Whether there will be any 15-minute speeches or morning business has not been determined as yet, but at any rate, the Senate will resume the consideration of the Defense appropriation bill if that measure has not been disposed of. There will undoubtedly be rollcall votes on Wednesday, inasmuch as every effort will be made to complete action on the Defense appropriation bill on that date.

On Thursday, November 25; Friday, November 26; and Saturday, November 27, there will be no sessions.

On Monday, November 29, the Senate will convene at 10 a.m. A rollcall vote will occur at 11 a.m. on the treaty to resolve certain boundary differences between the United States and Mexico.

Following the rollcall vote on the treaty, the Senate will resume consideration of the Defense appropriation bill, if that measure has not yet been disposed of, though hopefully it will have been.

In any event, phase II of the President's economic proposals will be called up following disposition of the Defense appropriation bill. There will be rollcall votes on phase II.

In addition to the foregoing measures, action will be taken on the following, and it is hoped that we can adjourn sine die by December 4:

The District of Columbia and supplemental appropriation bills.

The Supreme Court nominations.

A nomination to the Office of Secretary of Agriculture.

Conference reports.

And there will be action on other matters.

In fine, rollcall votes will occur daily throughout Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday of next week and Monday of the following week, and long daily sessions may be expected.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY AT 9 A.M.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move, in accordance with the previous order, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 9 a.m. on Monday morning next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 2 o'clock and 48 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, November 22, 1971, at 9 a.m.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate November 20, 1971:

ACTION

Joseph H. Blatchford, of California, to be Director of Action.

CABINET COMMITTEE ON OPPORTUNITIES FOR SPANISH-SPEAKING PEOPLE

Henry M. Ramirez, of California, to be Chairman of the Cabinet Committee on Opportunities for Spanish-Speaking People.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

H.R. 5—A NEW PLAN TO MEET COLLEGE COSTS

HON. JAMES A. BURKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 19, 1971

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, as millions of American parents each year discover, financing their youngster's college education is a serious and costly prospect. Often, family savings are limited, scholarships are not in abundance, loans are not the best solution for all students, nor are they always available.

I rise again then for the third time this year, Mr. Speaker, to focus attention on my bill, H.R. 5, the Higher Education Funding Act of 1971, a new plan to meet college costs. H.R. 5 would assist families by permitting parent-taxpayers to set aside limited amounts of money annually to meet college expenses. A deduction from gross income would be allowed for amounts contributed to a trust, purchase of insurance or annuity contracts, custodial accounts with banks, nontransferable face amount certificates, and/or Government bonds.

CXVII—2676—Part 32

Joining me in reintroducing H.R. 5 are Congressmen JAMES ABOUREZK, of South Dakota, FRANK J. BRASCO, of New York, HENRY HELSTOSKI, of New Jersey, ELWOOD HILLIS, of Indiana, NORMAN LENT, of New York, and TENO RONCALIO, of Wyoming.

A list of cosponsors of this approach to meeting college costs follows:

Watkins M. Abbott, Virginia; Thomas G. Abernethy, Mississippi; Joseph P. Addabbo, New York; William R. Anderson, Tennessee; Frank Annunzio, Illinois; Edward G. Biester, Jr., Pennsylvania; Edward P. Boland, Massachusetts; Joel T. Broyhill, Virginia; John Buchanan, Alabama; and James A. Byrne, Pennsylvania.

Bob Casey, Texas; Frank M. Clark, Pennsylvania; James C. Cleveland, New Hampshire; George W. Collins, Illinois; William R. Cotter, Connecticut; Edward J. Derwinski, Illinois; Harold D. Donohue, Massachusetts; Thaddeus J. Dulski, New York; John J. Duncan, Tennessee; and Joshua Ellberg, Pennsylvania.

Walter Flowers, Alabama; William D. Ford, Michigan; James G. Fulton, Pennsylvania; Richard H. Fulton, Tennessee; William J. Green, Pennsylvania; Charles H. Griffin, Mississippi; Gilbert Gude, Maryland; G. Elliott Hagan, Georgia; Seymour Halpern, New York; and John Paul Hammerschmidt, Arkansas.

Julia Butler Hansen, Washington; Ken Hechler, West Virginia; Henry Helstoski, New Jersey; Floyd V. Hicks, Washington; Louise Day Hicks, Massachusetts; Jack F. Kemp,

New York; John C. Kluczynski, Illinois; Speedy O. Long, Louisiana; Paul N. McCloskey, Jr., California; and John Y. McCollister, Nebraska.

John Melcher, Montana; Robert H. Michel, Illinois; Abner J. Mikva, Illinois; Parren J. Mitchell, Maryland; John S. Monagan, Connecticut; G. V. (Sonny) Montgomery, Mississippi; F. Bradford Morse, Massachusetts; John M. Murphy, New York; Thomas P. O'Neill, Jr., Massachusetts; and John J. Rhodes, Arizona.

Benjamin S. Rosenthal, New York; William R. Roy, Kansas; Edward R. Roybal, California; Fernand J. St Germain, Rhode Island; Robert H. Steele, Connecticut; Frank A. Stubblefield, Kentucky; Charles Thone, Nebraska; Guy Vander Jagt, Michigan; John C. Watts, Kentucky; Charles H. Wilson, California; and Lester L. Wolff, New York.

LAMPREY CONTROL PROGRAM IN THE GREAT LAKES

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 19, 1971

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I recently received a letter from Mr. Bill Mavety,

reporting on the lamprey control program in the Great Lakes.

I believe the information contained in Mr. Mavety's letter will be of interest to my colleagues and request the text of the letter appear at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The letter follows:

MAVETY OIL Co.,
Traverse City, Mich.

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL,
Conference of Great Lakes Congressmen,
House of Representatives, Washington,
D.C.

DEAR SIR: Even though we received increased funding for lamprey control, we are still losing the battle to preserve our Great Lakes Fishery. The lamprey count from the eight weirs operated by the Great Lakes Fishery Commission shows double the count in 1971 over 1970. Besides, according to Robert Scofield of the Great Lakes Fisheries Commission, the 1971 count was predominantly female—an even more ominous sign.

About 9,634 lampreys were taken from these eight weirs which indicates an average of 1,200 lampreys per stream. In Lakes Michigan and Superior an average of 40 streams are treated every four years which indicates 160 lamprey producing streams. Multiplying the number of lampreys per stream (1,200) by the number of lamprey producing streams (160) we come up with 192,000 as an estimate of the residual population of lampreys in Lakes Superior and Michigan. Each one of these lampreys will kill 40 pounds of fish. When we multiply the number of lampreys (192,000) by the kill of each predator (40 pounds) we find that each year the lamprey takes a minimum of 7,680,000 pounds of our fish, the majority of which are trout.

Compared to the lamprey, man is a very poor fisherman. Mr. John Scott, DNR Fisheries Biologist testified as follows to the projected 1971 catch.

	Pounds
Lake Michigan Sports.....	1,000,000
Commercial.....	75,000
Indians.....	50,000
Lake Superior Sports.....	513,000
Commercial.....	200,000
Indians.....	50,000

Total pounds..... 1,888,000

This shows that the lamprey outfishes men 4 to 1.

But to make matters even worse, members of the Great Lakes Fisheries Commission tell me that the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife is prohibited from hiring the necessary extra help to implement an increased lamprey control program. This in effect nullifies the increase in funding that we all fought so hard for. If the lamprey population is allowed to double another year, we can look for a kill of at least 15,000,000 pounds of trout.

This is disaster. This represents eight years harvest by man.

I firmly believe that our multi-million fisheries resource is worth saving—do you?

BILL MAVETY,
Traverse City, Mich.

CONGRESSMAN YATRON ANNOUNCES POLL RESULTS

HON. GUS YATRON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 19, 1971

Mr. YATRON. Mr. Speaker, my second public opinion poll has been tabu-

lated and I would like to take this opportunity to share the results with my colleagues in the House of Representatives. The questionnaire, which was included in my recent newsletter, requested the opinions of my constituents on current issues before the Congress. More than 34,000 responses have been recorded.

This 20-percent response, which is well above the number who usually participate in polls of this kind, clearly indicates that the people of Berks and Schuylkill Counties are deeply interested in the major issues of the day and are eager to convey their views to their elected representatives. Many thousands replied and hundreds amplified their answers with letters detailing the reasons for their responses.

We know that the strength of our Government is dependent upon the existence of a procedure for the regular exchange of views between Government officials and their constituents. The questionnaire is one of my attempts to involve my constituents in the decisionmaking process and I would like to express my sincere appreciation to all who replied.

The questions related to both domestic and foreign policy issues. These issues covered the economy, health insurance, China, the Vietnamese war, international relations, and domestic affairs—all areas of major concern before the House today.

It was interesting to note, however, that one area high school in Berks County did participate voluntarily in this questionnaire. Since the 26th amendment to the U.S. Constitution lowered the voting age to 18, I think it is important that the views of these young people be examined.

Significantly, in eight out of the 10 questions asked in the questionnaire, the views of these high school seniors paralleled those of their parents. There were only two areas in which there was a wide divergence of opinion. While only 56 percent of the new voters thought we should concentrate on domestic matters to the exclusion of international problems, nearly 90 percent of the adults felt domestic concerns were our top priority. Also, 57 percent of the young people, and only 28 percent of the adults, felt that the Government should guarantee loans to big businesses.

Before I insert the complete results of the questionnaire into the RECORD, I would like to draw some conclusions about their significance.

Fifty-four percent feel that the Nixon administration has not met the basic needs of the country.

Just over half favored the establishment of a national health insurance plan.

A majority—55 percent—approved the freeze on wages and prices.

On the question of the seating of the Red Chinese in the United Nations and United States trade with that country, just under one-half agreed that these actions were acceptable.

Three-quarters of this group were strong in their conviction that the Vietnamese war should be ended by acceptance of the best possible compromise settlement.

Fifty-six percent approved of revenue

sharing between the Federal Government and the States.

Nearly 90 percent felt that we should concentrate on domestic problems to the exclusion of international concerns.

A full 61 percent felt our financial commitments abroad were not necessary to our national security.

Sixty-five percent felt that the Government should not guarantee loans to big businesses.

The overwhelming majority, however—97 percent—were in favor of legislation which require a welfare recipient to work or accept training for a job.

Mr. Speaker, this public opinion poll has proved to be extremely useful in measuring precisely the attitudes of my constituents on some of the major problems confronting the 92d Congress. I know it will help me provide the people of the Sixth Congressional District with effective representation in the days and months ahead.

In conclusion, while it is not expected that everyone will agree on every issue, it is hoped that we can all agree that the process of exchanging views is healthy and should be encouraged. I feel that, through these newsletters and questionnaires, this goal is reached and everyone's interests are served.

At this point in the RECORD, I would like to include the full text of the results from my recent questionnaire:

QUESTIONS AND PERCENTAGE RESPONSES

(Answers in percent)

1. Do you think the Nixon Administration is meeting the basic needs of the country such as housing, health care, education, jobs and stable prices?

Response: Yes, 38; No, 54; Undecided, 8.

2. Do you favor the present establishment of the wage and price freeze announced by the President on August 15th?

Response: Yes, 55; No, 41; Undecided, 4.

3. Do you favor establishment of a national health insurance program which would cover all the medical expenses of every American?

Response: Yes, 54; No, 40; Undecided, 6.

4. Do you favor:

a. trade with Red China?

Response: Yes, 49; No, 41; Undecided, 10.

b. seating Red China in the United Nations?

Response: Yes, 49; No, 40; Undecided, 11.

5. Do you agree that we should end the Vietnamese War by accepting the best possible compromise settlement?

Response: Yes, 74; No, 21; Undecided, 5.

6. Do you favor proposed revenue sharing plans which would return a portion of federal income taxes to state and local governments?

Response: Yes, 56; No, 37; Undecided, 7.

7. Do you feel that government should concentrate less on international problems and more on our own domestic problems during the decade of the 1970's?

Response: Yes, 87; No, 10; Undecided, 3.

8. Do you feel our financial commitments abroad are necessary to our national security?

Response: Yes, 29; No, 61; Undecided, 10.

9. Do you favor legislation which would guarantee government loans to big business to keep these companies from going bankrupt?

Response: Yes, 28; No, 65; Undecided, 7.

10. Should we establish a uniform federal welfare program which would require among other things, each recipient to accept a job, or training, if he is physically able to work?

Response: Yes, 97; No, 3; Undecided, 0.

NEVER A LESSON

HON. MARGARET M. HECKLER

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 19, 1971

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, one of the most uplifting and moving articles I have read in some time appeared recently in the Taunton Daily Gazette, which services Taunton, within my 10th Congressional District, in Massachusetts. This fine article tells something of the warmth and pleasure that a remarkable gentleman, Frank V. Pacheco, has brought to so many civic and community groups, let alone friends, through his playing of the accordion, at which he is an acknowledged master.

It is always encouraging in times like these, when we hear so much of gloom and doom, to encounter the rare person, such as Frank Pacheco, with a wonderful philosophy of life which harmonizes itself in music. What is remarkable is that Frank Pacheco, in his entire life, has never taken one lesson, and yet he plays the accordion with the touch of the master. This is an achievement all the more notable, since Frank Pacheco has been blind since birth. The congregation at the Winthrop Street Baptist Church, the members of the Kiwanis Clubs, the Golden Age Club, and many other groups and friends, have had their lives made richer by his friendship and music. He is owed a great debt, and it is a pleasure for me to include in my remarks at this point, a column which appeared on October 23, 1971 in the Taunton Daily Gazette:

HE ENTERTAINS THE BLIND

(By Mike Williams)

A 62-year-old accordion player, blind since birth, doesn't need sheet music. He relies on his memory.

"I never took lessons," said Frank V. Pacheco of 24 Linden St. "I can hear a tune and I'd be like a tape recorder. I can sit right down and play it."

Pacheco has played his accordion for various groups, including civic and social organizations in the city.

He is a member of the Friendly Circle for the Blind, and has been with the group since its inception in February of 1936.

The Friendly Circle for the Blind is one of the 12 organizations that come under the United Fund, which is having its annual fund drive this month.

Pacheco was born 62 years ago on Broadway in Taunton, son of the late John and Mary Pacheco. He laughingly refers to himself as a "Broadway baby."

Pacheco began his accordion playing in a dream.

"It was the Friday before Christmas," he told us, "when I was 11 years old.

"I had a dream that I got an accordion and that I could play it," he said. "I told my mother and father about my dream and dad asked me if I'd like to have an accordion."

The answer, of course, was yes.

"By that Sunday," he said, "I was playing it. Just simple tunes of course, but I was playing the accordion."

He began entertaining for organizations and started playing for the Friendly Circle for the Blind at their first meeting at the Winthrop St. Baptist Church. At present, there are 35 blind persons who are members of the group. He entertains them at each meeting.

Pacheco also has played at Kiwanis Club meetings and for the Golden Age Club, other

senior citizen groups, the Catholic Guild for the Blind, and similar organizations.

He receives some compensation from groups, but he's ready to play almost anywhere, just for the joy of it.

"All I need is my accordion and transportation," he told us.

He resides with a sister, Mary, and has two brothers and four sisters. During the holidays Pacheco and his accordion travel to the homes of relatives.

"I used to play at some clubs or night spots," he said. "But no more."

"There can be a couple of drunks that start a fight and you never know if a bottle is going to come flying at you," he said. "I quit that circle."

Pacheco's gig is now "Singalong With Frank" and he demonstrated his ability by playing the accordion and singing "Red Roses for a Blue Lady."

He doesn't play much "modern stuff."

"I'm getting old and can't grasp it very much," he said.

But the "modern stuff" doesn't matter when Pacheco begins playing. His ability to overcome a handicap and to entertain is inspiring music all by itself.

THE 30TH ANNIVERSARY OF PEARL HARBOR IS CLOSE UPON US

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 19, 1971

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, although 30 years have passed since its sinking, the battleship *Arizona* is considered by the Navy to be a vessel in commission because its dead crew is still aboard. The *Arizona*, lying on the bottom of Pearl Harbor, is a memorial to the bravery and sacrifice of our fighting men, and to the continuing determination of the American people never to be caught unaware again.

As we have gone from one crisis to another, it has become difficult to remember with any accuracy those early, desperate days of World War II. Yet we owe to our heroic dead, and to those alive among us who helped win that war, heart-felt tribute to their devotion to country and to their service in its cause. In recalling those days, now seemingly so long ago, it is possible that we may strengthen ourselves for our present dangers. Such memorial observances of Pearl Harbor should be conducted in this Chamber and throughout the country.

In the solemn spirit of stern resolution "to gain the inevitable triumph—so help us God" expressed by President Roosevelt to the Congress, and shared by all Americans in that grim hour of the Pearl Harbor attack, we can find an example to follow today. In the years which have passed since we were so infamously attacked, our enemies have become deadlier, weapons more fearful, and the need for devotion to country greater. We can best remember Pearl Harbor by meeting the terror of our own days with the courage of that day.

Every day hundreds of people board small sightseeing boats docked in Kewalo Basin, near central Honolulu, and head for Pearl Harbor. Each of these boats takes its group of visitors to Hawaii past

the breakwater and then heads into the open sea. From the deck of their boat the tourists can enjoy a broad panorama of the leeward side of peaceful Oahu.

Diamond Head lies far behind, along with the beach at Waikiki, Honolulu's high-rise buildings, the volcanic mountains, the tall Aloha Tower guarding the harbor, the pineapple-shaped tower of the Dole Co., and the International Airport.

During the first part of the boat ride, Oahu seems to the tourists an unreal island in an unreal sea, but, as the boat approaches Pearl Harbor, it suddenly becomes a pinpoint target, a tiny volcanic mass of brown, green, and yellow earth.

When the boat enters Pearl Harbor itself, the passengers become hushed. An announcer briskly declares through a loudspeaker that within a few minutes all cameras must temporarily be stowed amidships. The boat passes Bishop's Point, to starboard, and Iroquois Point, to port, and stops briefly at Drydock No. 4 where naval police come aboard, a reminder of the haunting past, a past which has led to instinctive precaution.

Tourists look puzzled as cameras are gathered up. Ahead lies giant cranes and huge drydocks, submarines and destroyers, parade grounds and the neatly tended lawns of barracks. A giant troopship swings by, heading out to sea. In the distance are fields of sugar cane, and the ever-present clouds of rain hanging over the mountains.

The tourist boat's announcer is a controlled sort of man. It is not in him to hurt the feelings of anyone aboard, western or Oriental. At one moment, he speaks softly of a Japanese decision not to bomb a hospital ship lying in Pearl Harbor, but then he lowers his voice slightly as it takes on a slightly metallic tone when he mentions the harbor entrance, guarded by nets, through which Japanese submarines made their way in December of 1941.

The boat chugs slowly past Ford Island, in the middle of Pearl Harbor. The announcer's voice becomes chillier, more impersonal. History, he seems to be implying, is history, and history is worth remembering. He says:

Striking in over Oahu from the west at 7:40 A.M., Japanese planes struck at Schofield Barracks. At 8:00 A.M., another flight of torpedo planes attacked from the east. The second attack came at 8:40 A.M. from the northeast, the attacking groups consisting of dive bombers, high-level bombers, and fighter aircraft, which flew offshore of Waikiki in a circuitous route to strike at their targets out of the sun.

The little tourist boat rounds the northern tip of Ford Island, turns east, and then turns south, gliding almost noiselessly now past hunks and chunks and pieces of other submerged vessels, bits of bulkhead, bits of decks, scraps of superstructures lying quietly in the water. There is rust and sea and memory in this strange graveyard, where the grotesque shapes of silent ships lie on their sides. The tourist boat stops briefly alongside the *Arizona*, her fore and aft still showing, her midships covered with a memorial concrete canopy.

Then the tourist boat heads back into the open sea, turning in the direction of

Waikiki and the high-rise buildings of Honolulu. Children sit quietly along the upper deck, enjoying the Pacific breezes. Nobody says much, not even the announcer.

But we ought to have something to say in this Chamber about Pearl Harbor's 30th anniversary when December 7 comes around. We owe it to the memory of the men killed in their country's service on that day. We owe it to those who fought in World War II, the war whose best known slogan was "Remember Pearl Harbor." Have we forgotten so soon?

NATIONAL HEALTH INSURANCE PROPOSALS

HON. BELLA S. ABZUG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 18, 1971

Mrs. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, it is truly shocking to observe that with our gross national product exceeding \$1 trillion annually, few Americans—rich or poor—receive adequate health care. Even if adequate care is available, its costs are often so high as to discourage less affluent individuals from seeking medical attention when they need it.

There is no excuse for this situation. Medical care is as much a right of every American as is public education or police protection, and no one should ever be denied it because of his financial condition.

The House Committee on Ways and Means is presently considering a number of health insurance/health care bills. Some of them are no more helpful than a bandage on a cancer. The Health Security Act, which is also known as the Kennedy-Griffiths bill and of which I am proud to be a cosponsor, is the only one of these bills which holds out any promise of fundamental change in the fragmented, ill financed, and often irresponsible way in which our health care is provided. While it is not perfect, it is basically a strong, progressive piece of legislation.

Today, I had the privilege of presenting my views on this subject to the Committee on Ways and Means. At this point in the RECORD, I include the text of my statement to the committee:

TESTIMONY OF CONGRESSWOMAN BELLA S. ABZUG

The American medical system, long assumed by Americans to be the world's finest, is under vigorous attack, and with good reason. Almost alone among the prosperous industrial nations, we have treated medical care as a commodity not very different from any other and have largely permitted the market place to regulate its organization, distribution, financing and quality control. There may be reason for producing and distributing automobiles this way, but it is no way to regulate the provision of a service that is a *sine qua non* of decent life.

Numerous legislative proposals now face the Ways and Means Committee. All purport to improve our medical care system; some are plainly rear-guard actions by frightened segments of the health care marketplace, desperate to preserve their influence; others offer trivial reforms that are far too limited to alter the consistent failure of American medicine to serve all Americans. Only the

Health Security Act, which was introduced in the House by Representative Griffiths and four other Members of this distinguished Committee and in the Senate by Senator Kennedy, and of which I am a co-sponsor, demonstrates an accurate comprehension of the disgraceful gap between what our medical system is and what it should be.

I intend first to make a few remarks about the problems of our existing health care system and then to comment on pending legislative proposals to change it.

WHAT IS WRONG WITH TODAY'S HEALTH CARE

Distribution of services

Health services are not distributed according to the need for them. The poor suffer disproportionately from preventable but unprevented diseases and conditions like anemia, acute rheumatic fever, tuberculosis, malnutrition, and maternal death during childbirth, because there are too few hospitals and doctors serving them and because medical services cost more than they can pay. Rural areas, too, lack medical facilities, and there are entire counties without a single doctor.

We do not produce the right mix of medical personnel and services.

We have too few doctors in general practice but an excess in the more glamorous surgical specialties.

We have too many hospitals, sources of prestige to communities and community leaders, but too few out-patient facilities.

We have failed to attack our serious public health problems.

We, the world's most prosperous country, have tolerated crippling malnutrition in rural and urban poor and debilitating occupational diseases in miners and chemical workers.

We might have had present-day levels of auto safety years ago, had we cared to, and, many experts feel, we could have had a nearly crash-proof car by now.

We allow treacherous tires on our cars, highly flammable clothes on our backs, corrosives and poisons in our kitchens.

We have been half-hearted in our attempts to regulate the fouling of our air and water, sluggish in protecting our citizens against medical hoaxes, and timid in controlling the tobacco industry, a major cause of the cancer we are about to try to conquer.

Organization of medical care

Proper medical care, whether received through clinics, groups, or individuals, requires the attention of a generalist, who will be responsible for all aspects of preventive care and treatment of most medical problems, and readily available specialists who will deal with problems of greater complexity and advise and teach the generalist. Medical facilities should follow a similar pattern, with small installations for simple care and procedures, general hospitals for more difficult but still common problems, and sophisticated regional centers for treatment of obscure diseases, housing of expensive but infrequently used equipment, and maintenance of complex services requiring extraordinary skill, such as open heart surgery. Obviously, records must be kept and must flow freely from one level to another and the patients' movement from one level to another should be straightforward and unimpeded.

In fact, we have none of this. Most people have no doctor who is regularly responsible for their well-being. They do not know how to find out whether they need a specialist or what kind they do need. They do not know what tests to have annually. Their records do not travel with them. Our institutions all wish to be total services facilities; consequently, there is a fabulous redundancy of equipment and puerile competition for training fellows, patients and federal grants.

One reason for the development of a medical organization that leaves patients confused and undirected is the failure of medical institutions to bother asking patients, the consumers of health services, about their

preferences. Any reorganization that fails to achieve significant consumer input will be unlikely to satisfy consumer needs better than the present one.

Financing

Medical care is a fundamental right, like police protection or primary education. The need for services should be sufficient reason to receive them. Personal wealth should be irrelevant. No bargain basement compromises can be countenanced, because medical care, unlike many commodities for which a cheap version will serve as well as a costly one, comes really only in two qualities, good enough and not good enough. The latter, no matter how cheap, is without value and fraudulent.

Americans have for years accepted the principle that the fundamental services provided by the government for all people, such as national defense, the judicial system, pollution control, food and drug regulation, etc., should be funded out of general revenues, and that these revenues should be collected principally by means of a progressive income tax. Medical care is just such a basic service and should be so funded.

The per capita cost of our medical care is rising rapidly and is already large compared with other industrial nations. This large relative cost, which has not brought us superior quality, is the consequence of several facts of the medical market place. The first fact is the doctor shortage, creating a sellers' market that will persist for the foreseeable future. The shortage is exaggerated by our failure thus far to make use of skilled paramedical personnel. The second fact is the position of the medical insurance companies, acting as fiscal intermediaries between patients and services but falling utterly to exercise the cost control that should be part of their function. There are several reasons for their indifference to rising medical cost. Their premium rates are adjusted to provide a set rate of profit, often by a cost-plus arrangement. Larger cash flow thus means a larger profit. Insurance companies invest money they hold and larger cash flow also provides more investment capital.

A very costly example of the insurance industry's failure to encourage efficient use of services has been their willingness to pay for unnecessary hospitalization. Because hospitalization has always been the catastrophe against which people most wanted protection, far more people own hospitalization insurance than have coverage for non-hospital costs. Diagnostic evaluations are therefore routinely performed in hospitals, where their real cost is large but where they are a covered service if a bogus "emergency" diagnosis is given. The same evaluations could be done more cheaply in outpatient facilities, but their cost would not be covered. Insurance companies have made no effort to discourage this practice by refusing to pay for these pseudo-emergencies, but have merely raised their rates to cover the deceptive practice.

The third fact is the outrageous profiteering and inefficiency of the medicine-associated industries, notably the drug industry. Drug manufacturers have an average rate of profit twice that of the average American company, although they have no unusual risks. Fully a quarter of their income is spent on promotion and marketing a practice resulting in overuse of drugs and use of heavily promoted, new and expensive drugs instead of older, less expensive preparations which may be just as suitable. This modern medical sideshow is justified as needed to cover the cost of the development of new, wondrous drugs, but research and development is only six percent of drug sales, and of that, the greater part is devoted to development willing to answer candidly will admit that he knows doctors who are too foolish, too old, or too irresponsible to meet even minimal standards of performance.

The point is not that doctors and hos-

pitals are wretched; it is that we don't know much about them, because we don't look. They are self-regulating which means in medicine, as in every other human endeavor, unregulated except when disaster has struck or appears ready to strike. A proper national health insurance plan will set standards of care, evaluate performance in relation to these standards, and deal firmly with violations.

HEALTH CARE LEGISLATION

The health insurance proposals before the Ways and Means Committee vary as widely in cost (\$2 billion to \$70 billion) as they do in ambitiousness, but there are no bargains to be had. The total cost of medical care, now estimated at \$70-80 billion per year, is more or less fixed, whether paid out of federal revenues or private resources. The question is whether reforms are going to affect a trivial part of that care and its cost or whether they will impinge on all aspects of the medical system. To emphasize this once more: we can only judge these legislative proposals as part of the whole cost of medical care. The "expensive" Health Security Act, at \$70 billion, does not cost more than the Administration's "cheap" National Health Insurance Partnership Act, at \$15 billion, when you add to the latter the \$55 billion that will be paid by private and other governmental sources. The difference between the various proposals is not the cost, it is what we get, and what we get should be measured against the problems outlined above.

Some of our health care problems are more obvious, though not necessarily more important, than others. Obviously, the disaster of a catastrophic illness, destroying well-ordered, prudent families, is an event with which we all empathize, and there are many proposals to insure against this scourge. At the same time, Congress clearly is moved by the plight of the penniless and several proposals do provide free health insurance for them. The AMA-devised Medicare plan, or Health Care Insurance Assistance Act, is one of these. It also provides some help to the near poor, though not much, since a family of four with a net income of about \$5500 would receive a federal payment of only 10% of the cost of insurance. Such measures as these are directed at the extremities of the health care problem; they make no impression at all upon the body of our expensive, inefficient, fragmented, non-quality-controlled medical system.

Even worse, Medicare would pour new billions into the health insurance companies that have financed, supported, and encouraged the present system. In testimony before the Senate Finance Committee, Secretary Richardson said that the bill "would have little effect on the organization and delivery of medical care or on controlling rising costs. The proposal would inflate demand for services yet it does not promote appropriate ways to use the leverage of new funds to help influence the quality and efficiency of services." The Secretary is correct, but similar criticisms apply just as strongly to the Administration-backed National Health Insurance Partnership Act.

The Administration bill purports to offer a new National Health Strategy, principally through encouraging doctors and hospitals to form comprehensive health care institutions, the health maintenance organizations (HMO's) and encouraging people to join them. I believe that an HMO, offering total, prepaid health care, can in fact be a more efficient provider of high-quality, unfragmented care than can doctors scattered about the community, and can perform patient education and preventive services, keep and organize records and evaluate therapy, to an extent impossible for the solo practitioner. It is the basic unit of an intelligent health care system if it is held to high standards and if its performance is under constant scrutiny by the people who receive its services and pay its bills. The existing

HMO's such as HIP in New York, Kaiser-Permanente on the west coast, Group Health in Washington, and many others, have grown rapidly in recent years, indicating that despite some criticism of understaffing and a tendency to discourage use of the facility, these units have provided considerable patient-doctor satisfaction.

Unfortunately, the HMO question would seem to be a bit of a smoke-screen at present, since, unlike the Health Security Act, the Administration bill does not provide much financial inducement for people to join HMO's or to doctors to form them. The proposal's principal feature is the requirement that employers buy three-fourths of a health insurance plan for their employees and employees' families. The minimum plan cannot have a very large cash value since there are substantial deductibles and co-insurance. The dollar value of the insurance would be applied at their employee's option, toward membership in an HMO, but there would be an additional cost to the employee equal to the actuarial values of the deductible and coinsurance, which is probably larger than the value of the insurance. The attractiveness of the HMO's will be inversely related to the extra money the family must pay to join.

An HMO needs doctors as well as patients. The National Health Insurance Partnership Act does not attempt to control fees paid to private practitioners. Will large numbers of doctors give up the huge incomes of private practice for the merely generous incomes of the HMO?

If the Administration bill does not move consumers and doctors effectively toward HMO's it offers nothing more than the same new billions into private health insurance, without any more organizational change, that Medicare would produce, and we've seen what Secretary Richardson thinks of that. The Administration bill also shares with Medicare the particularly condescending features of deductibles and co-insurance, which are present because of a widely held view that poor people enjoy going to the doctor and will go often just for fun, even if they are not sick.

In his National Health Insurance speech President Nixon stressed cost consciousness. He said: "Only as people are aware of these costs will they be motivated to reduce them. When consumers pay virtually nothing for services and when, at the same time, those who provide services know that all their costs will also be met, then neither the consumer nor the provider has an incentive to use the system efficiently." It is very strange to put the responsibility for cost control on the patient, who, not being a doctor, does not know whether he is "sick enough" for medical care. (Interestingly, the HMO's supported by the administration do not have deductibles or coinsurance.) Cost control should be exerted by regulating the fees paid to providers, but this form of cost consciousness is not mentioned in the Administration bill. It seems to me to be a basic principle that we want no person to wonder, when he feels sick, whether he should spend money for treatment. Incredibly, it is a principle which both the present system and most of the pending bills stress. It has always been the situation faced by the poor. We want even the poor person to see a doctor, who can decide on the basis of his expert knowledge whether to treat the patient or reassure him. If we can educate patients so that they recognize certain symptoms as not serious, that will be excellent, but we do not want them to stay away because they don't have the cash.

The Health Security Act, in contrast to all of the other proposals before the committee, will promote broad organizational changes and will attack most of the ills of our health care system. As I will point out, it is far from a perfect bill, but it is worth reviewing briefly some of the beneficial

changes it will promote with respect to problems outlined earlier.

Distribution of services

Wealth will no longer determine the amount or quality of one's medical care. There will be no financial barrier to seeking services; providers will be compensated directly by the system. The Act sets aside five percent of the total money in the Trust Fund for health planning and for dealing with a variety of distribution problems. Funds will be available for training specialists in short supply, for encouraging desirable geographic movements, and for planning and building facilities which are necessary to provide services. There is a commitment to equalize throughout the U.S. the availability of services by channeling more funds into areas which are now poorly served.

Organization of medical care

The Health Security Act encourages doctors to enter HMO's or comprehensive health service organizations, as the Act prefers to call them, by taking away the enormous fees now possible in fee-for-service medicine. Payments for a given service will be an appropriate fraction of the money available to care for a person's total health needs, i.e. the capitation payment. Therefore, comparable services delivered on a fee basis and on a capitation basis will lead to comparable incomes, except that the efficiencies of the HMO in terms of better use of paramedical personnel, office space, etc. may well permit greater net earnings for the HMO doctors. With rewards more or less equal the advantages to the physician of HMO's, such as easily available consultations, regular schedules and well-defined night call, and provisions for in-service continuing education, should prove adequate to bring doctors into that form of practice.

The Act provides funds for organizing new forms of health care delivery. Its governing board has the power to eliminate redundant service by ordering a provider to cease providing it, and to demand that new services be offered. Further, there is, for the first time an attempt to develop a consumer input into the medical care system. I will return to this a little later on.

Financing

Money for health care insurance and planning will come half from general revenues and half from employer and employee taxes. This is a far more progressive format than that of the Administration bill, although it suffers from the same flaws as our entire tax system does, generally failing to collect enough money from wealthy people. Payroll taxes appear at first to be a tax on businessmen; in fact, they are quickly passed along to consumers or compensated for by lower wages.

Private health insurance with its attendant costs will no longer be needed under the Health Security Act. Although the doctor shortage will not be eliminated overnight, the spiraling costs due to the sellers' market will be controlled by regulation of fees-for-service and capitation payments. Overutilization of hospitals will be discouraged since outpatient services will be paid for.

Quality control

Among current health proposals, the Kennedy-Griffiths Bill is the only one concerned with the quality of services delivered. All providers will be committed to furnishing information needed for peer review of utilization and for review of surgical procedures. Institutional providers will have to have good records, a proper utilization of review mechanism, and a therapeutics committee. HMO's must provide continuity of care, easy referral, and easy access to their services.

Practitioners will have to meet federal standards in addition to state licensing criteria and will have to meet federal continu-

ing education requirements. Their participation as providers can be terminated for inferior care or unethical behavior. They cannot be paid for services delivered in a non-participating hospital.

In addition to its concern with the quality of services provided by health professionals and institutions, the Health Security Act will study broad trends in mortality, disease incidence, and therapeutics, attempting to evaluate the quality of the health care system as a whole.

The Health Security Act will encourage rational drug prescribing by paying only for drugs that are efficacious and safe and by requiring that doctors practicing outside the scrutiny of health institutions and their therapeutics committees identify the disease they are treating and use a drug known to be effective in treating that disease.

Despite the contentions of its critics, the Act encourages pluralism in delivery of care, permitting providers to organize in almost any way they choose, and be paid either on a fee-for-service basis or by capitation methods. It is "monolithic" only in that it will control the amount of payment and the quality of care.

The scope of the Kennedy-Griffiths Bill is impressive, but it does have some key deficiencies. A Bill called the Health Security Act, proposing to bring to all citizens equal and high-quality health care, cannot justifiably avoid dealing with aspects of public policy that have a large influence on health. Thus, while concern with auto safety has resided largely in the Department of Transportation, the death and injuries of tens of thousands of people in highway accidents has large health implications. Similarly, malnutrition, industrial disease, dangerous household products, air pollution, and smoking should be recognized as basically health problems. Allocation of resources to deal with them and studies of the efficacy of such allocations should flow from an agency whose concern is health.

Although the Bill empowers the Health Security Board to eliminate redundant services, it does not make explicit the desirability of having institutions, especially hospitals, be organized pyramidally, with, for example, large numbers of relatively small general hospitals and a much smaller number of regional centers where usually difficult or rare problems could be dealt with, where costly programs would be sufficiently utilized to justify their cost, and where high-quality clinical research could be maintained.

The financing of health care under the Kennedy-Griffiths Bill can also be criticized. Without entering into any discussion of our supposedly progressive income tax, I question the degree to which the Bill relies upon payroll taxes and social security-type levies. These are not progressive at all; in fact, the social security tax is quite regressive, since it has an income ceiling. At the very least, this ceiling should be eliminated. A payroll tax, in addition to being passed along to consumers, tends to make workers cost more and thus encourages an already-dangerous trend toward substitution of capital for labor. The most equitable and most rational financing mechanism would be from general revenues. It is condescending to suppose that Americans cannot understand that excise taxes take their money away just as unpleasantly as income taxes do.

The Health Security Act does not make a sufficient commitment to ending medical profiteering. It should be a stated goal that profits of medical industries not be larger than those of the average American industry. Measures suggested by the 1969 Task Force on Prescription Drugs would represent a fine start toward this end.

Although the Health Security Act will provide rigorous standards of quality control—

there are essentially no standards now—it fails to set for solo practitioners the sort of demands it makes of doctors in comprehensive health service organizations. This makes little sense, since the solo doctor is often quite isolated from contact with other physicians and from new information. The Act should authorize the Health Security Board to set up local peer review committees for participating practitioners who do not belong to institutions already having such committees. Furthermore, it is time we recognized that while the M.D. degree, like a diamond, is forever, the knowledge and skills that came with it are not so permanent. In addition to requiring continuing education, the bill should demand periodic relicensing of physicians and possibly of other health professionals.

Perhaps the most important responsibility facing the organizers of health care is assuring that the system can never again become so isolated from and unresponsive to the people it serves. The Health Security Act provides for a Health Security Advisory Council made up of more than 50% health consumers. This Council also has regional and local counterparts. The function of these Councils is to advise the governing Health Security Board on matters of policy. Unresolved disagreements between Board and Council will be presented annually to Congress, but it would seem that the Board can ignore with impunity most of the Council's recommendations. One mechanism for partially easing the imbalance in power between Board and Council might be to give the Council explicit standing before the federal courts in cases involving questions of whether the Board has carried out its functions properly.

Consumer input may be even more important at the level of primary patient care, but there are few requirements in the Health Security Act for such input. Comprehensive health service organizations are required only to consult with enrollees regarding policy; this provision is inadequate unless expanded. At the very least, it should provide that unresolvable disputes be brought promptly before the local Board for mediation, and before the courts if need be. Hospitals, nursing homes, and medical facilities other than the comprehensive health service organizations are not required to have any consumer input at all. This is a serious deficiency. All medical institutions receiving any public funds should be required to consult with the people they serve, have consumer representation on all peer review and other committees, and respond to criticism from enrollees.

This said, a hopeful word is in order. The current feeling that providers and consumers inevitably have hopelessly different aims, needs, and preferences is probably false. It is our institutions that make it seem so. Once the relations between health professionals and patients are no longer predominantly fiscal, they can relate to one another as parties interested only in quality health care.

While I consider the flaws in the Kennedy-Griffiths Bill real and significant, I must emphasize again my conviction that it is the only health insurance bill before the Ways and Means Committee that will change our health care system at all. It asserts for the first time a national interest in equitably distributed, progressively financed, intelligently organized, high-quality medical care and takes a giant step toward that goal. The other bills are tranquilizers, quieting the demand for medical reform without meeting it. They are worth little and would be worse than nothing, because they would create an illusion of our having acted, an illusion that would stifle real reform for years to come. Let us have something better.

DEMOCRATIC PARTY REFORM

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 19, 1971

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, the commitment of the Democratic Party to reform has recently been reaffirmed by Chairman Lawrence O'Brien.

Both governmental and political institutions are experiencing their own credibility or confidence gaps. In the Democratic Party we have taken a hard look at our processes and have written new party rules to assure fairness and openness as we move toward the 1972 Miami convention. Chairman O'Brien outlines this purpose in a recent statement:

O'BRIEN URGES VIGOROUS STATE-LOCAL ACTION TO IMPLEMENT REFORMS; REFORM COMMISSION CHAIRMAN LAUD NATIONAL COMMITTEE SUPPORT

WASHINGTON, Oct. 31.—Democratic National Chairman Lawrence F. O'Brien called today for vigorous and imaginative action at the state and local level in order that the sweeping reforms adopted by the Democratic Party will be fully implemented by the 1972 Democratic National Convention.

It is not enough to have written the laws—to have opened the door of full participation for every Democrat, O'Brien said in a message to Democratic national committeemen and women, governors, state chairmen, and mayors. "We must now carry the message to the people, particularly those individuals who traditionally have not participated in party activities, for whatever reason."

O'Brien's memorandum accompanied a special reform issue of FACT, the party newsletter, detailing the unprecedented reforms adopted unanimously by the Democratic National Committee in the wake of the 1968 National Convention.

The newsletter contains letters from the party's two reform commission chairmen—Rep. Donald M. Fraser, D-Minn., chairman of the Commission on Party Structure and Delegate Selection, and Rep. James G. O'Hara, D-Mich., chairman of the Commission on Rules.

"Without your unwavering support over these past months," Fraser wrote O'Brien, "we would not, in my judgment, have been able to achieve the enormous progress that we were able to report to the Democratic National Committee meeting on October 14. The solid support that you have given our staff and the shoulder-to-shoulder posture you have taken with the Commission, demonstrate beyond any doubt the Democratic Party's commitment to reform."

O'Hara wrote: "Those of us who have had the privilege of working with you in achieving the reforms now adopted know we could not have come this far without your steadfast support and encouragement. When you rap the gavel opening the Miami convention, it should be with real satisfaction in the revitalization of the Democratic Party that has been accomplished under your leadership."

O'Brien's memorandum expressed special concern "that we reach young people, women, blacks, Spanish-speaking Americans, Indians, and other minorities—all of whom have been seriously underrepresented in past national conventions."

"Nothing would be more tragic than for these historic reforms to go unrecognized and unused by our failure to reach these critically important people. Let me, therefore,

urge each of you to give your personal attention to devising programs that spread the good news of Democratic Party reform."

Noting that the Republican Party has done nothing in the way of reform, O'Brien said: "They have examined their existing procedures and institutions and concluded that nothing could be improved. And so their convention—and their party—will continue to represent only a small fraction of the American people—and a highly unrepresentative fraction at that. This, too, is a fact we must make clear to the voters of America."

O'Brien's memorandum and text of the special issue of FACT are attached.

MEMORANDUM

To: Democratic National Committeemen and Committeewomen; Democratic Governors; Democratic Mayors; Democratic State Chairmen.

From: Lawrence F. O'Brien, National Chairman.

Subject: The record of Democratic Party reform and the unfinished agenda.

The enclosed special edition of the DNC's newsletter, FACT, summarizes the remarkable progress that has been achieved in the past 2½ years to implement the mandate for reform enacted by the 1968 Democratic National Convention. This document, for the first time, summarizes both the reforms of the Commission on Rules and the Commission on Party Structure and Delegate Selection, as well as detailing the implementing steps that have been taken to date. It is, in my judgment, an impressive record. I hope you will review it carefully.

The Democratic National Committee and its staff intend to pursue the full implementation of the reforms, particularly in the area of delegate-selection, will require the most vigorous and imaginative action on the state and local level. It is not enough to have written the laws—to have opened the door of full participation for every Democrat. We must now carry the message to the people, particularly those individuals who traditionally have not participated fully in party activities, for whatever reason.

I am especially concerned that we reach young people, women, blacks, Spanish-speaking Americans, Indians and other minorities—all of whom have been seriously under-represented in past national conventions. Nothing would be more tragic than for these historic reforms to go unrecognized and unused by our failure to reach these critically important people. Let me, therefore, urge each of you to give your personal attention to devising programs that spread the good news of Democratic Party reform. I would appreciate receiving from you periodic reports of the affirmative action programs that are underway in your state or locality.

We have taken a number of bold and innovative steps of which we can be exceedingly proud. The Republican Party, by comparison, has done nothing. They have examined their existing procedures and institutions and concluded that nothing could be improved. And so their convention—and their party—will continue to represent only a small fraction of the American people—and a highly unrepresentative fraction at that. This, too, is a fact we must make clear to the voters of America.

In my "Return to the White House: A Nine-Point Political Strategy," I listed "party reform" as the first point. This was quite deliberate since I noted that "... no other factor will contribute more to a Democratic victory in November 1972."

The foundations of Democratic reform have now been completed; implementation is already well underway. With your active cooperation and assistance, we can finish the job in the next nine months. And, in so doing, we will take a major step forward in winning the White House next November.

THE NEW PARTY

In his closing remarks to the Democratic National Committee on October 14, National Chairman Lawrence F. O'Brien said "... We have steadfastly maintained the course charted by the 1968 National Convention in the area of party reform. We have taken the '68 mandate and implemented it ... Never has a political party so totally changed its way of doing business in such a short period of time. ... And there will be no turning back."

This issue of Fact will tell the story of "the new party"—the remarkable achievement that has taken place within the Democratic Party in the past 2½ years. Born in chaos and controversy of Chicago 1968, the reform effort took root due to the leadership of Democratic National Chairman Fred Harris, Senator George McGovern, Rep. James O'Hara, Senator Harold Hughes and Rep. Donald Fraser, among others.

In 1970, the new DNC Chairman, Lawrence F. O'Brien, sustained these beginnings and generated the comprehensive backing that was essential to their adoption by the National Party. By October 1971, every major reform envisioned in early 1969 has been achieved.

Although implementation of these reforms by the states is not finished—and the 1972 National Convention is still nine months away—the foundations are now firmly in place to guarantee that the 1972 Democratic nominee will be the most democratically-selected candidate in Party history. This Fact special report will summarize every major Democratic Party reform ... and what these reforms are likely to mean in nominating the Democratic presidential and vice-presidential candidates next year.

THE NEW CONVENTION

Every four years the TV commentators, editorial writers and average voters wonder aloud about that peculiar American tradition; the National Nominating Convention.

"How can grown men and women carry on like that?"

"Can't they speed things up?"

"What's going on, anyway?"

"It's two o'clock in the morning and the balloting for President hasn't even started."

"There must be a better way to do it."

The Democratic Party agrees. Out of the controversy of the 1968 National Convention in Chicago came a new determination to modernize and streamline the institution of the National Convention.

The '68 Convention mandated the Commission on Rules, headed by Rep. James O'Hara of Michigan, to prepare recommendations to make the Convention more efficient, more easily understood, and more responsive to the electorate. For more than two years, Rules Commission members and staff crossed the country, hearing scores of witnesses. Hundreds of hours were spent drafting, considering and refining the many proposals for improving the national convention as an instrument for nominating the candidates and adopting the Party's platform.

At its October 13-14 meeting, the Democratic National Committee unanimously approved the last of the recommendations made by the Commission on Rules affecting pre-convention activities. The final determinations on the procedural (post-gavel) rules will be sent directly to the Rules Committee of the Convention.

This means that every major reform advocated by the Commission on Rules and the Commission on Party Structure and Delegate Selection (McGovern-Fraser) has now been adopted by the Democratic National Committee. Two years ago few persons believed possible such a revolution in Party procedures and structure. (See statement by Senator Harold Hughes on the progress of Democratic Party reform).

Transmitting the final determination of the Rules Commission to the Democratic National Committee, Rep. O'Hara said, "The proposed rules changes will make future Democratic National Conventions representative, open, deliberative and fair."

TO MAKE THE CONVENTION REPRESENTATIVE

The recommendations of the Commission and the formula prescribed by the Democratic National Committee revise delegate apportionment in the direction of one man-one vote and one Democrat-one vote. The old formula was based on the electoral college strength of a state, past Democratic vote and a victory bonus system, while the Commission formula was based on 50% population and 50% Democratic vote in the past three presidential elections. The formula adopted by the DNC is comprised of 53% electoral vote and 47% Democratic vote in the past three presidential elections.

At the 1968 National Convention, the votes of the 13 largest delegations comprised a majority. In 1972 the 9 largest states will be sufficient.

In previous years, the standing committees of the Convention were composed of one man and one woman from each state delegation. Under the new rules, the size of each delegation will be reflected in the composition of the Credentials, Platform and Rules Committees. The membership of each Convention committee will total 150—a state or territory will have at least one member, the remaining 95 will be apportioned according to size of the delegation. (For example, California and New York will have 9 members each on these committees; Delaware will have one.)

Each delegation will elect its delegates to the Convention committees, and the committees will select their own permanent chairmen.

To ensure women equal representation on these committees, the recommendations require that when a state elects a single committee member to each of the standing committees, it must divide its representation to the committees as equally as possible between men and women. States that elect two or more representatives to the committees are required to elect an equal or nearly equal number of men and women, giving due regard to the race and age of the members elected.

Further, women will be represented in equal numbers among temporary and permanent officers of the Convention, and the proposed procedural rules also say the Convention vice chairman shall not be of the same sex as the chairman.

The temporary roll call shall consist of persons whose seating has been recommended by the Credentials Committee's majority report—whether challenger or challenged—and they shall be permitted to vote on everything except their own seats.

TO MAKE THE CONVENTION OPEN

All meetings of the Convention committees—including all committee votes—are to be open to the public and to the press.

To ensure wide participation by Democrats in drafting the platform for the 1972 Convention, the Platform Committee is directed to hold at least eight regional public hearings. Subcommittees of the Democratic Policy Council are currently holding pre-platform hearings on a wide range of subjects.

Each committee must publish its report and make it available to the delegates before the National Convention. The Platform and the Report of the Rules Committee must be printed and in the hands of delegates at least 10 days prior to the opening of the Convention, and the Credentials Committee must have its report available two days before the gavel falls. This advance preparation of reports will give the delegates a clearer idea of the proposals before them and facilitate

meaningful debate. Upon the request of ten per cent of the members of a committee present and voting at a meeting, a minority report shall also be prepared and, along with the majority conclusions, be submitted to the full National Convention—thus assuring a hearing for all viewpoints.

Extensive procedures have been established for the Credentials Committee, whose members must adjudicate all challenges to a delegate's right to represent a state at the Convention.

Specific deadlines are provided to assure full protection of rights for all parties in the credentials proceedings. A written notice of intent to challenge must be filed within 10 calendar days after the delegate-selection process is completed in a state, a requirement that it is hoped will minimize last minute credentials challenges during the days immediately preceding the Convention.

The Credentials Committee is also empowered to hold hearings in the states and to appoint its own impartial hearing examiners to develop the facts in the case.

TO MAKE THE CONVENTION DELIBERATIVE

All resolutions, committee reports and minority reports must be fully debated and voted upon by the Convention delegates. To avoid surprise or misunderstanding, amendments from the Convention floor will not be permitted.

Motions to lay on the table, order the previous question and other peremptory motions will not be permitted, nor will interruptions of the roll call and dilatory motions, amendments and appeals.

In order to speed up Convention business, the total time permitted for a candidate's nomination and seconding speeches will be limited to a total of 15 minutes. Planned demonstrations will be banned (no more hired bands and conscripted participants). Spontaneous eruptions on a candidate's behalf will be taken out of the 15 minute time allotment.

"Favorite son" nominations are foreclosed by the requirement that a candidate establish substantial support in three or more states before his name may be placed in nomination. Under the new rules, a nominating petition must contain the written backing of at least 50, but not more than 200, delegates, with no more than 20 from one delegation. A delegate may not sign more than one nominating petition. The same procedure also applies to the nomination of the Vice President.

A delegate will be permitted to vote for whomever he pleases even if his conviction is contrary to a state law binding him to another candidate. This is considered a matter between the delegate and his state, not the Convention, which will record his preference at the time the roll is called.

TO MAKE THE CONVENTION FAIR

For the candidates

To further democratize the proceedings, the roll call of the states, as well as the order of nomination, will be determined by lot.

Each declared presidential candidate is entitled to appoint a non-voting member to the Convention Arrangements Committee and to the drafting subcommittee of the Platform Committee.

Each delegate by his participation in the Convention agrees to help place Democratic candidates on the ballot in his state and agrees not to support any candidate other than the nominee of the Democratic National Convention.

And for the delegates

"Unit voting," whereby a majority of one could swing an entire delegation's strength behind a particular candidate, has been abolished.

Seating arrangements on the Convention floor will be determined by lot at a drawing held before the Convention is brought to order. In the past, the Arrangements Com-

mittee determined the seating arrangements for the delegations.

Communications between the floor and the Convention chairman will be provided to ensure that the chairman will identify any delegate seeking recognition. Requests for recognition will be electronically registered in a manner visible to the chairman, the delegates and the news media.

Communications equipment must be sufficient to permit the delegates to communicate with the rostrum, with the candidates' headquarters, with the press and with each other.

These far-reaching reforms of the convention system will eliminate much of the traditional hoopla, as well as the unnecessary boredom, of the past. Instead, these new procedures, in combination with a new, lively format, will result in orderly attention to the issues and to the nomination.

THE NEW DELEGATE

"A quiet revolution is sweeping the Democratic Party," Rep. Donald M. Fraser told the Democrats' Commission on Party Structure and Delegate Selection in mid-July.

Rep. Fraser, successor to the Commission's first Chairman, Sen. George McGovern, made the prediction that by the end of 1971 a minimum of 40 states would be in compliance with the Commission's 18 Guidelines for choosing delegates to next year's Democratic National Convention.

On October 15 (reporting to the Democratic National Committee) Fraser announced: "That figure is now in sight."

He released an analysis showing that 36 state Democratic parties had already fully met the new reform standards or were acting on new rules that would move them into the "full compliance" column well before December 31.

Moreover, virtually all the remaining states and territorial parties are hard at work to complete the admittedly complex job of changing past procedures—a process guaranteeing the most open, non-brokered Democratic National Convention in history.

How can the quiet revolution be explained? Most simply:

In the past two years, Democrats decided to make Party reform more than a catch phrase. And these Democrats went to work.

For many state parties it meant a sharp break with decades of tradition. For more than a third of the states, it meant writing substantive party constitutions, by-laws and rules for the first time. Ten states that picked all or significant portions of their national delegations by committee had to adopt a new democratic process where rank-and-file Democrats choose the delegates.

When the 18 Guidelines were adopted nearly two years ago and the first "compliance letters" sent to state parties in February, 1970, not one state met the 18 new standards.

At best, state parties were out of compliance on only five, six or seven guidelines. Most of them missed the mark by better than half; some were out of compliance on as many as 16 or 17 of the guidelines.

Addressing himself to this point in his October 15 report, Rep. Fraser said: "Looking at the 50 state parties and the total number of guidelines they were out of compliance with when they began, we have moved from zero to 78% up the ladder toward full compliance on the basis of rules adopted and proposed rules that will soon be acted upon."

This record can be explained only by the extraordinary breadth of the reform effort in state after state, as well as the personal commitment of countless Democrats to see the job through to a successful conclusion.

In the two-year period that state Democratic parties have been at work to comply with the new standards, an impressive record has been written. As of mid-October:

36 state parties had either acted upon or were preparing final action to adopt new

rules in full compliance with the guidelines.

Virtually all the remaining 14 states and territories have set a definite time schedule for completing action.

13 state parties have successfully obtained legislative changes opening the system to wider citizen participation.

Every state Democratic party named a reform commission or committee to study its system and propose appropriate change. Over 1,000 Democrats have been working in these reform groups.

Approximately half of the state parties held public hearings to obtain grassroots opinion. In all, several hundred public hearings were held—one state alone held 20 hearings.

The Commission on Party Structure and Delegate Selection itself held 17 public hearings—beginning with a national hearing in Washington, D.C. on April 24, 1969 and ending four months later in Boston, Mass. Some 500 Democrats testified at these hearings and provided the substantive basis on which the new guidelines were developed.

All the Commission's meetings have been open to the press and the public.

THE GUIDELINES: WHAT DO THEY MEAN?

Two principles are at the core of the 18 Guidelines that will govern the selection of delegates to the 1972 Democratic National Convention: non-discrimination and the grassroots election of delegates. Specifically, these principles mean the following requirements for state and territorial Democratic Parties:

Party rules must specify no discrimination on basis of race, color, creed or national origin.

All vestiges of discrimination on basis of sex and age must be eliminated.

Affirmative steps must be taken to encourage representation on the national convention delegation of young people, women and minority groups in reasonable relationship to their presence in the state's population.

Remove excessive costs and fees (over \$10). Remove mandatory assessments of delegates.

Remove petition requirements in excess of 1% of standard used.

Adopt explicit Party rules and make them readily available to all persons upon request.

Adopt uniform times and dates for meetings; fully publicize this information well in advance.

Prohibit proxy voting in delegate selection process.

Prohibit unit rule at all levels.

Clearly designate delegate-selection process as distinct from other Party business.

Adopts rules setting quorums at not less than 40% for all committees involved in delegate-selection process.

Alternates must be chosen in same manner as delegates.

Delegate vacancies must be filled by "timely" and "representative" Party committee, by reconvening body that elected delegates, or by delegation itself acting as a committee.

Select at least 75% of national delegates in convention system at congressional district or smaller units.

Apportion each body selecting delegates at all levels on basis of population and/or Democratic strength.

Give each candidate for delegate an opportunity to state presidential preference on the ballot at each stage of process or be designated "uncommitted."

Prohibit all delegate selection processes prior to the calendar year of the Convention.

Limit selection of National Convention delegates by committee to 10% of the total delegation. The committee making these selections must be timely and properly apportioned.

State-making process must be open to full

and meaningful participation by all Democrats, with no undue burden placed on any Democrat who wishes to challenge for a position on the slate.

Party groups making up delegate slates must have been elected, assembled or appointed with adequate public notice that such a task would be performed.

Several other guidelines "urge" state parties to take additional action, such as:

Work for removal of all laws, customs and practices that restrict voter participation in the political process, i.e., restrictive voter registration laws.

Remove all costs and fees.

Explore ways of easing the financial burden on delegates and alternates.

Provide for fair representation of minority views in the Convention delegation.

Provide easy access for unaffiliated voters and non-Democrats to become Democrats.

ARRANGEMENTS COMMITTEE

A major reform stemming from the Commission on Rules has been opening up planning for the 1972 National Convention to a broad spectrum of Democrats, including governors, state chairmen, members of Congress, elected state officials, young people and the presidential candidates.

Responding to criticism that past National Conventions were planned by an unrepresentative group of party officials, the Rules Commission instructed the DNC chairman to nominate for an Arrangements Committee a slate that would include representatives of principal groups in the Party structure, as well as persons who traditionally have been underrepresented in all phases of the National Convention.

At the October 13-14 meeting the DNC, the members unanimously elected an Arrangements Committee slate proposed by Chairman O'Brien that included 8 women, 7 men, 2 blacks, 1 Spanish-speaking American and one 19-year-old. Each presidential candidate will also appoint an *ex-officio* member.

The Arrangements Committee is responsible for housing; communications; radio, television and press; security; seating of delegates, visitors and guests; admission and passes; transportation and finance. The membership of the Arrangements Committee for the 1972 Democratic National Convention includes:

Lawrence F. O'Brien, Chairman, Democratic National Committee.

Mary Lou Burg, Vice-Chairman, Democratic National Committee.

Dorothy Vredenburg Bush, Secretary, Democratic National Committee.

Robert S. Strauss, Treasurer, Democratic National Committee.

Jacob M. Arvey, National Committeeman from Illinois; senior member of the Executive Committee.

Mrs. Beatrice Rosenthal, National Committeewoman from Connecticut; senior female member of the Executive Committee as regards continuous service on the National Committee.

Gov. Reubin O. D. Askew, Florida (host state for the convention).

Mrs. Caroline Wilkins, State Chairman from Oregon, only female State Democratic Chairman.

Robert S. Vance, State Chairman from Alabama.

U.S. Sen. Phillip A. Hart, Michigan (recommended by the Majority Leader of the United States Senate).

U.S. Rep. Edward P. Boland, Massachusetts (recommended by the Speaker of the House of Representatives).

Mrs. C. Delores Tucker, Secretary of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, Vice-Chairman of the Pennsylvania Democratic Party.

State Sen. Barbara Jordan, Texas.

State Rep. Mrs. Waldo S. Benavidez, Colorado, Denver Democratic Party leader.

Gwendolyn R. Mink, 19 years old, sophomore at the University of Chicago, Speakers Bureau Chairman of the National Student Vote, former intern in the offices of Senator Edward M. Kennedy and Speaker Carl Albert.

CONVENTION REFORM

Numerous recommendations of the Commission on Rules have already been incorporated into the planning for the arrangements of the 1972 National Convention. Among these are the following:

Arrangements have been made to print the reports of the Platform and Rules Committees and to distribute them to the delegates ten days in advance of the opening of the Convention.

Low-cost air conditioned housing has been provided, not to exceed \$5 or \$6 a day.

25 caucus rooms are being constructed within the convention hall.

All Presidential candidates will be provided with equivalent office space adjacent to the convention hall.

All delegates and alternates will be seated on the floor for the first time.

A special expense fund has been established by the Committee with which to pay the expenses of the Standing Committee members.

Seating of the delegations will be done by lot.

Aisles will be wide so as to allow easy passage for all delegates.

For the first time the Convention Manager and an Arrangements Committee, widely representative of all Party groups, were elected by the full National Committee.

Security within the hall is under the sole authority of the Arrangements Committee.

All Presidential candidates will be offered equal headquarters facilities in at least two hotels.

Extensive facilities have been provided for full media coverage of the Convention, including easily accessible TV booths, camera stations commanding full view of the proceedings and sufficient lighting to allow color TV.

Discussions are now underway with the telephone company to provide a network of telephonic communications between the press and delegates, between delegations and between delegations and the rostrum.

Finally, the Roll Call will no longer be alphabetical, but will be done by lot.

FINANCING REFORM

The Democratic National Committee has, to date, provided \$310,000 to support the Fraser-McGovern and O'Hara Commissions. "Money has never been better spent," said DNC Treasurer Robert Strauss.

"I am totally behind the work of the reform commissions and I am delighted that our fund-raising efforts have been able to provide this financial support. I am particularly pleased with the election of Mrs. Patricia Harris as temporary chairman of the Credentials Committee for I know she will bring her many talents and dedication to the task of assuring democratic selection of delegates to the 1972 Convention." Strauss emphasized that the Credentials Committee would receive full financial backing by the DNC in overseeing the delegate-selection process in 1972.

DNC Vice Chairman Mary Lou Burg has been working tirelessly to involve more women in the political process. In the past year, Miss Burg has participated in numerous fund-raisers and given a host of speeches on behalf of distaff Democrats all over the country. She is particularly delighted with the election of Pat Harris as Temporary Chairman of the Credentials Committee. "I'm happy to see Mrs. Harris doing the job, not just because she's a woman," said Miss Burg, "but because she's a really fine administrator and I know the reins are in capable hands."

ENFORCING REFORM

Patricia Roberts Harris is a symbol of change: She's a Black woman who's risen

to a position of prominence in what has up to now been a white male-dominated sphere of influence. Why, then, have some come to feel her latest post, temporary Credentials Committee Chairman for the 1972 Democratic National Convention, is somehow antithetical to the reforms adopted by the Democratic National Committee? Some say it's because she doesn't have a long record of party reform activity behind her.

"True enough," admits the busy lawyer, ex-U.S. Ambassador, board chairman of two major corporations and dedicated wife. "I haven't been making loud noises about reform up to now. Well, I haven't been making too many statements about child abuse either. Is that supposed to mean that I'm for cruelty to infants? The fact is that I'm not sure why there were doubts about my commitment to reform. All I can say to the doubters is, come Convention time, watch my smoke."

Mrs. Harris also points out the McGovern-Fraser Guidelines and the O'Hara rules on Convention reform ensure that, whoever the chairman of the credentials committee, he or she would be under the mandate of those regulations to enforce the new Convention procedures for seating state delegations at the 1972 Democratic National Convention.

There was talk throughout the brief struggle between Mrs. Harris and Sen. Harold Hughes for the committee chairmanship that the contest would precipitate a breach among party leaders. After the vote, however, a move to make the Harris election unanimous was approved by the full DNC.

SO, YOU WANT TO BE A DELEGATE . . .

If you are interested in running for delegate to the 1972 Democratic National Convention, be sure to familiarize yourself with the procedures and regulations in your state. Each state party is required to make its rules readily available.

A copy of the 18 Guidelines is available from the Commission on Party Structure and Delegate Selection. To receive a copy, send your name and address to: Mr. Robert Nelson, Commission Staff Director, Democratic National Committee, 2600 Virginia Ave., N.W., Wash., D.C. 20037.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., October 18, 1971.

LAWRENCE F. O'BRIEN,
Chairman, Democratic National Committee,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR LARRY: The meeting last week of the National Committee was certainly a victory for Party reform. For those of us who have worked on the Commission on Rules, adoption by the Democratic National Committee of our recommendations for Convention Rules and the implementation of our proposals for the Arrangements Committee and the Standing Committees was very gratifying.

I know you share our satisfaction in the progress to date and our determination to have a nominating convention next year that is completely representative, deliberative, open, and fair.

Larry, those of us who have had the privilege of working with you in achieving the reforms now adopted know we could not have come this far without your steadfast support and encouragement. When you rap the gavel opening the Miami convention, it should be with real satisfaction in the revitalization of the Democratic Party that has been accomplished under your leadership.

Best wishes.

Sincerely,

JAMES G. O'HARA,
Chairman,
Commission on Rules.

SENATOR HUGHES PRAISES DELEGATE REFORM

Sen. Harold Hughes (D-Iowa) had words of high praise for the Democratic Party's reform efforts in the past two years.

An acknowledged leader of party reform efforts since the 1968 Democratic National Convention, when he chaired an *ad hoc* commission on the presidential nominating process, Sen. Hughes is vice chairman of the Commission on Party Structure and Delegates Selection.

At a Commission meeting Oct 15, Sen. Hughes said the Democratic Party's accomplishments in meeting the reform standards are "amazing."

"When I look back two years and see the futility of what we faced, it's amazing how far the states have come. It's been a very successful thing," he said.

Hughes praised the Party's commitment to reform. "Two years ago," he said, "I doubted that 10 states would be in conformity" with the guidelines for delegate selection. "Now I think that between 45 and 43 states will be."

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Washington, D.C., October 19, 1971.

HON. LAWRENCE F. O'BRIEN,
Chairman, Democratic National Committee,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR LARRY: As we move through the critical fall months toward the beginning of the convention year, I want to thank you for your invaluable assistance in backing the Commission's efforts to obtain full compliance with the guidelines among all the state parties.

Without your unwavering support over these past months, we would not in my judgment, have been able to achieve the enormous progress that we were able to report to the Democratic National Committee meeting on October 14. The solid support that you have given our staff and the "shoulder to shoulder" posture you have taken with the Commission, demonstrate beyond any doubt the Democratic Party's commitment to reform.

I wish to express my strong gratitude for your help at this point, in light of the unwarranted questioning of your position on reform, as an aftermath of the contest for a temporary chairman of the Credentials Committee.

Incidentally, I was particularly impressed with your leadership in encouraging the National Committee to reverse its position and unseat itself as automatic delegates. This action by the Democratic National Committee was a strong affirmation of the guidelines.

Congratulations.

Sincerely,

DONALD M. FRASER.

THE NATIONAL CANCER ATTACK
ACT OF 1971

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 19, 1971

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, November 15, 1971, the House overwhelmingly passed the "National Cancer Attack Act of 1971" by a vote of 350 to 5. This action has generated considerable reaction from the American public in support of the House passed version of this legislation.

At this point I would like to insert in the RECORD editorial comment from the New York Daily News which addresses this issue:

HOW HUNT CANCER CURE (S)?

House and Senate are agreed that the government shall steeply increase spending on cancer-cure research. But the Senate wants to set up an independent agency for the purpose, while the House favors keeping the ex-

isting cancer institute within the National Institutes of Health.

We hope the Senate-House conferees will settle for the House version.

Create an independent organization, and we'll encourage the setting up of similar groups to hunt for cures for all the ailments on which sizable numbers of people think unlimited sums should be spent.

The end results most likely would be tragic in many cases and needlessly expensive in all. Why not let the NIH direct all of these cure quests?—which, unless we're mistaken, was one purpose for which the NIH was created.

TRADE POLICY

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 19, 1971

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, last Tuesday, the able chairman of the Committee On Ways and Means (Mr. MILLS), delivered a thoughtful and timely speech to the 58th National Trade Convention in New York.

The subject of trade policy is one of special importance to anyone who is concerned about our country and its economic role in the world.

Few individuals can speak with as much authority or expertise in this field than Chairman MILLS. I am therefore inserting the text of his address in the RECORD, and calling it to the attention of my colleagues:

REMARKS OF CONGRESSMAN WILBUR D. MILLS

I am both pleased and honored to be here today and to participate with you in your exploration of the "Imperatives for World Economic Progress" in this 58th National Foreign Trade Convention. This annual convention has a long tradition of deliberating on those policies of business and government which enhance the free flow of trade and investment and which contribute to economic growth and well-being throughout the world.

I am sure I am not the first speaker to pay tribute to that tradition by quoting from a statement by Secretary of State Cordell Hull. Secretary Hull spoke a great many truths concerning the importance of foreign trade and the vital necessity of international cooperation in trade relations. As I view the state of our international economic affairs, it occurs to me that a statement of Secretary Hull before the Committee on Ways and Means is particularly apropos at this time.

The date is March 8, 1934, and the statement is in support of H. R. 8430, which became the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act of 1934. Secretary Hull observed: "The field of international trade, however, upon the existence of which the economic lives of scores of nations depend, and the economic well-being of all nations in important measure depend, is hopelessly clogged and obstructed by prohibitions, embargoes, quotas, restrictions, and numerous other economic and currency impediments. The processes of exchange and distribution have broken down and adequate relief imperatively requires the restoration of confidence, employment, normal commodity prices, and normal trade, both internal and external." (Emphasis supplied.)

This description of conditions in international trade of 37 years ago appears to me to be perilously close to conditions which can develop in the world economy should the present attitudes and policies in world trade centers persist. Prohibitions, import quotas,

bilateral restrictions, discrimination, economic and currency impediments are coming to be increasingly used, if not in practice, at least in terms of proposals by governments as they seek to protect their own economic situations or to redress real or alleged imbalances in their economic affairs.

There is no doubt that the economic conditions, both internal and external, which faced the United States this past summer were of an extremely serious nature. Inflation, under-employment and long-time budgetary deficits domestically, were reflected in increased imports, lagging exports, and deficits in our balance of payments and balance of trade.

These conditions to which the President addressed his action on August 15 did not develop overnight. And I believe we need to remind ourselves that they cannot be corrected in a brief period of time.

Internationally, the President's action in imposing an additional duty of 10 percent on most dutiable imports and suspending the convertibility of the dollar into gold represented for the United States a new freedom from the rules of the game as they particularly applied to this country. Given the role of the dollar in the international monetary and financial system, the United States has not had the flexibility enjoyed by other countries to adjust the value of its currency to reflect shifts in economic conditions and relative economic strengths. In trade, the position of leadership assumed by the United States had up until this summer foreclosed unilateral action in the trade field to assist in the necessary adjustments in the international economic accounts.

The President's shock treatment certainly worked up to a point. Our international economic problems have now received the attention of our trading partners which they previously had tended to ignore in face of the overall economic strength of the United States. I believe that the reaction of our trading partners after the initial shock has been for the most part one of cooperation.

The correctness of the United States action on August 15 will be lost sight of, however, if other governments are given time to react in response to pressures from their own producing interests. Indeed, there is every evidence that, as the timetable for lifting the additional duty on United States imports remains indefinite, the negotiating leverage for achieving a meaningful realignment of currencies will be dissipated.

Indeed, as Mr. Hull observed, we need a "restoration of confidence," for despite the actions of August 15, we still have a crisis of confidence on the part of the business community and labor. This is particularly true of our trade policy.

Abrupt changes in policy are usually characterized as the end of an era. It is my hope that the forces which have been set to work since August 15 will not result in the end of the era of cooperation in international trade and monetary policy in which world trade has expanded from \$55 billion in 1950 to \$311 billion in 1970.

Trade expansion policies, including the trade policy the United States has pursued, anticipate economic adjustments. Trade expansion policies run into trouble when the economic adjustments resulting from reduction in trade barriers develop faster than they can be assimilated by the affected economic interests. The success of the trade agreements program until recently has been due to the recognition that trade liberalization must proceed surely but slowly if it is to remain economically viable and politically acceptable.

The leadership the United States has been able to exert in international trade is due to the fact that under the trade agreements extension acts and the Trade Expansion Act of 1962, the Congress and the President were speaking with one voice. The failure to extend the President's trade agreement author-

ity after June 30, 1967, has contributed substantially to the deterioration of consistency in our trade policy and indeed has raised the question as to whether the United States has a trade policy.

The history of the trade agreements program has been one of the President seeking increased flexibility to deal with our trade problems internationally and the Congress providing written safeguards in recognition of the interest of producing groups in our economy. Thus, over the years, a balance of forces was achieved in delegating tariff adjustment authority to the President under specified conditions which provided for escape from situations of import competition to which industries and workers could not adjust.

In the Trade Expansion Act of 1962, the Congress granted the President more sweeping tariff reduction authority than ever before. However, despite the introduction of the concept of adjustment assistance for firms and workers injured by imports, the safeguard provisions of the 1962 Act and their administration failed to recognize that our producing interests would need quick and effective relief in dealing with the type of competition from imports that subsequently developed. In part, we failed to recognize that economic growth abroad has contributed greatly to the efficiency of foreign producers. Moreover, in administering other phases of our trade laws, we have failed to take into account the type of trade practices, often government-assisted, which have placed our own producers at a disadvantage, not only in the United States markets but abroad.

The tremendous shift in attitudes toward our trade policy on the part of a number of major industries and labor unions is compelling testimony to the failure of government policy to deal adequately with competitive forces to which our own trade laws should be addressed. It is an important aspect of the crisis of confidence on the part of manufacturers and workers.

Industry after industry has failed in its efforts to obtain relief under the tariff adjustment provisions, or, as they are known more familiarly, the escape clause provisions, of the Trade Expansion Act. Relief under the Antidumping Act or the countervailing duty provisions has either been so slow in coming or administered so reluctantly that the United States producers have despaired that the government would provide any assistance with unfair pricing policy of the foreign exporters and their governments.

There has been improvement recently in the administration of the Antidumping Act. Nevertheless, the complete breakdown in confidence of both management and labor that the government would respond to severe problems of import competition has caused industry after industry to seek legislated import quotas. Such proposals would impose quotas on imports across broad industrial sectors. Such relief is in contrast to the more selective type of relief contemplated in the escape clause provisions, and is, of course, of great concern to our trading partners, since it represents a completely different approach from trade policy that this country has pursued up to this time. Such an approach contradicts the type of international obligations which we must insist our trading partners live up to in view of our own great interest in world markets.

I share the concern of those who feel that the trade problems facing the United States are so serious that we must devise trade controls which will limit imports to a certain percentage of the domestic market. I still feel, however, if we amend our present laws wisely and prudently, we can retain the benefits of expanded world trade and safeguard our own producing interests, both business and labor.

But we must do so very soon. That is why I am concerned that we have not been able

to take advantage of the imposition of the additional duty on imports to obtain quick and responsible action on the part of all major trading nations in the realization of exchange rates. It obviously is not possible to agree on a restructuring of the international monetary system in a short period of time. Nevertheless, an interim agreement on currency values could do much to quiet the concerns of many that the longer the present situation in the international monetary market persists, the more governments will resort to artificial currency manipulations and trade controls. I think we need to remember that whatever the cost of the failure to act earlier to make fundamental changes in the international monetary systems, it is at least partially offset by the great increase in world trade achieved under that system due in no small part to stable currency values. Thus, in any political strategy to reform the monetary system, I think we must keep in mind that the reforms must be accomplished without losing the economic benefits all countries enjoyed under the old system.

Among the beneficiaries, too, have been those economic interests actually engaged in international trade and investment. The indefiniteness of the present monetary and trade situation is not one that instills confidence in businessmen to make those decisions which lead to economic growth. Thus, the very nature of the present series of confrontations in trade policy give me great concern.

As I have indicated, the imposition of the additional duty on imports was basically sound and necessary in view of the currency crises and other ominous trends of last summer. Indeed, I had publicly stated my willingness to consider legislation under which a temporary border tax adjustment could be imposed. However, the President's action in imposing the 10 percent additional duty on most dutiable imports was without the specific authorization of the Congress. As you are aware, there has been no clear-cut explanation of the legal basis of the President's action under the national emergency he declared. Suffice it to say, the President has apparently terminated, in whole or in part, previous Presidential proclamations reducing duties pursuant to his trade agreement authority.

On some \$4.5 billion in imports in 1970, the President's action had the effect of terminating all previous trade agreement concessions so that the rates of duty applying to imports are the statutory rates of 1930. It now appears that some importers are considering whether to petition for a ruling on the legality of the additional duty. A collateral question arises as to the President's authority, under the trade agreement provisions, to rescind the additional duty once he has terminated the previous tariff reductions.

Still another problem that must be faced is whether and how the President will deal with the last stage of the Kennedy Round scheduled to become effective on January 1, 1972, under a previous trade agreement proclamation which the President has terminated, in part, or "suspended." While such a question may appear superfluous in face of the 10 percent additional duty, it will hardly appear so minor to our trading partners.

Thus, my concern here is that, despite the obvious necessity of the additional duty, the lack of appropriate consultation with and delegation of authority from the Congress regarding this matter in particular has created uncertainty as to what trade policy in the United States is, and what the aims of this country are in dealing with our trading partners.

Again, in my own view, we are in the position we find ourselves because, by force of circumstances in both the executive branch and in the Congress, it has not been possible to work together to develop a balanced package of trade measures which would, on the one hand, give the President authority

and flexibility to deal with trade problems internationally and, on the other hand, provide in our own domestic trade law reasonable and effective programs to deal with adverse competitive situations and available to all producing interests on the same basis.

In this regard, it is popular these days to state that many of our international trade problems will be solved if we recapture the competitive spirit and effectiveness of the proverbial Yankee Trader. I, too, subscribe to that theory. I certainly do not share the views of others that United States exports are passe, and that the United States should resign itself to becoming a service economy. Such a concept may fit the econometric models that are also popular these days, but which have little in common with the real world.

A part of the real world of international trade is contained in a number of bills pending before the Committee on Ways and Means which are based on hard analysis that existing trends in trade are robbing United States workers of job opportunities and eliminating profitable operations of many small firms which cannot adjust by investing abroad. The realities of trade policy in the 1970's, therefore, must involve a new awakening between workers and business in the United States as to the mutuality of their interest. For too long have we ignored the vital commercial aspects of day-to-day developments in our trade relations. Too often, market access problems abroad for United States producers have gone unsolved and the only viable answer for the individual corporations has become increased investment to produce abroad. It may well be that we should spend less time in coordinating policies and more time and thought to developing a single government department which will have the full responsibility for pursuing United States commercial interests abroad with the same fervor and success that foreign producers expect and obtain from their governments.

The world moves very swiftly these days. If we do not shortly begin to exhibit that maturity and political ability to understand and be understood by our major trading partners, all of the benefits we have come to enjoy from years of international economic cooperation can soon disappear. Moreover, there is a task ahead of rebuilding a trade policy for the United States which will reflect, first, its economic and, second, its political position in the world today. This task cannot be accomplished by the President alone. Today more than ever before, the President's power and flexibility to meet problems in trade must necessarily rest on the authority delegated to him by the Congress.

Finally, both management and labor must work toward the common goal of recapturing the competitive edge in producing in this market and abroad. This may sound like so much sophistry to some, but if this country is to remain the economic power and political force in the world economy that our traditions demand, it must be done through business and labor working with and through government toward their own interests both as producers and consumers.

JAMES G. FULTON

HON. WM. JENNINGS BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 19, 1971

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, Jim Fulton was a highly respected Congressman, a great American and a dear friend. We shall miss him, and we extend our deepest sympathy to his family and to the people of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Speaker, we all knew of Jim Fulton's interest and expertise on scientific matters, for he was his party's ranking member of the House Science and Astronautics Committee. We knew too of his dedication to the people of Pennsylvania as the senior member of his party in Pennsylvania's delegation to the Congress. And we knew of his sincere interest in people. I well recall the day that he personally escorted my young son to introduce him to a foreign royal visitor to the Capitol. My son will never forget that simple act of friendship. Jim Fulton was a member of a family long prominent in Pennsylvania public life. He was devoted to this great heritage. Jim was also a dedicated member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. He had a deep interest in foreign affairs and he realized that America could not remain great if it isolated itself from the rest of the world. James Fulton was a statesman, and we shall miss him. Again we extend our sincere sympathy to his family and to his friends.

THE 25TH ANNIVERSARY OF FRANK & EDWARD SKWIAT POST NO. 451, AMERICAN LEGION, MICHIGAN CITY, IND.

HON. JOHN BRADEMÁS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 19, 1971

Mr. BRADEMÁS. Mr. Speaker, today I have the most pleasant duty of congratulating the Frank & Edward Skwiat American Legion Post No. 451 of Michigan City, Ind., on its 25th anniversary. In these past 25 years, the Frank & Edward Skwiat Post has contributed the time of its members and the resources of its treasury to virtually every civic project in Michigan City. In the short span of 25 years, the post has become a respected institution in Michigan City.

Mr. Speaker, the civic-minded activities of the Frank & Edward Skwiat Post are another reason for Michigan City to be proud of itself as a community. The common council of the city recently recognized this fact in a resolution, which I insert at this point in the RECORD.

The resolution follows:

RESOLUTION CONGRATULATING THE FRANK & EDWARD SKWIAT POST NO. 451, THE AMERICAN LEGION, ON ITS 25TH ANNIVERSARY

Whereas, in this year, the Frank & Edward Skwiat Post No. 451, The American Legion, Department of Indiana, will celebrate the 25th anniversary of its Charter, and

Whereas, in the Preamble to the Constitution of The American Legion, it is recited that among the fundamental precepts upon which The American Legion is founded includes the individual obligation to uphold the Constitution of the United States, and to safeguard and to transmit to posterity the principles of justice, freedom and democracy, and

Whereas, the Frank & Edward Skwiat Post No. 451, The American Legion, has exhibited throughout its organization a great desire to fulfill such precepts by its engagement in the National and Departmental programs of

The American Legion, such as: Boys' State, Oratorical Contests, Flag Education, Patriotic Observations, Community Services, Rehabilitation of Veterans, Knightstown Home, and Child Welfare, and

Whereas, the Frank & Edward Skwiat Post No. 451, The American Legion, has built and maintained a Post Home at 121 Skwiat Legion Avenue which has served our community for educational activities, political functions, recreational programs, ceremonial observances, and civic projects, and

Whereas, among its many accomplishments, the Frank & Edward Skwiat Post No. 451, The American Legion, has purchased equipment for the Fire Department of Michigan City, and for the Police Department of Michigan City; has purchased animals for the Michigan City Zoo; has sponsored and participated in athletic events for children and adults; has provided American flags and Indiana State flags to schools within the Michigan City area, and has made generous contributions to worthwhile projects and programs including, but not limited to, Mental Health, United Funds, Heart Association, and Scholarship Foundation.

Now, therefore, be it resolved by the Common Council of the City of Michigan City that it does hereby officially congratulate the officers and members of the Frank & Edward Skwiat Post No. 451, The American Legion, and officially recognizes its contributions to the Community, State, and Nation as an outstanding Legion Post.

Be it further resolved that a copy of this Resolution, after its passage and approval by Conrad S. Kominierak, Mayor of Michigan City, be forwarded by Philip J. Schroeder, Clerk of the City of Michigan City, to Kenneth L. Beach, Commander of the Frank & Edward Skwiat Post No. 451, The American Legion, with the official seal of the City of Michigan City affixed thereto.

Introduced by:

RAY H. PARRY.

Passed by the Common Council of the City of Michigan City, Indiana, this 19th day of October, 1971.

JAMES L. KINTZELE,
President of the Council.

Approved by me, this 20th day of October, 1971.

CONRAD S. KOMINIAREK,
Mayor.

Attest:

PHILIP J. SCHROEDER,
City Clerk.

MEETING THE DEMANDS FOR M.D.'S

HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 19, 1971

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I was pleased to note in the American Medical News of September 27, an article by Dr. Robert Rosenberg, an outstanding physician from my hometown of Rockford, Ill. Dr. Rosenberg makes the important point that the doctor shortage confronting the Nation is not simply a matter of having too few physicians to go around. Rather, the real problem is that the doctors we do have are distributed unevenly, with overconcentrations in certain geographic areas and in certain specialties. We have too few physicians in central urban areas and in rural parts of the country, and too few primary care or family physicians in relation to the number of specialists and surgeons.

Because we are currently considering a number of proposals to improve the availability and quality of health care in the Nation, I believe Dr. Rosenberg's observations are particularly timely. It will not be enough merely to pour large sums of new funds into the health care system; effective reform will require that we also devise incentives to reduce the kind of imbalances that Dr. Rosenberg has identified. I would commend this article to my colleagues and include it at this point in the RECORD:

[From the American Medical News, Sept. 27, 1971]

MEETING THE DEMAND FOR M.D.'S

(By Robert J. Rosenberg, M.D.)

Twenty-five years ago, and less, there was a clamor for more electronic and industrial engineers. Today we have many areas with an oversupply of these highly trained men, but with no jobs for their sophisticated areas of expertise. Consequently, there are hundreds, perhaps thousands, of skilled men forced to accept other employment to support themselves and their families. Five years ago our educational experts predicted a marked shortage of teachers in elementary schools. With the dropping off of the population explosion and an economic downturn, thousands of college graduates equipped to serve in this field are now idle. This is yet another example of a planning program which did not anticipate future realities. Also within the medical profession during World War I and World War II, due to the emergent situation overseas, there was a marked shortage of general surgeons. The outcry at that time was for young physicians to engage in general surgery. This has been done with a resultant over-population supply in relation to the population needs.

Our primary shortage of physicians at this time is directly related to an over-population of highly specialized individuals as opposed to family practitioners and a maldistribution of physicians into the more densely populated urban areas. The age of specialization has removed doctors from many neighborhoods and the need for having expensive diagnostic equipment available in order to do good work has now taken the generalist away from the corner drug store and into the medical centers. The public may not realize it, but the physician recognizes that the evaluation of medical care has changed. Not long ago people sought the services of the doctor in the hope that they might be helped. Today they go to the doctor expecting to be cured.

The figures show that the physician population has been increasing 25% faster than the population growth for the past 20 years. It is clear that we must plan, and as we plan, we must be factual and flexible. Merely to increase the number of physicians would not adequately meet the requirements for physician availability.

VETERANS UNEMPLOYMENT

HON. NICK BEGICH

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 19, 1971

Mr. BEGICH. Mr. Speaker, unemployment in our Nation and particularly in Alaska is a very serious problem. A significant portion of this unemployed force is the veterans who have recently returned from military service.

In an attempt to help alleviate the plight of the unemployed veteran, I have written letters to 120 community leaders urging them to provide opportunities for our returning veterans. I attempted to point out to these leaders that we have a special obligation to these men. They have given up prime years that could have been spent securing a job with security and good pay. These are men who are qualified to hold responsible jobs, but because of their temporary absence from the labor force, are finding suitable employment opportunities scarce.

I am pleased to report that in response to the letters I sent out, the Department of Labor in Alaska has sent me an informative letter explaining what they are doing to deal with this same problem. I would like to commend them for their work and dedication to our veterans. I am inserting a copy of that letter for my colleagues inspection so that they may see the fervor with which Alaska is dealing with this problem.

STATE OF ALASKA,
DEPARTMENT OF LABOR,
Juneau, Alaska, October 28, 1971.

Honorable NICK BEGICH,
Congressman for Alaska, House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BEGICH: We were pleased to see a recent news story indicating you had sent letters to 120 community leaders in Alaska urging their assistance in finding jobs for returning veterans.

Our Employment Security Division of the State Department of Labor has been pursuing a vigorous program through its Manpower Centers aimed at placing as many of our Vietnam Era Veterans in Alaska as possible into jobs.

Working in cooperation with the State Veterans' Representative, a number of mail promotion techniques have been used in Alaska. Our experience, however, clearly demonstrates that personal employer contact is the most effective technique for veteran job development, and, to the extent available staff resources of Alaska Manpower Centers permit, this approach is stressed. The employer interest cards used nationally to stimulate employer action in hiring veterans actually has elicited little response from Alaskan employers; however, direct contact and coordinated local publicity has obtained some good results.

In Anchorage, where the 1½ staff positions provided to Alaska by the Manpower Administration of the U.S. Department of Labor, were assigned to augment the Jobs for Veterans drive and where a Jobs for Veterans task force is active, results have been very satisfactory thus far.

During the 5 months following the kick off of our statewide Jobs for Veterans Campaign in April 1971, the record shows our Manpower Centers have taken 2,152 new applications for employment from veterans, of which 809 were Vietnam Veterans. During the same period 1,187 job placements of veterans were made, with 693 being Vietnam Era Veterans.

We anticipate the impact of the jobs made available through the Emergency Employment Act of 1971 will stimulate further job placement of Vietnam Era Veterans. As a matter of fact, early reports from our Manpower Centers concerning this program show a high number of veterans placed in the openings now being processed under the Emergency Employment Act.

Sincerely,

FRANK E. CASHEL, Director.

OUR NATIONAL LABOR POLICY

HON. DAVID N. HENDERSON

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 17, 1971

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, you may be surprised to learn that during the first 150 years of our country's existence, there was no such thing as a Federal labor law. Not until 1926 when Congress passed the Railway Labor Act did the Federal Government take any action toward regulating labor or employment relations.

The Railway Labor Act came about because of the great number of disputes in the railroad industry after World War I which disrupted transportation of goods in interstate commerce. Its purpose was to provide a procedure for settlement of such disputes and to prevent rail carriers from interfering with efforts of their employees to form and join labor unions. The central policy of the Railway Labor Act was expressed in the statement in section 2, fourth, that:

Employees shall have the right to organize and bargain collectively through representatives of their own choosing. (45 USC, sec. 152, Fourth)

Nothing was said in the act about the right of employees to refrain from joining or forming labor unions, and within a short time the railroad brotherhoods became worried about the possibility that workers could be coerced by the carriers into joining company dominated and controlled unions. As a result the unions requested that Congress amend the railway act to include a prohibition on any form of compulsory unionism agreements. In accordance with this request Congress in 1934 amended section 2, fourth, to read:

It shall be unlawful for any carrier to interfere in any way with the organization of its employees . . . or to influence or coerce employees in an effort to induce them to join or remain or not join or remain members of any labor organization, or to deduct from the wages of employees any dues, fees, assessments or other contributions payable to labor organizations.

It is thus an historic, if somewhat ironic, fact that organized labor itself was the first to insist upon incorporation of the right to work principle in a Federal labor statute. These union officials were well aware that compulsory unionism agreements are frequently nothing more than "sweetheart" contracts.

Until the year 1935 workers in industries other than the railroad industry had no Federal law to protect their organizing activities or their efforts to obtain collective bargaining rights from their employers. All this was changed with the enactment in 1935 of the Wagner Act, officially known as the National Labor Relations Act, which was the first comprehensive Federal labor statute.

This new statute was frankly designed to encourage the formation of labor unions and to strengthen their bargaining position with employers. The act made it unlawful for an employer to

interfere with organizational activities of employees or to refuse to bargain with a union representing employees. One of the most important features of this new law was the provision in section 8(a)(3) which permitted union agreements requiring all workers in a bargaining unit to belong to the union and pay union dues.

Armed with this extraordinary privilege of being authorized to demand agreements requiring all employees to join the union and pay union dues as a condition of employment, labor officials launched intensive organizing drives which skyrocketed their membership from a level of approximately two million in 1935 to an estimated high of 17 million in the next 10 years, and swelled their treasuries with a tenfold increase in dues payments, initiation fees, and other types of assessments. How many of the newly acquired "members" were forced into the unions under compulsory union shop and closed shop contracts is impossible to determine, but conservative estimates place the number at 3 million. Compulsory unionism mushroomed under the emergency created by World War II.

Labor Department reports show that prior to World War II only 20 percent of all employees covered by union contracts were bound by compulsory membership agreements; however, in 1946, 77 percent were subjected to such clauses. During the war, the Government-sanctioned wage-price administrators frequently recommended forced unionism clauses as the price for keeping union officials from calling employees out on strike.

Emboldened by their success union officials began pushing their demand for compulsory unionism harder and harder, and, as might be expected, these efforts did not go unnoticed by the American public, particularly those members of the public who were unwillingly forced to pay union dues. In response to the public reaction a number of States, beginning in 1944, adopted laws prohibiting compulsory unionism. The first such laws were adopted as amendments to the constitutions of Florida and Arkansas, in 1944. Other States quickly followed suit and there are now 19 States with right to work laws on their books.

Eleven of these State right to work laws were in force at the time Congress adopted the Taft-Hartley Act amendments to the National Labor Relations Act in 1947, and in order to eliminate any doubt as to the effect the Federal law would have upon such State laws Congress wrote into the Taft-Hartley Act the now famous section 14(b), which expressly provides that nothing in the National Labor Relations Act—

shall be construed as authorizing the execution or application of agreements requiring membership in a labor organization as a condition of employment in any State or Territory in which such execution or application is prohibited by State or Territorial law.

In 1951, the railroad unions were successful in pushing through Congress an amendment that deleted the 1934 right to work provision in the Railway Labor

Act. Immediately thereafter officials of the railroad brotherhoods insisted that management accede to their demands for compulsory "union shop" agreements. Management objected, and President Truman then appointed Emergency Board No. 98 to settle the dispute. That Board concluded that the Congress, by adopting the 1951 amendment to the act—section 2, eleventh—established a Federal policy in favor of the "union shop." It recommended that the railroad companies conform to that policy, and they were compelled to do so.

Recalling that it was the railroad unions that favored voluntary unionism in 1934, why the change of view in 1951? Mr. George Harrison who was President of the Brotherhood of Railway Clerks in 1951 and the chief spokesman for the Railroad Brotherhood officials, answered this question when he complained that unions were unable to discipline members effectively because of the voluntary nature of their affiliation with the union. Associate Justice Brennan referred to this when giving the opinion of the U.S. Supreme Court in *International Association of Machinists et al. v. S. B. Street et al.*, 367 U.S. 740, 763, 6 L. Ed. 2d 1158 (1961):

Mr. Harrison expressly disclaimed that the union shop was sought in order to strengthen the bargaining power of the union. . . . Nor was any claim seriously advanced that the union shop was necessary to hold or increase membership. The prohibition against union security in the 1934 Act had not interfered with the growth of union membership or caused the unions to lose their positions as exclusive bargaining agents.

Totally virtually all railroad workers in the country are victims of compulsory unionism as a direct result of the action taken by the Congress in 1951. Previously, they were protected by a right to work provision in the National Railway Labor Act. None of them is protected by the existing 19 State right to work laws, inasmuch as the governing Federal statute does not contain a provision similar to section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act. Therefore compulsory union shop agreements are enforceable in the railroad and airline industries in all 50 States.

The review of the development of our national labor policy makes it crystal clear that the problem of compulsory unionism actually arises because it is sanctioned by the Government of the United States. Yes, the culprit is the Federal Government. Our Federal labor policy encourages and abets interference and intrusions on the individual rights of the Nation's working men and women. It is injurious to the country's economic and political wellbeing. Union abuses will continue to multiply until Congress establishes a policy of voluntary, rather than compulsory unionism.

It is well to note that Congress moved in that direction by including in the Postal Reorganization Act of 1970 a provision permitting only voluntary unionism in the Postal Service. In that instance, the House of Representatives went on record as favoring voluntary unionism by a vote of 226 to 159.

Now Congress must take the necessary action to correct the inequities resulting from the National Labor Relations Act

and Railway Labor Act by passing the National Right to Work bill. This will give workers in the private sector of our economy the same rights and freedoms which have been given the postal workers in the public sector by specific congressional action.

EXTREME POLLUTION IN RHINE RIVER, GERMANY

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 19, 1971

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the Christian Science Monitor of October 14, 1971, carried an article datelined Bonn, West Germany, under the heading "Even Eel Fishers Draw Empty Nets on Rhine."

The article makes it clear that the reason that eels, a hardy species, are absenting themselves from the Rhine River is because of extreme pollution. There are rivers in the United States which are polluted to the same or almost the same extent as the Rhine.

There is legislation pending in the House which would enable us to correct this situation and I feel that it is time for the Congress to act.

I include the text of the Christian Science article at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

EVEN EEL FISHERS DRAW EMPTY NETS ON RHINE

(By Harry Ellis)

Morning after morning over the past hot summer the eel fishers of the Rhine have drawn up their nets and found them empty.

In a good season each of the 27 men who fish this section of the Rhine for a living catches upward of 5,000 pounds of the long, snakelike fish, esteemed by German gourmets.

Last summer, according to Paul Jansen, chairman of the Rhine Fishermen's Association, not one of his colleagues has taken more than 60 pounds of eel since the end of May.

The reason, experts agree, is pollution. Not pollution of a sudden, dramatic kind, like the spilling of insecticide into the Rhine, which killed all fish in the river in 1969.

The culprit this year is cumulative pollution, the gradual wearing down of the river's ability to cleanse itself, with the result that even coarse fish—eel, carp, and the like—cannot survive.

Understandably, Mr. Jansen and other men who work on the rolled, dark waters of the Rhine see the problem in terms of providing a living for their families.

OXYGEN CONTENT HIT ZERO

Water-pollution experts, taking a wider view, project growing danger for millions of Germans and Dutchmen dependent on the lower Rhine for drinking water, irrigation, and industrial use.

On June 8 and 9, according to state officials of North Rhine-Westphalia, the oxygen content of the Rhine at the city of Koblenz, assaulted by a massive onslaught of urban and industrial sewage from the Main and Neckar Rivers, dropped to zero.

Oxygen-starved bacteria no longer could neutralize polluted wastes, and the river at Koblenz and downstream turned foul smelling and almost black.

All three rivers, Rhine, Neckar, and Main, had been low, with the result that much sewage had sunk to the bottom, instead of flowing out to sea.

Then had come heavy rains and the Main and Neckar, flowing more swiftly, had carried their stirred-up bottom mud to the Rhine.

Quickly the oxygen content at the measuring station at Koblenz sank to zero milligrams per liter of Rhine water, from earlier levels of 4 to 6 milligrams.

"At the Dutch-German frontier," declared a Dutch engineer in The Hague, "the oxygen count in the Rhine was down to 1 milligram per liter, instead of the normal 3 at this time of year." (Even 3 milligrams is considered dangerously low.)

DISCHARGE ORDER STOPPED

Immediately the state government of North Rhine-Westphalia ordered factories to stop discharging heated water into the Rhine until the oxygen content of the river had restored itself.

This is easier said than done. Huge cooling towers used by modern industrial plants reduce, but cannot eliminate, the temperature rise in river water cycled through factories. Many older plants lack cooling towers.

Meanwhile, stringent laws in North Rhine-Westphalia, which houses the industrial Ruhr, require any new factory to guarantee no damage to the environment before the plant can be built. Such laws, effective on a federal scale, should prevent industrial pollution from multiplying in the future.

BUILDUP IS DENSE

Some existing Ruhr factories are building water-purification plants, beginning to reduce chimney emissions of sulfur dioxide and other noxious gases, and shipping their acid wastes in sealed containers out to sea to be dumped, instead of pouring them into the Rhine.

"All this is to the good," remarked an expert. "But the problem is, here in the Ruhr we build our factories and cities cheek by jowl, so that often a residential community is separated from a chemical plant only by a fence."

The result for the Rhine, he continued, is that urban and industrial wastes have poured into the river in unprecedented volume since World War II, as German production boomed.

Gradually the Rhine's ability to cleanse itself has been so taxed that sudden rains, as in early June, can "kill" the river at critical points by exhausting the river's oxygen.

Mr. Jansen himself pays tribute to the efforts of federal, state, and local governments to restock the Rhine after the total fish kill of 1969.

But the empty eel nets he and his colleagues have drawn up from the river this summer show how much more must be accomplished before the damage of decades can be undone.

Even at best, such measures are only palliatives. With the temperature of the Rhine slowly but inexorably rising year by year, the June 8-9 disaster could recur at any time.

The problem, as one German expert put it, is twofold. Scientists must develop some way to restore oxygen to a river, by "chemical, technical, or biological means," instead of leaving the job to nature.

Second, Chancellor Willy Brandt's government must hammer through Parliament a law giving environmental control authority to the federal government. Currently each Land, or state, has jurisdiction over its own water, land, and air, with the result that regulations vary in kind and effectiveness from state to state.

LEGISLATORS DELUGED

Deluged by expert opinion that air and water pollution in congested areas of West Germany has passed the danger point, Parliament deputies appear ready to give Mr. Brandt's government the authority it seeks.

That would allow coordination, as scientists grapple with the unsolved problem of restoring oxygen to a starved river.

A few giant German chemical and petrochemical firms have developed cleansing sys-

tems that pump oxygen into "used" water, so that billions of bacteria—nurtured by the factory—can neutralize wastes before the water is returned to the Rhine.

To build such a purification plant for a single large factory costs millions of dollars. To do the same job for the Rhine itself is a task whose technical and cost aspects are staggering.

THE VAIL MEDAL AWARDS

HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 19, 1971

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, recently two of my constituents, employees of the Western Electric Co. in Sunnyvale, Calif., were awarded the Vail Medal for heroism and courage. These gentlemen are Mr. George R. Wolf, engineering associate at Western Electric, and Mr. Harlan E. Shoemaker, systems equipment engineer. Mr. Wolf received the silver Vail Medal and Mr. Shoemaker the bronze Vail Medal.

I include the following:

For the past fifty years, acts of helpfulness—often heroism—by telephone men and women have built a tradition which demonstrates their keen awareness of their individual responsibility to serve their fellow man.

Many of these acts are so outstanding they merit a lasting symbol of recognition. In the Bell System, such recognition is provided by the Vail Medal Award, established in 1920 as a memorial to Theodore N. Vail, president of the American Telephone and Telegraph Company from 1907 to 1919. The award reflects the Bell System's abiding traditions of loyalty and devotion to duty.

Cast in gold, silver or bronze, the medal exemplifies and perpetuates the high ideals of Vail, whose likeness appears on the face of the medal.

The standards to be met to qualify for a Vail medal are exacting. It is given for initiative, resourcefulness, courage, fortitude and accomplishment in averting or easing the effects of catastrophe, saving human life, maintaining or restoring telephone service, and preventing or minimizing damage to property.

In the course of the fifty years of the award's existence, it has been presented to more than 2,260 Bell System people. Of their number, 1,998 have received bronze medals, 248 silver medals and 19 gold medals.

During this time, Western Electric people received 46 bronze medals, 13 silver medals and two gold medals. Today's awards mark the first time people at the Pacific Region's headquarters in Sunnyvale have received Vail medals. For this and their acts of heroism and their individual willingness to serve their fellow man, Western Electric is especially proud to honor George R. Wolf and Harlan E. Shoemaker.

GEORGE R. WOLF

The Silver Theodore N. Vail Medal for Noteworthy Public Service was awarded to George R. Wolf, Engineering Associate, Sunnyvale, California, for heroism and quick-thinking response in the rescue of a young boy from possible drowning.

On May 29, 1970, Mr. Wolf, his wife and friends were fishing along a creek in Yosemite National Park. The creek, swollen with melting snow runoff, had turbulent rapids. Mr. Wolf was on the bank of the creek changing a lure on his fishing line when he heard shouts from upstream. He saw a small boy being carried downstream by the swift current.

Without regard for his own safety, Mr. Wolf instantly dropped his fishing pole,

threw off his jacket and plunged into the icy water. He positioned himself in the stream and intercepted the child as he was swept down. The ranging current carried Mr. Wolf and the boy further downstream before he was able to grab hold of a rock in the rapids and prevent them from being swept over a 25-foot waterfall a short distance downstream.

A group of people on shore formed a human chain into the water and helped Mr. Wolf and the badly bruised child to safety. The six-year-old boy was treated at a hospital for a mild concussion, bruises and abrasions.

Through his courageous disregard for his own safety, Mr. Wolf is credited with saving a life.

HARLAN E. SHOEMAKER

The Bronze Theodore N. Vail Medal for Noteworthy Public Service was awarded to Harlan E. Shoemaker, Engineering Associate (promoted to Systems Equipment Engineer, September, 1970), Sunnyvale, California, for spontaneous action and courage in helping to rescue a seriously injured climber.

On May 7, 1970, Mr. Shoemaker and his wife had paused at a scenic spot high above a valley in Yosemite National Park, when they heard a faint cry for help. Unable to spot anyone through his binoculars, Mr. Shoemaker quickly drove his car back down the road about three miles to where he had seen an empty parked car. Here he encountered an hysterical young man who asked for help for his companion who had fallen approximately 270 feet while rock climbing.

Despite his street shoes and no climbing experience, Mr. Shoemaker scaled 500 feet over large boulders and rocks in search of the injured victim, but to no avail. Then, joined by a Park Ranger and the other young man, they climbed 350 feet and located the unconscious victim on a rock ledge.

Mr. Shoemaker and the victim's companion each positioned a foot on a small outcrop of rock. They began treating the injured man for shock by loosening his clothing and massaging his arms and legs while a former Army combat medic climbed above the victim to treat his severely bleeding head wound. When it became apparent the victim was in danger of slipping over the ledge and falling another 50 feet, Mr. Shoemaker unhesitatingly placed both feet on the jutting ledge and held onto another rock with one hand. He kept his precarious position for approximately two hours continuing to administer first aid with his free hand until a rescue team arrived. Subsequently, the victim underwent successful brain surgery.

Exhibiting bravery, tenacity and clear thinking in the face of crisis, Mr. Shoemaker's actions exemplify the finest tradition of service to the public.

Both Mr. Wolf and Mr. Shoemaker received personal letters of congratulation from President Nixon and it is a pleasure for me to bring the heroic deeds of these fine gentlemen to the attention of the House of Representatives. Their acts should serve as an example for all Americans.

BUD HILLIS—AVIATION AUTHORITY

HON. EARL F. LANDGREBE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 19, 1971

Mr. LANDGREBE. Mr. Speaker, it is rare when a freshman Member of this House gains a reputation as a leading authority in the House on a subject. But my dear friend and distinguished col-

league from Indiana, BUD HILLIS, has managed to attain that stature. As evidenced by his floor managership of the air controller bill in a recent session, BUD HILLIS has become one of our foremost authorities on the subject of aviation.

BUD comes by this authority from personal experience. During his service in the Army Air Corps during World War II, he was bitten by the aviation bug. In postwar civilian life, he qualified for a pilot's license and has flown his own private airplane for many years. Like every flyer I have ever known, he is an absolute nut on the subject.

Now that he is a Member of this House, BUD has brought his wealth of information and his dedication to aviation with him. He realizes that American aviation has many problems, with which this House must deal. Foremost among these is the potential safety crisis of air traffic control. As a member of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, he is in a unique position to assist the hard-pressed air controllers in the Federal Aviation Administration.

Recently, BUD visited a modern air control facility in Knoxville, Tenn., and learned some information, which will be of interest to this House and to the public. In the event the air controllers bill goes to conference, it would be of special interest to the conferees. BUD yesterday made a 5-minute radio broadcast to the people of his district on the subject. Because of its national importance, I include the text of his broadcast at this point in the RECORD:

NOVEMBER 18, 1971.

RADIO REPORT NO. 43

ANNOUNCER. And now for another Washington Report with your Congressman Bud Hillis, who represents the Fifth Congressional District of Indiana.

I understand that you have just seen something that is perhaps a breakthrough in the area of safety from the standpoint of our airlines and air traffic.

HILLIS. Yes, this is right. I most recently had the opportunity to go to Knoxville, Tennessee and view the very latest equipment that FAA now has under test in this important area of air safety.

This equipment is quite a sophisticated application of the use of data processing information and computer technology to display on a radar screen to a controller on possible conflicting air traffic. This means that the machine will accept programmed data from the controller, analyze it and also analyze other information that has previously been stored in it and will warn the controller of any problems that it sees in the way of traffic conflicts in that area.

ANNOUNCER. In other words, this will tend to eliminate great areas of potential human error.

HILLIS. It could do that. It certainly would eliminate some of the stress and strain that I know so well that the air traffic controllers of this country are under.

ANNOUNCER. Let's back up just a moment and discuss the legislation which you have introduced and supported to improve traffic safety and then let's discuss how this new innovation will tie into that legislation.

HILLIS. Well, first of all, the legislation which passed the House took into effect the terrific strain and stresses the air traffic controllers are under in peak hours in their duties. This legislation would provide for early retirement and more importantly if a man was unfit physically to go on, retraining for other work.

This legislation passed the house some four weeks ago and is now in the Senate. It no doubt will pass the Senate but probably will come back again before what is known as a Conference Committee which Members of our Committee will serve. I want to be in a position to advise the Conferees if I am not a conferee myself on what the latest developments are in this field. When this legislation was under consideration, I visited various air traffic control facilities and saw some of the newest equipment. I wanted to apprise myself of this latest development even though it is experimental.

ANNOUNCER. Even though experimental, Congressman Hillis, the fact is that if it works over the long run, as the experiments are carried out, it could prolong the working life of the air traffic controller. Isn't that correct?

HILLIS. Oh, I think it definitely will do that because every place we went previously we found that this was a young men's business. A man as he gets into his middle forties perhaps is too old to make these quick decisions that are necessary. Perhaps with this type of equipment at his disposal, he won't be called on to have to make that instantaneous but correct decision that he is not able to do at that age.

ANNOUNCER. Let me go behind the scenes here just a little bit in Congress. Now you have picked up some new information on this trip to Knoxville, how do Congressmen go about informing their colleagues of the fact that a new technological breakthrough may be in the offing?

HILLIS. Well, just as soon as this breakthrough is announced, I intend to prepare a statement for the Congressional Record which is distributed to all the offices here and read by all the Members and many of their staffs informing them of this latest development and the conclusions that I reached as the result of actually getting to see it in action.

ANNOUNCER. Congressman Hillis, what was the most revolutionary thing that you saw concerning this new equipment down in Knoxville?

HILLIS. Well, to me it was when they explained to us that next spring, beginning about in either April or May, they will program this equipment and that the controller will inform a pilot of a special radio frequency and when he switches to the frequency he will then talk directly to the computer itself and the computer will answer him. Now this is done much as we record a voice today on tape.

ANNOUNCER. Just like we are doing right now?

HILLIS. Yes. It's done by the storing of digital information in the computer and the computer through its intricate workings can come up with the right answer at the right time. In other words, the computer will search out itself and all of the traffic information it has stored and advise the pilot that perhaps there is a plane out there very close to him.

ANNOUNCER. Thank you, Congressman Hillis. This has been another Washington Report with your Congressman Bud Hillis, who represents the Fifth Congressional District of Indiana.

NATO: 22 YEARS OF AGE: MAJORITY OR SENILITY

HON. J. EDWARD ROUSH

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 19, 1971

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, for some time I have been concerned about the size of our troop commitment in Europe and our failure to give a serious review to

the numbers of troops we continue to maintain there. I believe that at this time there is a more receptive attitude toward this concern of mine. Accordingly I would like to discuss this issue in some detail.

Our troops have been in Western Europe for 25 years. The troops initially remained there as an occupation force and for mutual defense against a Soviet attack. American presence was needed because the Western European countries were ravaged both militarily and economically. I might add here that the Soviet Union was equally ravaged with over 20 million dead. Yet because of the very nature of Russia's vastness and subsequent American and British aid, the Soviet Army had survived the brutal attack and was recovering. The Soviets were unchecked in much of Europe and were in a position to take and hold any objective which was left to them by the United States and Britain.

The Soviet Union did retain old expansionistic goals which were motivated by economics rather than political humanitarianism. While the allies' decisions were motivated by what would end the war most expeditiously, Soviet decisions were political and motivated by nationalistic policy. Churchill understood this and sought a troop landing in the Balkans in order to head off Soviet strength in Eastern Europe. His warnings were not heeded and the Soviet Army was permitted to "liberate" Eastern Europe and capture Berlin. Like the rest of Europe, the Soviet Union had been terribly hurt by the war, but the Soviet Army was in Berlin while the rest of Europe was prostrate.

In the center of this macabre circus stood the world's only nuclear power. This country, in 1945, had \$21 billion in gold reserves, or 70 percent of the world's supply.

This percentage excludes the Soviet Union's reserves as that country refuses to release its figures. By 1948 the United States had extended its wealth to \$29 billion and set out to lift Western Europe off its own back. Initially the problem was primarily economic but by 1948 the U.S.S.R. had successfully enshrouded Eastern Europe and had an atomic bomb. The world Communist design became a renewed threat. Communist activity seemed to be at its apogee in China, Eastern Europe, and the third world.

This was the world into which NATO was ultimately born. The theory had been hatched by Roosevelt and Churchill in the early 1940's and the need seemed all the more desperate by the late 1940's.

To say the world has changed in the past 25 years is the ultimate understatement. The lines are still basically the same but they are thin, more fluid, and not always visible.

Western Europe has been restored to economic stability and the United States now faces economic peril. Where this country once held 70 percent—\$29 billion—of the world's known gold supply it now has \$10.3 billion or roughly 25 percent of the world supply. West Germany alone has more American dollars than we have gold. In total, our overseas liabilities amount to four times our available gold supply. This means we would need the world's entire known gold

supply plus \$1 billion more to back up these liabilities. Unemployment in this country is greater than in any of the Western European countries. In West Germany where the core of our NATO troops are based, unemployment is less than 1 percent and 2 million workers have been imported as a needed force. These figures reflect not only a strong economy but an apparent boom. So, as regards the basics, Western Europe is in better shape than the United States. Western Europe has more manpower and has a greater gold reserve than the United States.

The latest development has been a refusal to support the dollar. As of the end of fiscal 1971 the dollar had been devalued 4 to 7 percent all over Europe. Our liabilities are stretched well beyond reasonable limits and this devaluation might well be only the beginning of greater financial problems. Very simply, Europe has more dollars than it needs. The continent is saturated with our paper; we have nothing to back it up and Europe knows it.

But in spite of this, our troop levels and dependent levels remain high—unreasonably high in light of their purpose, but I shall discuss this later.

To top off this bleak economic picture, the United States has had a deficit in its balance of payments for 19 out of the last 21 years. Since 1961 this Nation has operated on a deficit in Western Europe averaging \$1.6 billion. Our offset agreements with Germany—the last one ran out June 30, 1971, and we are presently negotiating a new one—cannot hope to make up this deficit. What is more, much of the offset payments are short-term German loans and therefore only postpone the fiddler's payment. The offset agreement is literally a postponement agreement and nothing more.

So this is what can happen when 6 percent of the world's population assumes the role of world guardian and banker. It is like the man who gives blood in order to save another individual but is not permitted to get off the table until he himself is prostrate, or worse, until he has nothing left to give. Let me mention a few statistics.

We have between 300,000 and 307,000 troops in Europe. This includes the 6th Fleet in the Mediterranean.

The troops are deployed as follows:
 Germany, 215,000 troops.
 Greece, 3,000.
 Italy, 10,000.
 Spain, not a member of NATO, 10,000.
 Turkey, 8,000.
 United Kingdom, 20,000.
 The service breakdown is:
 Army, 185,000.
 Air Force, 75,000.
 Navy/Marines, 35,000.
 MAAGS, 5,000.
 Dependents, 225,000.

As pointed out above we have 225,000 dependents in Western Europe. The majority, 145,000, are in West Germany.

The costs of U.S. forces in Europe have been estimated on three bases:

First, \$14 billion represents the estimated total cost of U.S. general purpose forces usually based in the United States and maintained primarily for use in a European emergency, related support elements and headquarters in NATO Eu-

rope, the support in the United States such as training and logistics required for these forces, military assistance for NATO countries and the NATO military construction program.

Second. \$7 to \$8 billion represents the cost of general purpose forces stationed in NATO Europe—including the Sixth Fleet—plus the U.S. support base required for these forces, that is, cost of new equipment and training and logistics support.

Third. \$3.2 billion represents the operating cost of U.S. forces actually stationed in NATO Europe—including Sixth Fleet. It includes military personnel costs and the costs for operating and maintaining equipment and facilities used by these personnel. It excludes indirect logistics and administrative costs outside of NATO Europe, major procurement and construction to the NATO construction program. The \$3.2 billion total is included in \$7 to \$8 billion total which, in turn, is included in the \$14 billion estimate.

Fourth. The balance-of-payments drain for fiscal year 1971 was \$1.8 billion.

With regard to our offset agreement with the Federal Republic of Germany—FRG—it used to be of great benefit to this country in the early 1960's when the FRG was building up a defensive force. This agreement largely offset the balance-of-payments impact of U.S. defense expenditures in West Germany—approximately 80 percent of deficits. At this time, the German buildup has ceased and hence the need and actual buying of arms from the United States has also ceased.

Our NATO Allies contribute to the central front (i.e. primarily West German bases) as follows:

- FRG, 326,000.
- France, 34,000—has withdrawn militarily from NATO.
- Britain, 53,500.
- Italy, none.
- Portugal, none.
- Greece, none.
- Turkey, none.
- Netherlands, 80,000—considered in central front.
- Belgium, 70,000—considered in central front.
- Canada, 3,100.
- Denmark, 27,000—considered in central front.
- Luxembourg, 550—part of the central front.

The figures listed for Netherlands, Belgium, Denmark, and Luxembourg indicate the entire army force in each country. The number of troops contributed by the Allies to NATO's central front is 594,150. The United States contributes 215,000.

The U.S. share of manpower has declined in the past 10 years. In 1961, the United States provided roughly 50 percent of NATO's combat ready troops. Our troops are down from a high of 434,000 in 1961 and the other NATO countries have increased their quotas. At present, our NATO Allies have over 2 million men in their armies. They spend a combined total of \$24 billion annually.

The primary contribution made by the Allies is their purchase of improved weaponry: modern tanks, improved mobilization systems, antisubmarine ships,

and aircraft. Ten of the European Allies—the Eurogroup—have established a European defense improvement program—EDIP—which contributes beyond the NATO commitments. The EDIP is expected to add \$1 billion to the effort in the next 5 years.

Last, I might add that the other allies have, in the past, purchased military equipment from the United States on the average of \$250 million annually.

Allow me to add a parenthetical breakdown on expenses: NATO costs its members at least \$40 billion annually. Fourteen of the 15 members contribute \$24 billion. Ten of those 14 members intend to add another \$200 million per year for the next 5 years. The United States spends \$14 billion on NATO and NATO-oriented forces. Plus, this country lost \$1.8 billion in the balance-of-payments drain last year in Western Europe alone. This \$1.8 billion figure represents the direct dollar cost for supporting our troops in Western Europe. Our grand total becomes \$16 billion.

Despite the fact that the NATO Allies now supply 90 percent of the manpower, the United States continues to pay 40 percent of all NATO costs.

To get a true picture of the pertinence of our NATO force in Europe one must bring the already discussed troop figures to life by analyzing combat effectiveness.

Our NATO combat force consists of 4½ divisions at 90-percent strength according to the Department of Defense. This means we have 59,000 combat troops less, of which 40,000 are prepared to fire at the enemy. In addition to these combat units we have 4½ initial support increments, and 2½ sustaining support increments or 88,000 support troops. In each of the 4½ combat divisions there are an additional 8,000 troops who do not fight but fulfill further support duties. There are 7,000 officers and enlisted men assigned to administrative commands. One general/flag officer for each 2,343 men is assigned to Europe. Few, if any, Armed Forces units of less than 3,000 men are authorized a general/flag officer as a commander. This still leaves the function of 22,900 men virtually unexplained.

One can easily see how our present posture in Europe is breaking our back economically. The obvious question becomes: Is it worth the price? Tragically the answer appears to be "No." Advocates of our present troop levels in Europe say we are pared to the bone—that we need the present number of troops to deter a Soviet attack and at the same time maintain a war on a conventional plane. This is the crux of the dilemma. "We need the present force levels to avoid nuclear war." Says who? In the event of a Soviet attack, the use of tactical nuclear weapons has been in our Army's game plan for over 10 years. This is evidenced by the fact that the United States has 7,000 nuclear warheads stored in Europe.

NATO is no longer an effective shield but a symbol. Our troops are outnumbered and are so ill-positioned that it was estimated during the 1962 Berlin crisis that it would take 30 days to mobilize. Bear in mind that this would have taken place during peacetime. Under war conditions—the Soviets would have air superiority—our forces may never succeed in mobilizing.

Two combat divisions could serve the same purpose as the 4½ divisions presently on the central front. Theoretically, one man, or even a piece of paper, could serve the same military purpose.

I was able to speak with the man who prepared the extensive memorandum on the NATO issue for Senator MANSFIELD, Mr. Edward L. King. This memorandum was literally 6 years in preparation. Mr. King has had a great opportunity to study the NATO question as a staff planner within the military stationed in Europe. I felt, in closing, his remarks would be pertinent.

Mr. King said that from his study of the subject he had concluded that our combat force—actually numbering 40,000 to 50,000 men—is extravagantly over-supported. He felt a troop cut of 150,000 men was more realistic than our present force levels but that a troop level of 75,000 to 100,000 was probably most realistic. Mr. King maintained we could cut our costs in one or both of two ways. The United States could cut its NATO force in Europe or cut its NATO committed troops stationed on domestic bases. He favored taking both steps but said that if only one could be taken, he would prefer the former. The cut in our Europe based troops would save roughly \$500 million on our balance-of-payments drain and \$1 billion in cost savings. A cutback in our NATO committed forces in the United States would only represent a cost savings.

Mr. King concluded that our NATO force is no longer an effective shield and likened its continuance to pumping blood into a corpse. Mr. King said he has seen and studied the degenerating operation of our NATO force and considers its structure tottering. His greatest fear at present is that as a result we may actually totter and topple into a nuclear war. It does not require a fertile imagination to recognize this fear as a valid one.

In terms of our actual national security and recent economic dilemma, a re-evaluation of our present commitments would appear to be wise.

WESTERN EUROPE CAN BE SAVED

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 19, 1971

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, there is necessary preoccupation with the President's forthcoming visits to Peking and Moscow and the euphoria surrounding such trips is something that must be properly recognized. Of special importance is the need to recognize that the foreign policy goal of the Soviet Union and the Communist bloc is that of continued expansion, by whatever means possible, of communism, and the free world cannot for a moment relax.

Therefore, it was with special interest that I noted the article in the Aurora, Ill., Beacon-News of November 5 by Dumitru Danielopol, the distinguished foreign correspondent of the Copley Press, which I believe is a very pertinent and timely commentary on Western Europe.

The article follows:

WESTERN EUROPE CAN BE SAVED
(By Dumitru Danielopol)

WASHINGTON.—Can Western Europe be saved from sweeping domination by the Soviet Union?

"Yes," says Axel Springer, "but only just." Germany's largest publisher recently gave a Washington audience a straight-from-the-shoulder appraisal of the European political situation as seen from his 20-story headquarters hard by the Berlin Wall.

Chancellor Willy Brandt and backers of his "ostpolitik" wouldn't have appreciated it.

Brandt's "ostpolitik," Springer said, dovetails with a Soviet "westpolitik" that aims at controlling all Europe.

Springer rejects the illusion that the Kremlin leaders have changed, that they have abandoned their ambition to conquer Western Europe and eventually the world for communism.

Compromise with the Reds is impossible, he said. "Peaceful coexistence aims at taking away from the capitalists by peaceful means all positions they still hold," he said.

The tall, blond, handsome German newspaperman ran into trouble in pre-war Germany for opposing Hitler. He started to build his newspaper empire in 1945 armed only with a license from the occupying British Army and a borrowed typewriter.

His publishing group today is the largest in Europe with five newspapers including the world famous Die Welt of Hamburg.

In the relentless struggle between East and West, Berlin is vital, Springer says, "one of the most important pawns for the Soviet Union."

Brandt, a former mayor of West Berlin, is well aware of its importance, Springer says.

"Berlin exists for the vision some day to be the capital of a free and united people," Brandt once said.

But Brandt cannot forget western inaction in 1961 when the Russians built the Berlin Wall, Springer adds.

"It may be that the seeds of his new dangerous policy towards the East were already laid on this fateful August 13, 1961," according to the publisher.

If Brandt's "ostpolitik" goes unchallenged, the results will not be a "peaceful, prosperous, quiet, united Europe, which is a partner of the United States, the result will be rather a Europe whose total resources would be at the disposal of the Soviet Union."

To substitute treaties with Moscow for guarantees of NATO, he says, would be a "catastrophe."

Without the alliance of the West, built with American help and with America as the leading member, the free world would be doomed, he claims.

As Springer sees it, the choice for Germany and for the free world is a simple one.

They must decide, he says, between a "Pax Americana" or a "Pax Sovietica."

"One excludes the other," he says. "Pax Americana would mean continued hope for all mankind; Pax Sovietica, new dark ages in our time."

FORTRESS ON 78TH STREET

HON. TIM LEE CARTER
OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 19, 1971

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, the November 19, 1971, issue of Life magazine contained an article describing the abject fear pervading certain areas of New York City. It seems that these citizens are in constant danger, that their homes are frequently broken into and treasures stolen. After they are attacked, abused, and mugged.

I regret to say that this same situation exists throughout the District of Columbia. Only 3 weeks ago my car was stolen from behind the apartment in which I live. When it was found, it had been completely wrecked.

Every day we read of murders, rapes, and heinous crimes. Mr. Speaker, we must do more to make the homes of American citizens safe. It may require doubling the number of police; but if that is required, it must be done.

I include the article from Life magazine for the perusal of the Members:

FORTRESS ON 78TH STREET

Street crime moves indoors—shoving into hallways, up fire escapes, over rooftops, chiseling away at doors and windows. In every large American city and in the suburbs as well, burglars and robbers wage their guerrilla warfare against homes and apartments. In defense, Manhattan's once proud, tree-shaded East 78th Street has become a solemn row of brownstone fortresses. East 78th Street is not a slum area; it is actually one of the city's richest and safest. Yet in one six-story building, shown on these pages and on the cover, 17 of the 24 apartments have been burglarized at least once. Apartment 2B in that building is less a home than a jail cell, a nearly impregnable bastion defended by five locks, two peepholes as well as alarms, chains, bars, bolts and booby traps. This fortress on 78th Street is not simply a response to a crime problem particular to Manhattan. On the contrary: nine other major U.S. cities have worse burglary problems than New York.

TO QUOTE SOME OF THE TENANTS

"I often see prowlers on the balconies of the building next door," says Norma, apartment 4B. "I call the police, the police come and chase the prowler up to the rooftop, then the prowler jumps over onto our fire escape, climbs up on our roof and gets away. I've met intruders face to face in my apartment and my handbag was stolen. I know my apartment is vulnerable, but I won't live behind bars. So rather than set up gates, I splurged on an expensive alarm system."

Alexander, who lives in 4C, has never been burglarized, though not long ago he was mugged on a neighboring street. "We never get robbed because we never take down the storm windows, and my wife is always there." He's been in the apartment 27 years. "We only have one lock because lots of locks mean people are wealthy and they must have something worth stealing. This city was a paradise in 1907 when I came from Gibraltar. Now it's not safe anymore. I think I'd like to live in Pennsylvania."

Rosalind has been in apartment 3C for 20 years. "It used to be safe in this neighborhood," she says. "Now I find signs that they've tried to pick my lock and force the door." Because she's home most of the day, burglars have not yet broken in. She has a chain on her door, a heavy lock, special screw locks on the windows, and has hammered nails into the window frames so that the windows will open only a few inches at the bottom. "They broke into my mailbox," she says. "They even stole the name off it."

Bob, burglarized once in 5D, has window gates, nails in the window frames, and two locks on the door. His car and his bicycle were stolen in front of the apartment house. "When they took the bike, they left the chain and lock behind." Burglars who invaded his apartment made off with a guitar, radio, jewelry, cash—and a spare set of door keys. "Now I've got new locks, a new car, and a motorcycle, which I keep in a garage."

THE RAIDERS ARE BOLD, THE TENANTS CAUTIOUS

Burglars attacking the fortress go at it like commandos dropped behind enemy lines. Mostly heroin addicts and often black, they are after whatever can be quickly converted

into cash. Escape routes are prepared, barbed wire cut, bricks pulled from building walls to give footholds to the roof. Inside, the tenants hear noises and wait for the sound of chisels, the face at the window. A teacher in 4D has been burglarized once, and many other times has seen prowlers on the fire escape. One night her window opened and two hands came through and parted the curtains. She says, "I scream, and call the police a lot." A stewardess in 3D no longer opens her door to anyone whose voice she cannot recognize. While she was away on a flight, burglars picked her lock and emptied the apartment, clothes and all. The man in 5C had a fake burglar-alarm sign on his door. It was stolen—along with the doormat. The tenants, who have asked that their full names not be used in this article, try to help each other. The man in 4A, himself burglarized once, ran to a neighbor's aid with a steel bar, and on another occasion chased away lock pickers with a butcher knife. Once he had a German shepherd for protection. Someone stole it.

Kevin, 5B, is a two-time loser. "The first time they picked the lock. The second time they just took it out altogether. I knew my original locks were weak—I picked them myself once when I forgot my keys. I guess I was a case of the American Innocent in from the suburbs. Now I'm a veteran. I can tell stories at parties along with the rest of them. I've paid my psychological dues for living in Manhattan. I think about getting out, but where could I run to?"

It's ego-deflating if you're a male and you have to lock yourself in at night," says George, apartment 3A. He has a pick-proof lock and window shutters lined with metal. "I see people coming out of alleyways with shopping bags, and I know they've been burgling somewhere, but I don't want a confrontation, not even with panhandlers who ask for money. You can't walk down the street anymore."

Burglars often work from rooftops, courtyards, back walls and fire escapes. Before robbing apartments in the fortress, they cut through wire fences and make steps in brick walls to give themselves a ready means of escape if they are discovered and chased.

HOW TO KEEP BURGLARS OUT OF YOUR HOME

The only thing that can keep a burglar from getting at your wealth is wealth. The apartment dweller or home-owner who starts laying in alarms learns quickly that protection is a matter of expense: the more you spend, the safer your home. A relatively simple alarm system that wires doors and windows costs up to \$100 per opening, or several hundred dollars for an apartment and into the thousands for a large suburban home. Other sophisticated alarms use microwaves, ultrasonic transmitters, electric eyes, and devices that automatically dial the police and play a recorded cry for help. Shortcuts are often worthless. Fake protection stickers ("These Premises Are Protected by the Jones Alarm Co., Inc.") are laughed at by professional thieves. Even when burglars spot a real alarm system, they may crack a door or window just to see if it works. The best compromise between expensive alarms and phony stickers is locks—some virtually pick-proof. Public pressure helps, too. Where demands for more police protection have brought increased foot patrols, for instance, the burglary rate has almost always dropped. Tenants can urge their landlords and legislators to provide adequate lighting in streets and hallways, to require burglar-proof construction, built-in alarm systems, intercoms between apartments and street entrances. But no protection is perfect. If a burglar really wants to get into your home, he'll get in.

A bicycle on the street is sure to be stolen, but inside it has a chance when it is chained and padlocked to a refrigerator. The owner says she would not be surprised to come back and find all four gone.

When all the locks and alarms don't work, there is the ultimate protection—a gun. The man in 2B carries construction company payrolls, and the automatic he uses on the job is just as handy at home.

A cat's night vision can make it an efficient burglar-detector. In apartment 4B a cat stares at the fire escape, meowing and arching its back at the approach of prowlers.

The TV set in 6C is partially disassembled to make it unattractive to thieves, then bolted to a steel plate which is bolted to a brick wall. "To get it out," says the tenant, "they'll have to take the wall."

"OUR REAL SECURITY IS IN EACH OTHER"

We are scared, the other tenants and I, and this month we met for a second time to talk about how to protect ourselves.

George, the building superintendent, volunteered his apartment for the meeting. It was a warm fall evening, and his steel-backed shutters were opened wide for a change. People came in slowly, hesitant at first to abandon their carefully preserved New York anonymity. We passed around wine and cheese, and gradually we began to open up to each other.

We talked about what our first meeting a couple of months earlier had accomplished. Most important were what we called the vigilante groups. Ray, Rita and Bill, Bob and I—all within earshot of each other's apartments—had exchanged telephone numbers and agreed that if we heard strange noises in an apartment, we would call. If no one answered, we would call the police. Already Ray, who lives below me, has checked with me twice, and I am grateful.

We had persuaded the landlord to put up a convex mirror in the hallway, so that we could see around a dark corner. At the second meeting it was suggested that we ask him about an intercom to replace our ancient buzzer system for letting visitors into the building.

Meanwhile Ray offered an alternative. "Give your friends a buzzer code, like three short and one long. Then don't answer to anything else unless you go downstairs to see who it is." Norma, who runs an art gallery on the first floor, offered to make signs reminding everyone to be sure and shut the roof and street-level doors tightly behind them.

Gail, a teacher, maintained that the fire escapes are the real problem. "I tried to get the first department to saw off the bottom level of the fire escape. It's as easy to walk up as a flight of stairs. They say it's against the regulations."

Bob reacted bitterly. The fire department won't help. And gates on the windows don't help—burglars broke through the ones I put up with one healthy shove. We can call the cops, but they never catch anyone anyway."

There's a limit to what we tenants can do, without becoming total prisoners. We think about window gates, for instance. But twice recently we've read about people who died, trapped in fires by their own elaborate security measures.

One girl, Carol, is new in the building, but already her folks want her to move to a safer part of town. Is there one? Those of us who live in the fortress have come to think that our only real security is in one another. Our meetings have produced one happy result: we now have friends to run to, not just faceless, nameless neighbors. There's a practical side as well. I now know when to be suspicious of people I pass in the halls, and when to smile and say hello.

APARTMENT 6'S ORDEAL: BURGLARIES, ROBBERY, ATTEMPTED RAPE

Rita and Bill have had it worse than anyone else in the fortress. After two years in apartment 6D their score stands at three burglaries, one robbery and an attempted rape. In December 1969, burglars smashed through the door frame and stole \$300 worth of Christmas presents. A few months later,

burglars forced open a living room window, bent back a heavy iron gate and got away with jewelry and a radio. Last year, burglars squeezed through a 15-inch-wide bathroom window, took a camera, clothes and jewelry then ripped an iron grille and air-conditioner out of a living room window, through which they escaped. The last time was the worst. A man followed Rita into the downstairs hallway and at knife point forced her to let him into her apartment. He took clothes, a camera, jewelry, and then ordered her to undress. When she refused, he slashed her sweater. She told him her husband would be home soon, and he grew frightened and ran. Today Rita and Bill have a new door frame, two locks, double iron gates on the kitchen window, a city sewer grating bolted to the brick wall of the bathroom window, an air-conditioner and iron gate on the living room window, wooden shutters and a metal bar bolted across the bedroom window, and broken glass and flower pots on the fire escape. "In all," says Bill, "we've lost \$3,000—and a lot of sleep."

Bill spends free time maintaining fortifications: inspecting his roof, fitting a steel bar over wooden shutters and bolting an iron grating into the brick wall around the bathroom window. But he can't be everywhere. While he was working on his apartment, thieves broke into his car. They took a set of encyclopedias, a new tire and the battery.

TRIBUTE TO RALPH C. WILSON, JR.

HON. JACK F. KEMP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 19, 1971

MR. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, it was my good fortune to play for Ralph Wilson, owner of the Buffalo Bills, for 8 years. No one has done as much for football in Buffalo and for the American League in general over the years than Ralph Wilson. His help to the players has always been of the utmost importance, and all recognize Mr. Wilson as a good friend.

Jim Peters, the outstanding Buffalo Courier-Express sportswriter who has covered the Bills since 1963, did an excellent feature story on Ralph Wilson in the November 14, 1971, issue. It is my privilege to call this to the attention of my colleagues and include the article at this point.

The article follows:

TRIBUTE TO RALPH WILSON

(By Jim Peters)

Ralph C. Wilson looks the part impeccably. He's tall, about 6-3. Slender, a trim 180 pounds or so, almost to the point of appearing frail in stature. A smart, but conservative dresser. He walks with the confident stride characteristically associated with the wealthy. A millionaire's millionaire.

He's the man who for the past decade has left undeniable imprints on the Niagara Frontier, ranging, at various times, from public administration—as when he brought professional football back to Buffalo in 1959—to public outrage, when last summer his threats to pull up stakes in search for financially greener grazing grounds for the Buffalo Bills cracked open a hornet's nest of civic concern.

Undoubtedly, there are those who think of the Buffalo Bills' 53-year-old owner as a distant individual whose primary reason for being here is to pad his already-extensive bank account. They couldn't be more wrong.

A more accurate description would be that printed by a national weekly sports magazine about five years ago: "Ralph Wilson," it observed, "is a gentleman and a sportsman, a man with a great deal of class."

That is how his friends and associates in pro football, horse racing and other businesses with which he is affiliated know Wilson. That he has been successful financially in most of his ventures hardly can be held against the man.

A shrewd businessman, yes. Coldhearted, not at all. The deep regard held for him by those in his employ and their unshaking allegiance to him is the best evidence of the latter.

"You don't work for Ralph Wilson, you work with him," one member of his football organization has said many times.

If only a few Buffalonians really know Wilson, however, certainly even fewer are familiar with his background. They might know he is from Detroit, that he is a Navy veteran, that he is more wealthy than the average man and that he likes big, new stadiums to house his football team. But, generally, that's about it.

Wilson was born in Columbus, Ohio, the youngest of two sons of Mr. and Mrs. Ralph C. Wilson Sr. His family (his brother died at an early age) moved to Detroit when he was three years old. Educated at Detroit University School, with one year at Kentucky Military Institute, Wilson received his B.A. degree from the University of Virginia and had finished one year at the University of Michigan Law School when World War II erupted.

"Then I joined the Navy and spent six months as an enlisted man," Wilson recalled recently while awaiting the kickoff for a Bills' game. "In those days, if you had a college degree, you could apply for a commission, which I did."

After attending Officers' Training School and, later, a mine warfare school, Wilson was assigned as a junior officer to a mine sweeper based in Casablanca. His commanding officer was George SchAAF, a Buffalo contractor, and together they took part in the Allied invasions at Salerno and Anzio.

Wilson doesn't talk much about his wartime experiences, although he later succeeded SchAAF as CO of Mine Sweeper 29 and, after the vessel was turned over to France, he became senior officer aboard the sweeper fleet's mother ship and saw additional duty in the Pacific.

By coincidence, one of Wilson's sister ships at Anzio struck a mine and was devastated. Two of that ship's crew, both of whom were decorated for pulling buddies out of the water, were the late actor, John Howard, and the brother of Mrs. Jack Horrigan, wife of the Bills' vice president in charge of public relations.

"I went into the insurance business with my father in Detroit after being released from the Navy in 1946," says Wilson, who thought very seriously of making the Navy his career. "My father spent most of the war on civic matters and his business was only of moderate size, but he gave me half and said if I wanted to build it up, fine, or if not, that was all right, too."

The elder Wilson, who died last year, also had bought a trucking company just before Ralph left the Navy. "He knew a little about it, having insured some trucking firms, but the auto business, like about every other after the war, expanded rapidly," recalls Wilson.

"We remained partners in these two businesses until 1959, at which time my father wanted to retire. Our agency bought his share."

Wilson, who never played football but who always has been a football fan, and his father were among the 60-odd stockholders who purchased the National Football League's Detroit Lions in 1947.

"I played basketball and baseball in high school," smiles Wilson today. "In college, I was waived from the freshman basketball team but did play shortstop for the freshman baseball team. Our interest in the Lions was more of a civic thing. No one could own more

than four per cent." It was enough, though, to spark a keen interest in the sport.

Wilson's opportunity to become a full-fledged football team owner came in 1959, when ultra-wealthy Lamar Hunt of Dallas, another young sportsman with class, offered him a franchise in the American Football League Hunt was planning to found. "Lamar gave me my choice of six cities," says Wilson. "I was familiar with Miami, as my family had spent a lot of time there, but I was turned down in my attempt to lease the Orange Bowl.

"I didn't know anything about Buffalo. In fact, the only person I knew in Buffalo was George Schaafl, my former CO in the Navy. But Edgar Hayes, a Detroit sports writer, told me of the city's record in the old All-America Conference. I made one visit and committed myself before I got out of town."

Wilson says he isn't at all sorry he did, especially now that a new 80,000-seat stadium is on the horizon, but the early years of the AFL might have made a less-determined man pull out. The financial battles he and his AFL cohorts had with the older, established NFL were beauties.

"The funny thing is, if Lamar had been given an NFL franchise in Dallas as he wished, there wouldn't have been an AFL," says Wilson. "We started the AFL to give pro football to cities we thought could afford and support it.

"The success of the AFL is a phenomenal story. It was such an uphill fight and the odds were so big against us that the early owners—fellows like Lamar, Barron Hilton in San Diego, Wayne Valley in Oakland, Billy Sullivan in Boston and so on—had to stick together.

"We were subjected to ridicule. The media and public looked upon us as a third-class outfit, a rag-tag league. And we had many differences, but when it came down to something crucial, we all stuck together. That really was the reason for its success. We were determined to prove we could play as good football as the NFL."

Wilson admits he "never envisioned the merger" with the NFL which came finally in 1966. And, while he lauds former New York Jets' owner Sonny Werblin's role in helping bring it about, the Bills' boss feels certain the AFL would have survived on its own—somehow.

"We'd have fought on, I'm sure," he says. "It was a matter of pride. No one ever ran out on anyone. Even when Harry Wismer (the late owner of the New York Titans, who preceded the Jets) was in financial difficulty, we all pitched in about \$65,000 each to save the league."

Since the merger, Wilson says the game has become "almost a full-time job with me." He is a member of three NFL committees and spends considerable time in New York on league matters, the biggest of which has become the labor problem, magnified by the growth in influence of the NFL Players' Assn.

"We have to reach some kind of understanding and mutual respect or accord between the owners and Players' Assn., or there will be some dark days ahead for pro football," warns Wilson, a member of the NFL Labor Committee.

Traveling to New York so frequently has enabled Wilson to visit his daughters—Christy, 25; Linda, 23, and Edith, 20—and to watch his race horses run. He admits to having been a "horse racing nut" since childhood.

Ironically, horse racing also provided Wilson with one of his greatest embarrassments recently when he drew a 30-day suspension by the New York Racing Commission over the controversial sale of Jim French, a horse which later ran in the 1971 Kentucky Derby. Wilson insisted he was the victim of a technicality and his standing among NFL club owners was unchanged after an investigation by league officials.

But his greatest love in sports still is pro football. And his admiration for NFL

czar Pete Rozelle is unequivocal. "We're very fortunate in football to have a commissioner like Pete Rozelle," Wilson says. "Pete's very bright, far-sighted and tactful. If he weren't commissioner, I'm sure he'd be a senator or vice president, he's that competent. I don't know anyone who could do the job he has done.

"As for the Bills, I'm very optimistic about their future in the Western New York area now that the stadium is to become a reality."

Wilson was asked if he ever considered selling the Bills. "Never," he replied. "Oh, I've had a lot of people who wanted to buy the team, but they all wanted to move it from Buffalo."

People who know him realize a class guy like Ralph Wilson wouldn't permit that.

THE UTILIZATION OF PETROLEUM WASTES WINS ENVIRONMENTAL HONORS FOR CITY OF LONG BEACH, CALIF.

HON. JAMES M. COLLINS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 19, 1971

Mr. COLLINS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the department of oil properties of the city of Long Beach, Calif., has received national recognition for its innovations in waste utilization. Petroleum Engineer rated city of Long Beach first for its program to eliminate dumping 500,000 barrels per day of produced oilfield brine into the Long Beach Harbor.

City of Long Beach is operator for the big Wilmington and East Wilmington fields, the latter field being run on contract by Thums, a combine composed of Texaco, Humble, Union of California, Mobil, and Standard of California. America shares the pride of city of Long Beach for its progressive programs in environmental control as recognized by Petroleum Engineer:

City of Long Beach Department of Oil Properties' environmental control seeks elimination of dumping of about a half million bbl/d of produced oilfield brine into the Long Beach Harbor, in order to improve channel and harbor waters as a livable habitat for marine life. This produced water contains about 25-50 ppm oily residue, 25-50 ppm solids, about 0.1 hydrogen sulphide, and is oxygen deficient. This oxygen-deficient brine, although otherwise compatible to marine life, served to depress O₂ levels. The goal was harbor water with an oxygen content of 5 ppm, as established by the State of California and supported by the City of Long Beach.

Many intermediate goals and objectives related to choice and design of equipment and systems were set along the way. Test programs regarding water quality, ability to clean various elements from the produced water, ability of the zones to accept the water and the need for biocides were carried out during early project stages.

The method chosen by the City is to re-inject all produced water into the oil zones. This solves a 2-fold problem—that of fluid waste disposal and that of a partial source of water for the injection program. Filtration, corrosion inhibiting and biocides all are necessary to permit successful injection. Direct injection causes a rapid loss in well injectivity that is costly to repair, but innovations in selection and use of filters, biocides, equipment configurations and water blending have solved these problems.

Two different produced water filtration systems are used: a diatomaceous earth filter plant with a 105,000-bbl capacity; and sand

bed filter systems of various capacities. All are specially designed, high volume, recyclable units. Corrosion was effectively curtailed using organic biocides of the acrolein type along with film forming inhibitors. Blending purchased fresh water with the brine also aids injection efficiency.

Objectives of the program are about 90% accomplished. Equipment is being installed which will completely eliminate dumping of dead water into the harbor from City operated properties by the end of 1972.

WORLD LEBANESE UNION CONVENTION IN BEIRUT

HON. MARGARET M. HECKLER

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 19, 1971

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, among the many peoples and cultures which have enriched American life has been that of the Lebanese, many of whom reside within Fall River within my 10th Congressional District in Massachusetts. For the Lebanese-Americans of Fall River, and of New Bedford, the recent visit of two fine citizens, Mr. and Mrs. Louis Lataif of 991 President Avenue, Fall River, to their native Lebanon, is particularly poignant and interesting. Mr. Lataif, who attended the World Lebanese Union Convention in Beirut in his capacity as the president of the Lebanon American Federation of New England, returned to his home, carrying a special message of blessing from the Maronite Patriarch, Paul Peter Cardinal Meouochi, to the Lebanese residents of Fall River and New Bedford. For Cardinal Meouochi, who knows Fall River well, and its Lebanese people, and who served as a pastor in New Bedford, the opportunity to transmit this special blessing must surely have been a most pleasing one.

Mr. and Mrs. Lataif, upon their return, offered many valuable and interesting insights into the culture and life of modern-day Lebanon, and it is a pleasure for me at this point to incorporate in my remarks an article which appeared concerning their visit on October 22, in the Fall River Herald.

The article follows:

MEMORIES OF LEBANON LINGER ON

Mr. and Mrs. Louis Lataif of 991 President Ave. have returned from a trip to Lebanon, bringing back with them memories of foods, customs, and places visited.

Lataif was among 5,000 world delegates to attend the World Lebanese Union convention in Beirut.

He was there in his capacity as president of the Lebanon American Federation of New England.

He read special messages of greetings and best wishes to the convention from Secretary of Transportation John A. Volpe and from Sen. Edward M. Kennedy.

The Lataifs were welcomed by Salmam Franjiah, president of Lebanon when they visited the summer palace at Ehdan.

They also visited the summer residence of the Maronite patriarch, Paul Peter Cardinal Meouochi, where they were given a five-hour private audience. The Lataifs were invited to hear him celebrate mass in his private chapel.

The cardinal, who had served as a pastor in New Bedford and Los Angeles before returning to Lebanon, was invited back to America by Lataif.

The cardinal replied that he would like to but his age, 76, prevents him from undertaking the trip.

The cardinal sent a message of blessing to the Lebanese community in Fall River. The blessing was recorded on tape by Lataif.

The Lataif's memories of the trip began with the arrival of their charter flight. Mrs. Lataif remembers seeing lightning in the sky. The lightning, which she thought was over Lebanon, turned out to be over Greece. Thinking there was rain, she later learned that it was the dry season, with no rain contemplated for eight months.

The Lataifs gave the following description of the food at the hotel where they stayed:

"For an appetizer, they had a choice of about 30 different hors d'oeuvres. Following the main course, you are presented with a large serving wagon brimming with the greatest delicacies of desserts, including the best of American, European and Lebanese types, also the many varieties of the famous Lebanese fruits including grapes, pears, peaches, apricots, plums, figs, cherries, apples, melons, dates and the like."

On occasions when they took short trips in taxis and talked with several merchants during shopping tours, they found a great understanding by the people for "the American public's desire to see a peaceful solution for all the Middle East."

The Lataifs said that "there is a strong sentiment about the American government's policy toward the Arab world, especially when they see thousands of Palestinian refugees living in tents under very poor conditions on Lebanese ground."

They said that the Lebanese people hope the UN and the great powers will find a solution to Middle Eastern problems.

Among the Lebanese people, the Lataifs said they did not see any poverty to a great extent or any beggars reaching for hand-outs. They reported that many of the middle class people have one or two cars and live comfortably.

The sights the Lataifs saw included the historical Cedars of Lebanon located in the area of three mountains, one in the north and two in the middle of the country. The large cedar trees in the village of Barouk and Maalser are said to be thousands of years old. They are reported to be the same from which King Solomon built his temple.

They also saw a huge natural spring formed into a lake at Zable.

At its mouth the lake spreads out into the Bardouni River which is surrounded by two mountains covered with a variety of trees, fruits, and cedars. The river runs between several famous outdoor eating places.

Also visited were the ruins at Baalbak. The Lataifs said they were awestruck by the ruins. Mrs. Lataif was particularly awed by the 100-foot high, 30-foot in diameter pillars of the ruins.

ACTION NEEDED ON CHEESE IMPORTS

HON. ALBERT H. QUIE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 19, 1971

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, foreign dairy producers have an uncanny ability to circumvent U.S. efforts to keep imports of dairy products within reasonable bounds so as not to interfere with the domestic price-support program.

In response to a Presidential request, early this year the Tariff Commission conducted an investigation on the importation of so-called over-47-cents

cheese. The report of the investigation was transmitted to the President on July 28, 1971.

Between 1953 and 1965, annual imports of dairy products were equivalent to 0.4 to 0.7 percent of the U.S. output of milk. In 1966 and 1967, foreign producers exported considerably more dairy products to the United States so that the ratio of imports to total domestic milk production was 2.4 percent. The President wisely imposed quotas on dairy products that accounted for 95 percent of the increase in imports.

Foreign exporters then made a remarkable transition into the commodities which were free of quotas.

Quotas were established for most cheeses, but those cheeses having a purchase price of 47 cents per pound or more were excluded. A dramatic increase in the importation of the over-47-cents cheeses within the Swiss or Emmenthaler cheese and Gruyere-process cheese category and the cheeses containing not over 0.5 percent butterfat is occurring this year. Imports during the first three quarters of this year range from 110 percent to 115 percent of last year's imports.

The actual figures on the first three quarters of 1970 and 1971 are as follows:

	Pounds
1970—9 months:	
Swiss	16,444,000
Gruyere	6,677,000
Other	15,767,000

	Pounds
1971—9 months:	
Swiss	18,579,000
Gruyere	7,356,000
Other	18,175,000

It is interesting to note that the importation of "over-47-cents" Swiss in the first three quarters of this year already exceeds the imports during the full year of 1969 when 16,430,000 pounds were imported. The same fact holds for other cheeses. During 1969, only 16,262,000 lbs. of this category cheese were imported while 18,175,000 pounds have been imported during the first three quarters of this year.

The Commission recommended to the President that quotas be imposed on these cheeses by eliminating the free entry of the over-47-cent cheeses because imports were interfering with the domestic price support program. I am hopeful the President will soon take action on this matter which is of great importance to the American dairy farmer.

REPRESENTATIVE ED DERWINSKI SPEAKS AT UNITED NATIONS

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 19, 1971

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, those of us who have had the privilege over the years of working closely with our colleague from Illinois (Mr. DERWINSKI) have come to appreciate his direct, no-nonsense style of getting to the heart of an issue, whether it be on the domestic or international scene. How many times over the years have we heard the statement made that "you never have to guess where Ed DERWINSKI stands."

Once again he has demonstrated this capacity for getting to the heart of an issue when he spoke to a committee of the United Nations earlier this week, debating the question of self-determination and lambasted the Soviet Union as the most imperialistic nation in the world today. It is appropriate that we should all be reminded again of the tragic fate of the Baltic States of Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia, which were taken over forcibly by the Russians so many years ago and are still denied their right to freedom.

I include the text of his remarks to the General Assembly in the RECORD at this point:

SPEECH OF MR. DERWINSKI

Madame Chairman, my country has a rich heritage of independence from colonial rule which Americans have cherished for almost 200 years. We have welcomed to our shores millions of refugees fleeing from political oppression to share the freedom which is synonymous with America. By far the overwhelming numbers have found happiness, prosperity, and individual dignity in this country.

We are committed to the proposition that peoples can only fully determine their own destiny where there is freedom of expression and choice and the absence of arbitrary regimes or external interference. We believe that a free society with the right to choose leaders and policies from among alternative candidates through secret ballot is the best means by which the desires of peoples can be accurately reflected. We therefore deplore totalitarian or arbitrary systems where the only voice heard is that of the particular individuals in power. Freedom and self-determination entails legitimate lively dissent and testing at the ballot box with frequent regularity.

The United States has been a foremost advocate of freedom for oppressed peoples. We desire that they have the same opportunity for freedom that we possess—so much so that hundreds of thousands of Americans have given their lives that other peoples might benefit from that precious heritage—the right of a people to determine their own destiny free of external threat or domination.

The United States Delegation was responsible in large measure for those provisions of the United Nations Charter which uphold human dignity and freedom; viz., Articles 55, 73, and 74. We stand for freedom and self-determination today as we have throughout our history as a nation. We believe this is a universal principle, and not one to be applied selectively.

We are highly gratified that fully 97 percent of the people who were under colonial domination in 1940 have achieved self-determination and independence. Eighty-three countries since 1941 have attained independence and have assumed their rightful place in the international community of nations. And each year new states emerge and are welcomed into the United Nations.

We have made our position clear on the unfinished task of self-determination in southern Africa on numerous occasions most recently under the previous agenda item in this committee. We support the right of the peoples of Namibia, Southern Rhodesia, Angola, Mozambique, and Portuguese Guinea to self-determination.

We also believe that we should not overlook new forms of colonialism and denial of self-determination which have been manifested since the Second World War.

We must be ever mindful of those proud nations which have lost their freedom in this period as well as those brave peoples everywhere who are denied national dignity and the right of self-determination.

The Baltic States—Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia—represent a special case in point.

They have been physically annexed by the Soviet Union and forcibly incorporated into the cluster of its "Socialist Republics." So far as the communists are concerned, Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia have ceased to exist as separate entities entitled to their own national identity and independence. These views are not shared by the United States, nor by numerous other countries. To this day, the United States accords diplomatic recognition to the representatives of the last legitimate governments of the three Baltic States.

Large numbers of Baltic peoples were transferred to the Soviet interior after 1940. There are indications that as many as 60,000 Estonians and 25,000 Latvians, and probably more Lithuanians, were deported or killed during the first Soviet occupation of the Baltic States in 1940-41. The largest deportation occurred on the eve of the German invasion. After the war several waves of deportations were conducted, particularly from Lithuania, and chiefly in connection with the collectivization drives in the Baltic States.

Comparison of Soviet data on peasants in Latvia for the period from early 1947 to May 1949 shows that some 36,000 families or about 150,000 individuals were eliminated from the rolls during the period. Making allowance for migration to cities, it appears that well over 100,000 Latvian peasants were deported to the interior. The figure for Lithuania may be assumed to be still higher. The Baltic peoples were evidently resettled in various regions of Siberia, as well as in the north.

We can judge whether a government reflects the will of the people by the extent to which it is confident enough to permit its citizens to emigrate freely. We have serious doubts as to whether self-determination exists in a country, for example East Germany where over 4,400 citizens have fled in 1971 alone by such means as swimming the Baltic to Denmark or Sweden, or scaling border fortifications. Or a country where citizens are refused permission to emigrate because they may create embarrassment for the regime.

We are all too familiar with the grim events of Hungary in 1956 and 1968 in Czechoslovakia when brave peoples seeking merely the rights guaranteed by the Universal Declaration of Human Rights—to live in freedom and dignity—were ruthlessly suppressed by external force of arms. At this point I want to emphasize that the United States unequivocally rejects the doctrine of "limited sovereignty." It is a form of imperialism and colonialism that no free man can condone. The fact is that the Soviet Union is practicing classical imperialism.

We have heard much from representatives of totalitarian states concerning the economic and social benefits to be derived from a Communist society. But the facts betray these assertions. In every case, economic development has been slowed or even reversed when men have not been free to make their own economic decisions. The contrast between the Communist countries, where per capita income is barely a third of that in the United States is a clear contrast. It is interesting to observe that in some of the Communist countries steps are being taken to relax restraints in order to encourage private initiative and foreign investment in an effort to improve economic conditions. Communism has produced stagnation, not legitimate progress.

Let me reiterate our unreserved support for the right of peoples to self-determination everywhere—for only then can they enjoy the fundamental human rights and freedoms enshrined in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

Madam Chairman, in an effort to expedite the proceedings this morning, I would also wish to comment as a matter of propriety and proper record on the comments made by the distinguished delegate from the U.S.S.R.

In reference to the situation in Southeast Asia, I believe it is proper for us to emphasize

that in Laos and the Khmer Republic, the victims of communist aggression are the peoples in those countries, and they are victims of communist imperial colonialism in its worst form. The people in South Vietnam are in fact victims of communist aggression and are defending their country against that constant pressure.

I should point out that in South Vietnam they have had free elections and they have a functioning parliament where there is freedom of speech and expression far more so than any freedom of speech and expression that may exist in the Soviet parliament.

And also reference was made by the distinguished delegate of the Soviet Union to the Pentagon papers, the implication that this was some great development. The fact is, and if someone in the Soviet delegation had any understanding whatsoever of freedom of press and freedom of speech, they would know that most of that material was and has been available, and it certainly was not denied the American public or the people of the world in any basic form.

Of course we appreciate the fact that it is very difficult for the Soviet officials to understand freedom of press and freedom of speech. We hope that the example of the Pentagon papers is an inspiration to them to permit information to be freely disseminated to their own people.

Then there was a reference made to U.S. aggression since 1947. I suppose that is a reference to the situation that existed, for example, in Korea, where the aggression came from the communists, and certainly in the halls of the United Nations of all places, it ill behooves any delegation to condemn the United States for the proper action taken with U.N. endorsement in defense of the freedom of the people of South Korea.

Then I should add that in Latin America, Africa and Asia we have had numerous examples where attempts at subversion, instigating rebellions of all sorts have occurred in which direct involvement of communist diplomats and officials has been evident. This is certainly not to the credit of the nations who continually foster those activities and the expulsion of diplomats from certain lands. The breaking relations which have occurred merely dramatize the facts.

Then even though I made reference to the Baltic States, Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia, I should reemphasize that there are many other non-Russian states within the U.S.S.R. where the people are deprived of legitimate self-determination. Again, it ill behooves a country which in fact is the world's largest practitioner of colonialism and imperialism to continually use the U.N. as a forum for anti-American clichés which in the exposure of free press and proper information falls far short of reality.

DONALD R. LARRABEE

HON. WILLIAM D. HATHAWAY

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 19, 1971

Mr. HATHAWAY. Mr. Speaker, at its annual dinner here on November 16, the Maine State Society of Washington honored Columnist Donald R. Larrabee for his outstanding service to Maine through his profession as a journalist. Mr. Larrabee is a past president of the society which is composed of former and present Maine residents currently living and working in the Washington area.

In his remarks at the dinner, Mr. Larrabee spoke about the present economic crisis in Maine and the apparent dichotomy between developing the economy

and protecting the environment. He also talks about changes in the Washington press corps during his 25 years here and gives a very perceptive description of the task of the Washington communicator today. For the benefit of my colleagues, I would like at this time to include in my remarks in the RECORD Mr. Larrabee's speech at the Maine State Society of Washington dinner:

REMARKS BY DONALD R. LARRABEE

This is a wonderful and flattering occasion for a newspaper reporter. Honestly, I'd rather cover an affair like this than be involved in it. The Maine Society has meant a great deal to me from my earliest days in Washington. It captures the spirit of Maine and although many of its members have not lived there for years, their hearts are there. And, as often happens with those who view things from a distance, they are able to find the faults, if not the solutions.

Over the years in Washington, it has been painfully evident that Maine was trying to find a panacea—instant riches or at least something lasting to uplift the economy. The fact is, of course, that Maine has riches—in its ocean, its pure air and water, its woodlands and, most of all, its honest, hard-working people.

But it is poor, indeed, in sources of reasonable steady income for many thousands of its citizens. And, if anything, it seems to be getting poorer, relatively speaking. I saw the potato industry go down the drain in the early 1950's after the government sank \$500 million into subsidies. The potato scandal subsided but Maine's potato industry never fully recovered.

Efforts to find a second crop in sugar beets have failed to materialize. Heralded efforts to build cheap power to attract industry have failed because private power and conservationists objected. Efforts to attract the oil industry, which wants to come to the Maine coast, have failed in part because of environmentalists and summer people who want to keep Maine just as it is—a jewel of a vacationland—unspoiled, for their private use in summer, and the heck with the natives the rest of the year. The old industries have gone and there are no new ones.

No one wants to see Maine polluted but Maine must find a way to accommodate economic development with the wisest and best use of its resources. It shouldn't have to be an either/or proposition. Maine can progress without pollution. It may have continuing difficulty if the "summer people" from Massachusetts, New York and Washington insist on putting up the "no trespassing" signs to further development and if they are able to dictate Maine's future behind the scenes. I assure you that big money and powerful political influences have had their part in keeping the State of Maine an isolated pocket of poverty in the best of times.

As a Maine son, who left the state, I suppose it might be said that it comes with poor grace to criticize. I should be there, working. Well, in a way, I have been working for Maine down here . . . keeping an eye on five senators and about ten congressmen for 25 years. And if you think that isn't a job! Especially when they have been as active as Owen Brewster, Fred Payne, Margaret Chase Smith and Ed Muskie. And, in the House, Peter Kyros, Bill Hathaway and Cliff McIntire.

There have been some memorable stories. Surely Senator Smith's declaration of conscience in 1950 ranks at the top for its national impact. Now, we have a native son attracting attention to Maine as a serious candidate for the presidency. Ed Muskie could very well be our President next year at this time but don't hold me to that prediction. I have to respect the power of White House incumbency on the basis of past history.

This has been my traveling year. Some-

thing like 50,000 miles. I began by going to Israel, Egypt and Moscow with Senator Muskie and now I'm just back from a tour of Portuguese Africa. When you are thousands of miles away, you begin to miss things like cold, pure drinkable water, a good full newspaper, a real hot dog or hamburger. Believe it or not, the thing I find that I really don't miss is television. Maybe it's because this medium has had such a drastic, and, at times, damaging effect on the credibility of both government and journalism since I have been in Washington.

When I came here 25 years ago, Washington was a smaller community with a smaller government. The press and the politicians were at each other's throats, of course. They still are. But, perhaps we are all more aware of it today. I think television has made the difference.

The press corps in Washington in 1946 was still largely a pencil and paper profession. The government was foundering after a big war. The President at the time met newsmen in his office. He had the audacity to hold a private conversation with one reporter and he was condemned by the rest of the press for favoritism. Now, a president talks with selected television newsmen, in a completely spontaneous discussion in which millions of Americans are allowed to be eavesdroppers. This is a dramatic measure of how the communications field has changed in Washington.

It demonstrates the power of this medium on which so many millions depend for their news. Every President since Dwight Eisenhower has been using television to reach the voters. It is something the politician must reckon with these days because it is unbalancing the American political system. It favors those who are in office and those who have the money to pay for it. Ed Muskie is beginning to learn the cost of seeking the presidency and it will become a more painful reality in the months ahead.

The job of the Washington communicator today is probably no different than it ever has been. But the impact of our words is felt more deeply and reaches more people faster than ever before.

Our power to influence, to mold opinion, and to interpret what is happening in terms of the average person is incredible. And our responsibility is horrendous. I, for one, am not certain that we are fulfilling that responsibility adequately. We need to take a closer look at ourselves.

News is, of course, a fundamental force in the struggle to govern. Every day, hundreds of thousands of words are spoken; scores of events occur. We sit here and judge what is most important for the American people to know. We assign priorities to these words and events. We do it quickly, by necessity, and we do it quite well in the circumstances—but we make mistakes in judgment, and sometimes they are very bad mistakes. We did not do a good job of covering the Vietnam war—and now, it seems to me, we are trying to save our consciences with the Pentagon papers. The American people have tended to trust us to a remarkable degree. Yet we are feeling a challenge from all sides these days and this is not necessarily a bad thing. The speeches by Vice President Agnew are blunt and sometimes excessive—but they say what most politicians secretly feel. Politicians have never been more than fair-weather friends with the press. We are true adversaries. The politician tries to use the press to further his policies and goals; the press uses the politician to gain information necessary to fulfill his task. The relationship of politician and press can never be neutral.

But television, on which all too many Americans rely for their news and information, has made actors of all too many politicians and performers of all too many reporters. The urge to be "on stage", to be part of the event, or the event itself, is a new development in journalism that is

changing the profession and jeopardizing our credibility as communicators.

In a way, newsmen—in Washington and elsewhere—are selling a product. They think they will find more readers and sell more papers by exposing failures than by trumpeting successes. They think people are more excited by corruption than by dull virtue. They also deal in image-making in an extraordinary way.

I covered John F. Kennedy from the day he set foot in Washington as a young congressman. He cultivated the working press, the columnists and others who form the bridge between the public figure and the unseen constituency. We received Scotch at Christmas and free plane rides. He was more accessible to journalists seeking personal interviews than any President before him. He used television skillfully and he projected an image of a dynamic president although he had more failures than successes and never really had a chance to prove himself. The evidence is there, in black and white, that the press has a Kennedy fixation.

Lyndon Johnson never quite got over the fact that the press was not as sympathetic to him as to his predecessor. Four years ago this summer, I spent an evening with Mr. Johnson and a handful of reporters talking about Vietnam, a subject which was troubling him deeply. We talked of the crises in the cities and his relations with Congress. But he kept turning back to the press. Mr. Johnson, privately but rarely publicly, accused the press of lying and distorting. In terms much stronger than those of Vice President Agnew, he blamed a small group of liberal Eastern reporters and newspapers—"the establishment"—for calling the shots. All the rest of the press automatically follows this tiny group, according to Johnson.

Well, there is some truth to this. There are more than a thousand daily press correspondents in Washington. But we don't have a thousand probes into government. Instead, we find hundreds pursuing a single story and duplicating each other. Indeed, we have a bad habit of interviewing each other. And I have seen reporters for major newspapers get together after a press conference to decide what they are going to feature in their story.

There is a process of selectivity, of selective disclosure that goes on in the press. But it goes on in government as well and it has gone on since men began to govern in this country. We both have something of the same problem. We deny news to the public by our selectivity and we think we are justified in doing it.

As you can see I am as much concerned about the fallings and distortions of the press as I am about the bias of the politicians. I think it was the editor of the Washington Post, J. R. Wiggins, now retired and living in Maine, who said that too many reporters today tend to be concerned with letting the readers know what they think about what a man said and less about what the public man really said. His point is well taken.

It is time, I suggest, for the press to do some self-examination, instead of simply pointing and pontificating over the attacks by the Vice President and the Attorney General or the Attorney General's wife. They hit sensitive nerves. They may have gone too far into the bone.

But we do indeed give tremendous attention to student rioters and dissenters, to professional agitators who probably would be much less violent if the TV cameras were not trained on them. I submit that the presence of reporters can influence the flow of events. I have seen it happen in the simplest of situations in Congress. A microphone stuck in a congressman's face elicits inflammatory comments that he never intended to make. And in front of live TV cameras, reporters can—and often do—become a part of the story.

The journalistic profession needs to look

at itself and assess what we are doing with our freedom and our responsibility to the public. We are heading for trouble if we don't. The press is on trial. It has a credibility problem in terms of convincing the American people that it is telling the full story. And, just as surely, the government has a credibility problem in terms of convincing the people that they are hearing the full truth.

We both must do a better job. Government must convince the people they can believe in government as it now exists. My growing concern is that people will not believe what they hear from their government. But I trust that this will not come about because the press has failed to do its job.

H.R. 11895 AND 11896, WATER QUALITY ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1971

HON. FRED SCHWENGL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 19, 1971

Mr. SCHWENGL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to add my strong endorsement to the statement made earlier today by the gentleman from Ohio, the ranking minority member of the House Public Works Committee (Mr. HARSHA) with respect to H.R. 11895 and 11896. He has pinpointed the problems we face and clearly enunciated the need for full and complete hearings on this legislation.

The one area on which I would comment further, and I use the term advisedly because I believe the gentleman from Ohio, and many other Members are in agreement with me, is that of the need for greater resources for the small watershed program.

Recent hearings by the Conservation and Watershed Development Subcommittee of the House Public Works Committee have given me still further evidence that we can't begin to seriously attack the water pollution problem unless we include in the program, a vastly expanded small watershed program. These hearings as well as the earlier hearings by the full committee have demonstrated that sediment washed into the streams from our hills and fields is a far greater source of pollution than all of the sources of municipal and industrial waste put together. In fact, 700 times greater.

For these reasons, I intend to offer an amendment to this legislation to greatly increase the resources allocated to the small watershed program.

CENTENNIAL ANNIVERSARY OF MOUNT CARMEL CHURCH IN MASSACHUSETTS

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 19, 1971

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, Our Lady of Mount Carmel Church—a Catholic parish in my congressional district—has just recently celebrated the centennial anniversary of its founding.

I am proud to call my colleagues' at-

tention to its 100-year history of uninterrupted service to the community.

Our Lady of Mount Carmel Church was founded on July 16, 1871, by the Reverend Louis Gagnier. In May of the following year, the cornerstone for the first church was laid. There were 84 families in the parish at this time.

Rev. John T. Sheehan was appointed pastor of the parish in 1880, and held this position until his death in 1935. Father Sheehan earned the respect and confidence of his people by his selfless dedication and concern. Under his leadership the parish flourished. A new school, staffed by the Sisters of St. Anne, was built. A rectory was added. And the present church building on Pleasant Street was dedicated in 1930. His dedication to the church and to his community for 55 years was truly admirable.

Father Sheehan was made a monsignor in 1925. He was invested with the purple robes in 1926.

After Monsignor Sheehan's death, the Reverend C. Ernest Lapiere assumed leadership of the parish. Under the guidance of this dedicated priest, the debts of the parish were consolidated and greatly reduced.

Father Lapiere was also the driving force in beautifying the parish cemetery, which still remains as a memorial to his many hours of hard labor and leadership. Father Lapiere was called to his eternal reward on July 9, 1948.

The burning of the mortgage on the present church was done on October 30, 1950, under the pastorship of Rev. Joseph T. Brodeur. Father Brodeur was pastor until October 1955. He was succeeded by Rev. Fernand Roy, who was the spiritual leader of the parish until 1961.

On January 14, 1961, Rev. W. Francois Dufrense assumed the duties of pastor of the Mount Carmel flock. It was Father Dufrense's task to implement the directives of the second Vatican council. To him should be given the credit for being the fearless leader of the religious community in Ware, for spearheading the changes in the liturgy, as well as the renovation of the church. He was also the driving force behind the ecumenical movement in the community.

Our Lady of Mount Carmel Church has the unique distinction of having had only seven pastors during its 100 years of existence.

Our Lady of Mount Carmel Church is also proud to claim that during its first 100 years it has had 26 of its parishioners enter the religious life. Nine young men have entered the priesthood and 17 young ladies have entered several religious orders.

PRODUCTIVITY TURNABOUT

HON. WILLIAM LLOYD SCOTT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 18, 1971

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, the current issue of a publication for industrial managers, "Industry Week," has an editorial by Editor in Chief Walter J. Campbell entitled "Productivity Turnabout." It

makes a lot of commonsense. This brief case history tells how one aging industrial plant dramatically changed from a losing operation to a profitmaking one. I feel my colleagues and others concerned with employment stability and sound economic growth will find it interesting reading.

The editorial follows:

PRODUCTIVITY TURNABOUT

(By Walter J. Campbell)

Two years ago, Alcan Aluminum Corp. issued a terse announcement: The 50-year-old rolling facility at Fairmont, W. Va., would be closed.

The nearly 300 employees became alarmed. They faced the loss of their jobs. Prospects for other jobs in the West Virginia area were dim. Many of the workers were mature. Some were approaching the threshold of retirement. They wanted to realize their pensions.

They faced up to reality.

"We'll turn out so much metal, and we'll increase our productivity so much you won't be able to shut us down," they told the company in effect.

Nine months later, Alcan issued another announcement: The plant would not close.

The reason: Productivity (output per man-hour) had increased by 25 percent. The plant had passed from losing money to breaking even to making a modest profit.

What happened in Fairmont is more than the scaring of a workforce into working harder. The plant manager says he had no complaints on the efforts of workers before the decision to close the plant. "They were putting out a fair day's work then. Now, they are working above and beyond the call of duty. But there is something else."

Actually, the threatened closing brought management and labor into a closer cooperation. They talked with each other. They became a team, working to preserve the plant and the jobs it supplied in the community. The union adopted a positive attitude in the face of adversity and expressed a determination to save the operation.

Scrapage was cut sharply. Formerly, 3,200 pounds from a 10,000-pound coil wound up as scrap. That figure was cut to 2,400 pounds.

Management and labor combined to evolve a better product mix, and to utilize equipment better. Restrictions on crew size were forgotten.

Everyone was working toward a single goal—save our plant.

The people of Fairmont are prouder today as a result of their success.

Perhaps, they may offer an example for the rest of America.

CARL S. HALLAUER

HON. FRANK HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 19, 1971

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, the real strength of this country lies not with our political, economic, or military might, but with the individual men and women who are working toward building a nation of peace and prosperity. If I had to single out one individual who exemplified the kind of American who makes this country great, I would name Carl S. Hallauer of Rochester, N.Y.

Many of my colleagues knew Carl Hallauer as one of America's most respected industrial, civic, and political leaders. We were deeply saddened to learn of his

death on November 6 at the age of 77.

Carl Hallauer's life story is that of an orphaned newspaperboy who rose to become a corporate and civic giant, serving as director or trustee of more than 60 civic and business organizations. Yet, apart from his tangible accomplishments, Carl Hallauer will be remembered most as a good and giving man. As he once said:

Sure it's satisfying to be successful in business, but I think it's more satisfying to be successful with people. That's what this life is all about.

Carl Hallauer's death was a deep personal loss for he was my friend and close personal confidant for many, many years. As a member of the board of directors of the St. Louis Cardinals, Carl was instrumental in the drive to save baseball in Rochester. One would have to give Carl as much credit as anyone for enabling the people of Rochester to buy stock and establish an independent baseball operation.

I had the privilege to serve with Carl on the executive committee and board of directors of the Rochester Community Baseball, Inc., and I relied on him throughout my service as president of the Rochester Red Wings for 6½ years.

To Carl Hallauer's wife, Florence, his daughter and son-in-law, Nancy and Arnold Johnson, I extend my family's most heartfelt sympathy.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I would like to include for the RECORD an article from the November 7 Democrat & Chronicle entitled "Carl Hallauer: People and Politics." Following is a tribute to Carl Hallauer which appeared in the Monroe Doctrine, the student newspaper of Monroe Community College, and an editorial by Andrew Wolfe from the November 11 Brighton-Pittsford Post. These tributes tell the story of how much Carl Hallauer did for his community and the Nation as a whole and how much he will be missed. I think our young people especially will find in Carl Hallauer an inspiring example of how profound an impact one individual can have on the welfare of his fellowman.

The three articles referred to follow:

[From the Democrat & Chronicle,
Nov. 7, 1971]

CARL HALLAUER: PEOPLE AND POLITICS
(By Bill Beeney)

There really is no emphatic point of time in his career to begin a story about Carl Hallauer.

You can talk about his early days—as he sometimes did. An orphan at 9, he went to work while still in short pants, selling newspapers on Front street.

You can talk about the days, 15 or 20 years ago, when Carl was at the height of his political activity—as he also frequently did. But never in a "good old days" sense; he enjoyed filling in small gaps of local political lore.

You can talk about the politics of today, and tomorrow—as Carl always did. He was as current as today's newspaper, and his associations with top Republican figures at every level never flagged. His counsel was still much sought-after.

It was in the political arena that his greatest interests lay. But you'd better include people at the top of that interest list. People with a capital P; People and Politics, they were Carl Hallauer's abiding love, and they returned that affection in kind.

Of course, he had impressive stature on the national and international business scene as president and later chairman of the board of Bausch & Lomb Inc. But he said one time: "Sure, it's satisfying to be successful in business, but I think it's more satisfying to be successful with people. That's what this life is all about."

He probably was a wealthy man when he died yesterday at the age of 77, but that status was comparatively recent. It mostly followed B&L's change from a home-owned company to a public corporation on the New York Stock Exchange. He wasn't all that concerned with monetary success.

Hallauer was seven years old when his father, who was working as a janitor at the old Union League Club, met George Aldridge, the Republican boss in Rochester.

Aldridge didn't know the elder Mr. Hallauer, but he talked with him and was impressed with his intelligence and capabilities. "How do you happen to be doing a job like this? It's not good enough for you," Aldridge said. Hallauer said that jobs were hard to find, and that he had to make a living somehow to support his family.

"See me tomorrow," said Aldridge.

Hallauer's father did see Aldridge. The politician gave him a job as Overseer of the Poor. Thus, overnight, he became a man of some standing, instead of a janitor. He only kept the job two years, because he died when Carl was nine, but in those two years he was able to support his family in comparative splendor, compared with his janitorial years.

"I never forgot that lesson," Carl said. "There are some things you always remember. That was an early one for me. I realized what a favor could mean to a man and his family."

Throughout his own political career (never an elected official, but always a man-behind-the-scenes counselor to the Republicans), Carl did favors for people.

"Politics is service to people—and favors," he once said.

That doesn't mean fixing speeding tickets. ("I never tried to fix one. I don't believe in trifling with anything that has to do with lives.") It meant to Hallauer such things as attending funerals (he rarely attended fewer than 50 a year), helping people with their personal problems, and making friends and keeping them through hundreds of small, apparently insignificant but thoughtful deeds.

As an executive he applied "a few simple rules."

"First, you can never lose your temper. Now should you never 'bawl out' anyone in front of another person. It's also important that when a fellow does a good job he be given a pat on the back. A little encouragement is a wonderful thing. But you must be just as firm in the opposite direction if someone isn't doing his job. You must take quick, proper action whether you like it or not. All of these things work in both directions."

He was one of the prime movers of the program, successfully engineered by Morrie Silver, to create the community-owned Rochester Baseball Club after the St. Louis Cardinals bowed out. He was a director of the club for many years and attended games frequently.

He also was a great fan of professional basketball, especially in the days when the Rochester Royals were here; his daughter, Nancy, married Arne Johnson, who played on those Royals teams. He was an enthusiastic golfer, but enjoyed the game more for the fellowship and conversational exchanges it permitted than for the competition itself.

He was a great admirer of J. Edgar Hoover and Herbert Hoover, whose pictures were among those on his office wall.

"Those two fellows have done as much for this country as any two men," he once said, meaning the two Hoovers.

Hallauer had a long association with Presi-

dent Nixon, whose ability impressed him greatly. He enjoyed applying the common touch even to Presidents.

When Nixon and his wife Pat visited Rochester last summer, Hallauer met them at the airport. About six years ago, he had given Nixon a pair of glasses. Carl asked the President, "How are your glasses?" Nixon admitted that he hadn't had a recent eye examination. Said Carl: "Well, you'd better get another examination and then send me the prescription and I'll have a new pair made for you. I want to make sure you can see what you are doing." Nixon laughed.

In his first meeting with the late Gov. Alfred E. Smith, back in the days when Smith was building the Empire State Building, Hallauer learned that Smith intended to use Zeiss coin-operated telescopes atop the building. That, in Hallauer's book, didn't figure.

"Al saw the light quickly when I pointed out that America's greatest building should have America's finest telescopes—Bullt by Bausch & Lomb," Hallauer recalled. "He went along with my suggestion."

But Smith, ever the politician, also had something to sell. "Why don't you," he suggested to Hallauer, "open an account in our bank downstairs?" Hallauer obliged, with a small account.

Although he never was particularly impressed with a person's background, Hallauer could trace his ancestry back, on his mother's side, to the American Revolution.

He was the sole living male descendant of Jeremiah Swift, a Connecticut Army captain killed in action in the Revolutionary War. And he was the great grandson of Gen. Philetus Swift, a Revolutionary general who helped found the village of Phelps in 1789, was a county judge, served five terms as a state senator and, for a while, was lieutenant governor of New York State.

There really is no place to begin a story about Carl Hallauer. And no place to end one. His name and contributions to Rochester's history will be forever fresh.

[From the Monroe Doctrine, Nov. 11, 1971]

MONROE COMMUNITY COLLEGE MOURNS A FRIEND

In 1960, Carl S. Hallauer, on a trip to Corning, N.Y., saw Corning Community College. When he returned to Rochester, he phoned County Manager Gordon A. Howe and said, "Monroe County has to have a community college."

Less than a year later, Monroe Community College was born and Carl S. Hallauer was named to its original Board of Trustees. He remained a regular trustee until 1970 and since then has been an honorary trustee, attending practically every board meeting.

Mr. Hallauer died early Saturday morning (Nov. 6, 1971) while vacationing at Hilton Head, S.C.

"This comes as a terrific loss to Monroe Community College and to the community," Dr. LeRoy V. Good, president of the college, said when he learned of the death.

"He hardly ever missed a meeting of the board, to this day. He has been serving as an honorary board member this last year. He was deeply fond of the college.

"His sense of humor and optimism will be terribly missed. This comes as a terrific personal blow to me. The board and faculty members will all miss him deeply."

Mr. Hallauer was born in Rochester Jan. 5, 1894. He rose from orphaned newsboy to become a friend of presidents.

In his business career he rose to become president and then chairman of the board of Bausch & Lomb. This for some people would be enough, but not for Carl Hallauer. His political, civic and personal achievements in Rochester and around the world outshine even his business attainments.

In order to earn a living, he had to quit high school after one year, yet he became a member of the board of three colleges—Monroe Community College, Rochester In-

stitute of Technology, and Clarkson College of Technology.

Besides his association with Bausch & Lomb, in business, he was also a director of Community Savings Bank, Garlock, Inc., Lincoln Rochester Trust Co., Rochester Gas and Electric Corp. and Tobin Packing Co.

In government, he was a member of the advisory board of the American Ordnance Association, a director of the Navy League and a member of the national Committee on Electoral Reform.

In politics, he was the man behind the scenes in the local Republican party for many years. He also attended every New York State Republican Convention from 1919 to the present. He was a delegate to every Republican national convention from 1932 to 1964. He was a member of the Monroe County Republican Committee from 1928 to the present; the State Republican Committee from 1924 to the present; and was a presidential elector in 1932, 1936, 1940 and 1948.

In philanthropic, cultural and educational fields, he was a director of the Rochester Community Chest; commissioner of the Rochester Municipal Museum; trustee of Monroe Community College; trustee of Rochester Institute of Technology; member of the Board of Governors of the Society of the Genesee; member of the Board of Governors of the Rochester Club; life trustee of Clarkson College of Technology; commissioner of the Saratoga Springs Commission; member of the Society of the Cincinnati, and director of the Saratoga Performing Arts Center.

In community service, he was a director of the Salvation Army; life member of the Salvation Army Advisory Board; director of Rochester Community Baseball Inc.; member of the advisory council of the Salvation Army National War Service; co-chairman of the committee on Americanism of the Sons of the American Revolution; general chairman of the Rochester Centennial in 1934; co-chairman of the Bishop Kearney Golden Jubilee in 1955; director and treasurer of the Automobile Club of Rochester; member of the Rotary Club; director of the Rochester Convention and Publicity Bureau; chairman of the Police Benevolent Fund; life trustee of the Rochester Fire Benevolent Association; life member of the YMCA; and honorary trustee of St. John's Home for the Aging.

Among his awards and honors were: Honorary captain of the Rochester Detective Bureau; honorary chief of the Rochester Fire Department; honorary member of the International Chiefs of Police; honorary member of the New York State Chiefs of Police; honorary member of the International Identification Association; honorary life member of the Genesee Conservation League; honorary life member of the Police Locust Club.

Honorary chief of the Iroquois Indian Reservation; honorary member of the Lincoln League of Rochester; honorary member of the Capt. Henry Lomb Post, GAR; honorary member of the Firemen's Holy Name Society; honorary member of the Police Holy Name Society; honorary member of the 209th Veterans Association of Rochester; Citizens Award from Rochester Business Institute.

Page One Award from the Newspaper Guild of Rochester; Citizenship Award from the Sons of the American Revolution; honorary Sc. D. from Clarkson College of Technology; Outstanding Citizens Award from Lincoln League Republican Club; honorary Ll. D. from Alfred University; Horatio Alger Award from Committee of American Schools and Colleges.

S.A.M.A. Award from Scientific Apparatus Makers Association as Scientific Industry's "Man of the Year" in 1961; Citizen of the Year Award from Kiwanis International in 1961; and the Civic Medal from the Rochester Museum of Arts and Sciences.

He was also a director of the Associated Industries of New York State and president of

the Scientific Apparatus Makers Association—and many, many more.

But what was most in his eyes—he was a friend to the students at Monroe Community College.

[From the Brighton-Pittsford Post,
Nov. 11, 1971]

CARL S. HALLAUER

(By Andrew D. Wolfe)

What is the best measure of the late Carl S. Hallauer's contribution to the metropolitan community?

He was a major business figure, heading Bausch & Lomb, Inc., and playing a central role in the community's economic life for many years.

He was a political and governmental figure of legendary skills, although he often and with humor spoofed the idea that he and his close colleague, T. Carl Nixon, were powers behind the throne in Republican party councils. A stunning accomplishment was his work for the development of the community college, work without which that institution could not have been so immediately and so spectacularly effective.

Nevertheless, despite all these accomplishments we would like to think that his greatest gifts were as a communicator—a man able to speak with and understand individuals of every possible background and interest.

Carl Hallauer had warmth, and wit, and above all, sympathy. He didn't hesitate to give his opinions, and he could voice sharp criticism of ideas he didn't like. But no matter how wide the ideological chasm might be between him and another person, he could find in such people human qualities which he admired and liked.

This is why he was so valuable a civic leader. More than any other man of his responsibilities, he devoted countless hours to maintaining lines of communication with an extraordinary range of people, from the most obscure to even the president of the United States. Thus he knew, particularly in his beloved home area, what people were thinking and what they wished and needed.

In a community which has been so successful in developing business and economic skills, Carl Hallauer's ability to inject the human ingredient into civic, political, and governmental thinking was unique.

There was nothing synthetic about his relations with his friends. For, basically, they were simply that—friends.

Thousands of them will miss him deeply.

MANY CHANGES HAVE COME TO ALASKA

HON. NICK BEGICH

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 19, 1971

Mr. BEGICH. Mr. Speaker, many changes have come to Alaska in the past few years, brought on mainly by a huge oil find and increased communications. Many more changes will come to my State for Alaska has been discovered—again. But the greatest changes have not occurred in the three largest cities, Juneau, Anchorage, or Fairbanks. They have affected "village Alaska," and have pushed these rural, remote communities abruptly into more modern times, including welfare checks and food stamps.

A number of young women from these communities have seen the culture and tradition of their native people slip away, and they have done something

about it. They have questioned what will happen if their people are not given the opportunity to learn the skills that these times will bring to Alaska. Their work has been invaluable, and I believe their efforts will do much to assure Native Alaskans a place in the future and a pride in their past. An article in yesterday's New York Times speaks well for three such Alaska Native women, and I am very pleased to include its text so that all may have the benefit of reading it.

The article follows:

NATIVE WOMEN OF ALASKA UNITE IN FIGHT TO UPLIFT THEIR PEOPLE

ANCHORAGE.—Back about five years, when she left her village of Barrow and went to work in far-off Washington, D.C., as a 22-year-old receptionist for Ernest Gruening, then one of Alaska's Senators, Brenda Itta quickly became known as "that Eskimo girl."

Miss Itta is back in Alaska now, doing community relations work for the Atlantic Richfield Company, which has oil interests on the state's North Slope, less than 200 miles from her home town at the northernmost point of the United States. But the memory of her Washington experience still bothers her.

An attractive woman partial to miniskirts, Miss Itta said she thinks visitors to Senator Gruening's office were disappointed because she wasn't short, stocky and wearing furs.

"It's such an old-fashioned idea to think that Eskimos fit into a pattern," she said.

Today Miss Itta is one of the young, well-traveled, articulate and motivated Natives (in Alaska its spelled with a capital N and refers to Eskimos, Indians and Aleuts) who are emerging as leaders in the growing Native rights movement. Their aim: Upgrade their standard of living by improving education and job opportunities and at the same time, improve the degree of respect among whites toward the Natives.

FEELING OF RESPONSIBILITY

For the most part, women activists such as Miss Itta were born in rural villages, left their homes as teenagers to attend a state-supported school and then went to college. They left brothers and sisters, parents and grandparents back home, and now, because they have college degrees, the women feel responsible for the welfare of their villages.

"We're united now and we're vocal," said Miss Itta, who is active both in the Alaska Federation of Natives and the smaller Arctic Slope Native Association.

To Miss Itta, her activism is in great part aimed at seeking to erase the patronizing attitude she said she finds toward Natives. ("In school, I was sent to a corner if I ever spoke a word of Eskimo.")

To Frances Degnan, who has spent the last six years working full time at no salary seeking to make Natives qualify for Government projects, education is a prime goal. ("If a Native wants to stay in the village, he should have a way to make a good living. If he wants to leave, he should have the skills to make it somewhere else.")

And to Rosita Worl, a Tlingit Indian who was born in Petersburg on Alaska's southeastern arm and grew up in Juneau, the state capital, heritage is most important. ("The sense of heritage has broken down and we need to bring it back. Young Tlingits grow up now without knowing their language, their history, their heritage.")

A PERSONAL GOAL

Miss Itta still bristles at the memory of her school days. "People seemed to think I was incapable of speaking for myself," she recalled. "They became overly kind, overly helpful, extra courteous. What that said to me was, 'You're a Native, and you don't know how to think.'"

She said that she hopes to see that attitude changed in her lifetime and to see Natives

running their own businesses, administering their own hospitals and planning the curriculum in their own schools.

Miss Degnan, an earnest, articulate woman of 28, who is one of the two women serving on the board of the Alaskan Federation of Natives, which was formed six years ago by joining scattered Eskimo, Indian and Aleut organizations, looks upon herself as a motivator, not a leader.

"I'm working at being an Eskimo," she says when anyone asks her about her work. "I want to see the Native have a choice in his life."

Miss Degnan has been doing what she calls "gut work" on a volunteer basis in her tiny village of Unalakleet, 150 miles southeast of Nome, working with Government agencies to make the town's 600 residents eligible for Federal projects and combing the village for students who could qualify for financial aid for college education.

EXODUS OF GRADUATES

She knows that the rewards are sparse. Of the eight college graduates Unalakleet has produced, for example, only Miss Degnan and a local teacher have returned.

"The Eskimo likes village life," said Miss Degnan, who has a degree in psychology and sociology from the University of Alaska. "It's rigorous, but we've lived there in harmony with nature for centuries. A lot of us would like to keep living there, but we want to know how we can raise a family without worrying about our next meal."

For Rosita Worl, 30, the fierce pride she has in her Indian heritage is reflected in almost everything she does.

She pushed successfully for a course in Tlingit culture and language in Juneau High School, went back to school to study cultural anthropology (she will be graduated from Alaska Methodist University, a small private school in Anchorage) and is planning a book on Tlingit culture for Alaskan school children.

Before she returned to college, she was active in the Alaska Native Brotherhood, the major organization of Natives in southeast Alaska, and worked to blunt the tendency of white administrators to direct bright Natives toward vocational schools rather than college. ("I told them, get your degree, go back home and make that Indian system yours.")

"We have so much culture, so much art, and so many of the qualities people are trying to retrieve these days—love, honor, respect," she said, "I'm afraid we've grown up thinking the Western way was the only way."

CROATIAN FRATERNAL UNION OF AMERICA

HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 19, 1971

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, I recently had the honor to address the members of one of the oldest fraternal groups in my 20th Congressional District of Pennsylvania—Lodge 146 of the Croatian Fraternal Union of America.

This organization was founded February 24, 1901, by 14 men, meeting in the home of Josip Zegudovic, who became the group's first president. From that humble start, Lodge 146 has grown over the years until today it has 654 regular members, 349 junior members, and owns the building where it conducts meetings and social events.

It was my pleasure to be among the

speakers at the lodge's 70th anniversary banquet and to witness the presentation of 50-year pins to nine outstanding members by the national president of the CFU, John B. Adovinac. The recipients of this award included Magda Bozicevic, Julija Grgas, Jelica Pavlecic, Ljubica Reskovic, Jelica Yelencic, Mila Zalac, Ivan Blazic, Andrew Gruber, and Maksa Karija.

They also received some well-deserved tributes from several prominent people attending the anniversary observance. Among them were Roy Cindric, president of Lodge 146; Rev. William M. Miller of St. Denis Church; John Montgomery, mayor of Versailles Borough where the lodge is located; Michael Grasha, a director of the CFU's Junior Order; Mr. Badovinac, and Leonard C. Staisey, chairman of the Allegheny Board of Commissioners.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride I join in the salute to Lodge 146 and its members. I would like to commend the men and women who lead that fine organization today for continuing to foster and build the ideals conceived by Mr. Zegudovic and his friends so many years ago. I insert the names of these officers into the RECORD and call the attention of my colleagues to them: president, Roy Cindric; vice president, William Kercell; secretary, John Rednak; treasurer, Glenn Kucera; recording secretary, Mary Balun; junior nest manager, Joseph Zalac; trustees, Frank Pavlecic, George Pavlecic, and Peter Bacon; house committee, Steve Sipkovich, William Kercell, Peter Puhala, James Lewis, and Joseph Zalic; club committee, William Kercell and Joseph Bogovic; sports directors, Frank Pavlecic and Joseph Zalac.

WILLIAM H. REHNQUIST

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 19, 1971

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, with all of the accusations by innuendo and guilt by association directed against William H. Rehnquist, I think that the following column of November 19 by the political editor of the Arizona Republic, Mr. Bernie Wynn, is particularly appropriate and should be read by every Member of both the House and Senate.

The column follows:

It is ironic that the liberals opposing the appointment of William Rehnquist to the U.S. Supreme Court are using the "witch hunt" tactics for which they condemned the late Sen. Joseph McCarthy, R-Wis.

Guilt by association, innuendo, half-stated facts, surmises, smear and exaggeration all have been used in an all-out effort to convince the Senate Judiciary Committee that Rehnquist is unfit for confirmation.

In the last few days, the cries of the pack have swelled into hysterical tones and self-appointed Rehnquist investigators are lurking behind virtually every palm tree and cactus in Arizona.

Last of the bloodhounds, it is hoped, was Sidney Zion, former reporter for the New York Times. He's at present a freelance gun for hire.

His claim to fame is that he first identified Daniel Ellsberg as the leaker of the Pentagon Papers to the Times.

Now Zion contends that sources he considers reliable, "A very heavy guy on the right," reported that Rehnquist was "part of a Birch (John Birch Society) cell in Phoenix in 1961 and 1962."

Not a card-carrying member of the society, Zion hastened to explain, just a member of a "clandestine group or cell."

Sen. McCarthy, in his zealous search for Reds in the bushes around Capitol Hill, also had this trouble of catching a suspect with an official card from the Communist Party.

At this juncture, McCarthy also tried to tie the luckless victim in with a "clandestine group or cell," on the basis of highly reliable, unimpeachable sources but unfortunately anonymous as well.

Rehnquist, a capable student of the law, submitted affidavits to the Senate Judiciary Committee denying that he ever was a member of the Birch Society.

Last week a Democrat (Paul Rademacher) told me that he attended a Birch Society meeting some years ago and saw Rehnquist at the meeting. He claimed he attended the meeting out of curiosity and had never mentioned seeing Rehnquist "because he may have been there for the same reason."

This may or may not be true since, for me, Rademacher has not always been the "unimpeachable source" that Zion claims to have discovered.

I suppose it's about time for my confession. In 1965, I attended a "clandestine group or cell" meeting of the John Birch Society. It was out in Sun City, as I recall.

In fact, I may have attended more than one Birch meeting during this period. And I encountered some interesting people, a few nuts, and even a couple of distinguished citizens.

I attended out of curiosity, too. But I also wrote a seven-part series on the activities and influence of the Birch Society in Arizona politics after a five-month investigation.

Never did the name of Bill Rehnquist come up, although he was politically active in GOP affairs at the time.

Meanwhile, one should keep in mind the target of the liberal attack isn't really Rehnquist. The real target is President Nixon.

In light of this, I called the White House last week and told President Nixon that I would have to decline any high federal appointment he might have in mind for fear my Birch association would be used to embarrass the administration.

He said he fully understood the situation. So we left it at that. But I could tell he was quite disappointed.

LET US PAUSE TO REAFFIRM OUR FAITH

HON. C. W. BILL YOUNG

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 19, 1971

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, once again Thanksgiving draws near, and we, as a nation, will pause to give thanks for the countless blessings we enjoy. I think it is very appropriate that this same time should be observed as National Bible Week, for indeed these two occasions go hand in hand.

Our country was founded on the principles of religious freedom; our forefathers who landed on Plymouth Rock, were humble and devout pilgrims who had the courage of their religious convictions and together sought a new way of life. Upon these principles contained

in the Bible, our Nation grew strong and prosperous. The Bible has had a guiding hand in many key episodes in the history of our Nation. Each President has been sworn into office with his hand resting on the Bible and in its pages are found the guidelines upon which they built the American way of life.

I feel that I must agree with Abraham Lincoln who stated that the Bible is one of the greatest fights which God has given to man, for through this book we may come to know right from wrong, to know and understand our fellow men with deeper love and empathy, to feel the true worth and dignity of each human being, and to have the strength to uphold our convictions.

For centuries, men have turned to the Bible in their hours of darkness for the answers to the troubling questions of life, death, and man's individual purpose, and it can help us now, too. That is the everlasting beauty of this book—it is timeless and unchanging.

I have had concern, as has everyone else, about the religious nature of this country and its deteriorating moral fiber. I am convinced that these are important qualities which must be rebuilt in our society. I pray that this week, when we draw our families together to celebrate Thanksgiving, we might remember the true purpose of this holiday and pause to affirm or reaffirm our faith in the great teachings offered in this, the greatest of all books.

HISTORY'S GREATEST VICE PRESIDENT STILL INFURIATING THE LIBERALS

HON. LOUIS FREY, JR.

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 19, 1971

Mr. FREY. Mr. Speaker, on November 9 of this year the following article appeared in a local paper from my district, the Orlando Sentinel. This editorial, which was written to commemorate the birthday of one of our country's noted, and certainly most newsworthy, Vice Presidents, points out how this man, who was a political unknown just 4 years ago, came to be one of the most independent and hard hitting of our Vice Presidents to hold office—Vice President Spiro T. Agnew, a household word:

Tuesday is the birthday of that American household word—ah, what was it again? Oh, yes. Spiro Agnew.

Mr. Agnew's natal day has not attained a significance leading to the closing of public buildings or even the flying of the flag. But the Quixote of the Nixon administration has slain enough windmills to make it worthy of note in passing.

He has undoubtedly been the greatest vice president in history, perhaps the only one to establish and maintain an individual identity in that office.

Others have come to it with national reputations established, men such as Lyndon Johnson. Others have built reputations by succeeding to the presidency from it, such as Harry Truman.

Agnew came to it an unknown, a curiosity if you will. He has emerged as a national

celebrity with a profound effect upon our way of life.

This effect has come chiefly through his attacks upon the press, particularly the liberal Eastern metropolitan papers and the three national television networks.

Before Agnew, instant television analysis was commonplace and accepted. Beautifully coiffed, resonant voice young men followed speeches by the President, with pitiless dissection of his remarks, paraphrasing and distorting to a point where millions watching and listening didn't know if they should really be trusting their nation to Lyndon Johnson instead of Sander Vanocur.

Then, a bit over two years ago, Mr. Agnew made a speech in which he said "a spirit of national masochism prevails, encouraged by an effete corps of impudent snobs who characterize themselves as intellectuals."

Since then, boys and girls, it has been a different ball game. Overnight, Spiro Agnew became a household word and Eastern liberals and television pretty boys have been on the defensive ever since.

Agnew has bared the lance against them on other occasions and has yet to lose a battle. One of his favorite descriptions of them is "nattering nabobs of negativism."

What does it mean? Who knows? Who cares? We—and they—get the message.

He isn't always right, of course. He said of himself, "I moved from a potential unknown to an actual unknown," and that is untrue.

He has struck a responsive chord in middle Americans who identify with his refusal to be spoon-fed a diet of television propaganda which forbids them to think for themselves and who chuckle at his inability to cure his slice or develop a "really consistent serve."

He is definitely not with it. He is square. He is out to lunch. So are most of us.

When Yale University President Kingman Brewster said black revolutionaries can't get a fair trial in America, Agnew replied American students couldn't get a fair impression of their country under Kingman Brewster.

About student radicals, he said they should be separated from society the way "we discard rotten apples from a barrel."

About law and order, he said "a sniveling, hand-wringing power structure deserves the violent rebellion it encourages if it doesn't stop cringing in fear of the young."

This sort of thing infuriates the liberals but to us it sounds pretty much like an average American telling the bozos off.

We make bold to suggest history will see it that way and will see Mr. Agnew as a crusader of his time who wrought a profound influence upon television news and commentary.

We further make bold to wish him a happy 53rd birthday.

WESLEY STOUT—A MAN TO REMEMBER

HON. J. HERBERT BURKE

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 19, 1971

Mr. BURKE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, Florida lost one of its truly great journalists when Wesley Stout of the Fort Lauderdale News passed away on November 13 from cancer.

It is true that he lived to a remarkable old age, but it is ironic that he died from the ravages of cancer as did his wife 14 years ago. I regret that he probably did not know or perhaps was not aware that the House just this week passed the Cancer Attack Act, which we all hope will not only bring tangible results, but will

lead us to the road in finding a cure for this dreaded disease.

Wesley Stout had an illustrious career. Prior to his coming to Florida to retire, he was a writer and later editor of the Saturday Evening Post when that magazine was at its zenith insofar as the reading public was concerned. Those who worked with him will readily acknowledge his great contribution to the field of journalism.

Although he came to Florida to retire, he was one of those who found the so-called retirement life boring. He wrote an almost daily column which appeared in the Fort Lauderdale News under the heading "The Beachcomber." He loved his country and followed politics and often wrote philosophically his views on politics in his column.

I had the pleasure of knowing him in person and considered myself a fan of his. I will miss his humor, his wit, and philosophy, but most of all, I will miss him and his writings about people, the State of Florida, and the Nation. I am proud to call to the attention of my colleagues the editorial which appeared in the November 16 issue of the Fort Lauderdale News concerning the well respected Wesley Stout, which reads as follows:

WESLEY STOUT LEFT A LEGACY OF HISTORICAL INFORMATION AND INFORMED READERS

He was a bottomless well of human and historical stories, a keen, accurate observer of the passing scene, and a man who gloried in trying to satisfy his insatiable curiosity.

Wesley Stout was all of that and more. Perhaps his readers found in his columns spanning nearly 20 years on this page the characteristics that made him unique, that made him so rare even in a time of journalistic greats.

His typewriter still was banging away last Saturday, but on Sunday the clatter of keys had punched out the legendary "30," the end of his profession.

While the ravages of cancer continued to drag him down for nearly a year—as it had his wife 14 years earlier—there was little change in his copy nor in the mind that stored up knowledge like a computer.

He knew his days were numbered but accepted it without bitterness. His prime regret was that there were things he wanted to see before laying aside his copy paper for good.

In one column several weeks ago, he wrote about the likelihood the Democratic National Convention next year was shaping up into a battle royal. His remark was that he only wished he could be around to see it.

As he approached the 80 mark, he expressed satisfaction over the inauguration of Richard M. Nixon as President. He explained he never wanted to die in a Democratic administration.

During his 19 years as the Beachcomber, he roamed the length and breadth of Florida, stopping in libraries, newspaper morgues and wherever else facts of the past could be searched out.

He was a great one for comparing notes—what may have been reported in a 60-year-old Jacksonville paper as against the news item in a St. Augustine, Fort Pierce publication.

And he searched out oldtimers who could cull from their memories details of yesterday.

Despite Florida's relatively short history, he was able to put the pieces together and bring it alive. That was particularly true of South Florida which interested him most as his adopted home.

While we shall miss him greatly and mourn his passing, we feel we were—and Florida was, too—extremely lucky to have known him, and we are grateful we had the opportunity of displaying his great talents to our readers.

He left behind a legacy in the form of voluminous notes which were turned over to the Fort Lauderdale Historical Society a few months ago. And his legacy included tens of thousands of interested readers and better informed citizens.

THE UNITED STATES AND THE UNITED NATIONS

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 19, 1971

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, the expulsion of Nationalist China from the United Nations and the seating of Red China has led to a serious—and long overdue—evaluation of our commitment to the world body. I have joined others in this Congress in recommending an immediate reduction of U.S. contributions so that our payments are equal to our representation.

The expulsion of Taiwan was most disheartening. Disheartening not so much for the loss of prestige suffered by the United States—we are stronger than that. Nor so much for the insult of a close friend and ally by the world body—Taiwan will still be our friend and ally. But rather, it is disheartening that an international council established to search for peace among all the nations of this world has chosen the politics of isolation as its course and misguided polemics as its primary purpose for existence. I say to you, the United Nations will not survive its actions.

This expulsion represents a serious precedent that should not be taken lightly. Nationalist China has been a faithful member of the U.N. since its founding. It has abided by all the rules and promulgations of that body. It did nothing to merit expulsion.

What will prevent a politically oriented coalition of Communist nations and third world favor-seekers from uniting to expel other members at will and for no cause? The failure of many nations considered allies of the United States to keep their promises, may indicate such coalitions will find support among a wider group of countries.

In examining the history of the U.N. in the last few years, one wonders why this Nation continues to maintain this forum for philosophical fantasies. What steps has the U.N. taken to help mediate the problems in Vietnam? None. What has the U.N. done to help ameliorate the situation in the Middle East? Nothing. What has this supposedly humanitarian body done for the Soviet Jews? The Northern Irish? Very little indeed.

Why, then, does this Nation continue to maintain a center for world discussion when it consistently finds it must go outside the United Nations to seek solutions to world problems?

There may not be justification now for dismantling of the world body, if for no other reason than the hope that someday in the future it might serve as a true instrument for negotiating international peace.

Certainly, however, there can be no justification at this time for the United States to continue to finance one-third

of the operating budget for the U.N. We do not own one-third of the world's wealth. Nor does one-third of the world's population live in these States. In no way of reckoning can that share be considered fair—a share, by the way, that added up to \$250 million this year. Let other nations maintain the burden as well.

Moreover, our contributions to various special projects has been dollars down the drain. In particular, drug control programs emanating from the U.N. and largely financed by this country have been useless exercises in political piddling. No substantive proposals have come from the U.N. No international treaty agreements. No multinational efforts. No nothing.

Additionally, this Nation will have to assess our foreign aid commitments to other nations who have shown the shallowness of their friendship with the United States. While I am not saying that our foreign aid dollars should buy unalterable support for our country's position, I do feel that on important issues of interest not only to the United States but to the entire free world, these "allies" should stand behind us.

It appears the "dollars for diplomacy" theory is finally dead. Let us use that money to help solve the problems we have here at home. A nation with a stronger moral and spiritual fiber, a better housed and better cared for populace, a stronger government, an efficient defense, will be in a far better position to bring peace to the world than any body packed with the problems evidenced at the United Nations in recent weeks.

PRESIDENT SHOULD SET NEW CHEESE IMPORT QUOTAS

HON. ED JONES

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 19, 1971

Mr. JONES of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, over 3 months have passed since the Tariff Commission completed its findings on the importation of cheese and made its recommendations to President Nixon. The President should delay no longer in setting the quotas they recommended.

Early this year President Nixon asked the Tariff Commission to hold hearings and make recommendations to him on the importing of certain types of cheese which cost over 47 cents a pound and on which there were no quotas. This was a very proper move on his part inasmuch as these cheeses constituted a substantial part of the dairy import total and had nearly doubled in volume in 1970 from 1969.

The Tariff Commission held the proposed hearings and made a recommendation to the President in late July that the "over 47-cent" cheeses be placed under quota.

Unfortunately since then the President has not acted on the Tariff Commission's recommendation. In the meantime the importers have been increasing their shipments of these types of cheese to the United States, so that they are now run-

ning 10 to 15 percent above those of the same period last year. Domestic milk production is running about 1 percent higher than last year, so there is no need to allow these imports to continue without restriction to meet our country's needs.

It would appear that the importers ultimately expect the President to act on the Tariff Commission's recommendations and establish quotas and are therefore increasing their imports prior to that time.

As a result it is our American dairy industry which is hurt during this period by this competition. The President should therefore act promptly in establishing quotas.

RECOMMENDS SPEEDIER TRIALS

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 19, 1971

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt that one of the obvious complications facing effective law enforcement is the delays which have all too often become standard procedure as far as trials in our courts are concerned. The Chicago Heights Star, in an editorial on November 11, very effectively and properly comments on the judicial conference which has recommended speedier trials.

The editorial follows:

AS WE SEE IT . . . FOR "SPEEDY TRIALS"

The law's delay, one of the more vexing facts of life in democratic societies, may become less so if federal efforts aimed at stepping up the trial process are successful.

Under the chairmanship of Chief Justice Warren E. Burger, the Judicial Conference of the United States has formally asked the U.S. Supreme court to amend the federal rules of criminal procedure to require all U.S. courts to set up "speedy trial" timetables.

Congress, at the same time, has before it a bill to accomplish this purpose.

At present, no time limits exist within which defendants must be tried and sentenced. Under the judicial conference's proposal, federal district courts would set realistic timetables to accomplish these ends.

In Congress, Senator Sam J. Ervin, Jr. (D., N.C.) has been pushing a bill that would require defendants to be brought to trial in federal courts within 60 days.

The Judicial conference, a 25-member group of ranking federal jurists, is the administrative and policy-making arm of the federal judiciary. If the Supreme court accepts the group's recommendations, they will become binding unless Congress objects.

A similar procedure will be followed with regard to a comprehensive new compilation of rules called the "uniform rules of evidence."

The judicial conference has approved the rules, which were the product of a six-year study by a committee of judges, lawyers and professors of law. The rules constitute the first compilation of federal evidentiary law, which previously had to be gleaned from widely-scattered case decisions.

Justice is not temporal; it is eternal. To delay it is to deny it, as the saying goes. Not only is protracted litigation costly, but it can result in "lost" witnesses and/or foggy memories.

By its action, the Judicial conference has made what could be a significant contribution to the cause of justice.

BROTHERHOOD IN MASSACHUSETTS

HON. MARGARET M. HECKLER

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 19, 1971

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, one of the most unusual examples of brotherhood and community generosity which has come to my attention in some time is that which the Sun Chronicle of Attleboro, Mass., described concerning the ingenious resolution of the need for housing which faced Mr. and Mrs. William Demers, who are residents of my 10th Congressional District in Massachusetts.

As a member of the Subcommittee of Housing of both the Veterans' Affairs Committee, and the Banking and Currency Committee, I noted with particular interest the openhanded outpouring of help and elbow grease of the wonderful citizens and groups within Attleboro. It seems that Mr. and Mrs. Demers, who were required to relocate due to a mortgage foreclosure, in a display of ingenuity, relocated themselves, and their 10 children, into a tent which they put up at the Massasoit camping grounds in Taunton until they were fortunate enough to be able to remove the tents closer to Mr. Demers place of employment, which they did when a space behind the Provincial Building at the LaSalette Shrine was made available for them. The need of Mr. and Mrs. Demers, and their children, was a source of great concern to all in the community, and a spontaneous effort took form to help them. Among those extending the hand of help were Municipal Councilmen William J. Crowley, Jr., and Paul H. Lallier, and Father Normand Boulet of St. Joseph's Church, and Father Edward J. Byington of St. John's Church. Bishop Daniel Cronin, learning of their unfortunate circumstance, took a personal interest, and all the community, and its civic groups, became involved. More than 30 citizens volunteered their time and help to restore and brush up a two-family dwelling at 12-12½ Holman Street, which had been vacated, so that one-half of it could be immediately used.

The constructive solution to the housing problem of Mr. and Mrs. Demers and their children, and the commendable generosity of so many, working together to help a family in a time of need, is worthy of much attention, and I would like to include the entire article at this point which appeared in the Attleboro Sun Chronicle on September 25:

FAMILY OF 12 FIND LOVE, GENEROSITY IN

ATTLEBORO

(By Dale King)

ATTLEBORO.—The cynics who feel sure there is no love and generosity in the world any more may take a lesson from a group of Attleboro residents, clergymen, laymen, Municipal Councilmen and just plain good neighbors who have assisted a man, his wife and their 10 children in settling into a renovated home.

In May, the 12 members of the William Demers family had to leave their Summer Street home when the mortgage was foreclosed. When they could find no other house to occupy immediately, they resorted to a less-desirable substitute—a tent.

The Demers family has been living in this tent since late last spring. They originally set up the makeshift structure at the Massachusetts Camping Grounds in Taunton, but were granted permission to put up the tent behind the Provincial Building at the La-Salette Shrine here, closer to where the elder Demers is employed as a custodian at the Attleboro Public Library.

City fathers and members of the ministry realized in the spring that the family would require suitable quarters eventually and the process of finding these quarters began.

The problem was first taken up by Municipal Councilmen William J. Crowley Jr. and Paul H. Lallier. The former is councilman for Ward 6 where the Summer Street home was located.

Crowley got together with the Rev. Norman Boulet of St. Joseph's Church and the Rev. Edward J. Byington of St. John's Church in seeking a means of remedying the situation. A lawyer from St. John's Parish volunteered his services in contacting city officials and agencies involved in housing.

Light seemed to show through in early summer when Father Boulet attempted to make the Nazareth Home on Commonwealth Avenue in Attleboro Falls available to the family. The home, the former St. Mark's Church building, had been sold, however.

But by this time, the situation became known to Bishop Daniel Cronin of the Fall River Diocese and the effort suddenly became one which embraced the entire Christian community.

A two-family dwelling at 12-12½ Holman St., vacated several years ago, suddenly became the focal point of the group now organized to help the Demers family relocate. The home is owned by the city and it was slated to be torn down to make way for a parking lot.

Mayor Thomas A. Piggott was contacted about the house and the situation was explained to him. The mayor agreed to change the plans about tearing down the house, but since the home and property were owned by the city, the house and land could not be bought outright by the Demers family. By law, the dwelling and property must be put out to bid.

In the meantime, a group of more than 30 persons, members of St. Joseph's Parish, St. John's, St. Stephen's of Dodgeville, St. Mary's of North Seekonk, Attleboro's Emmanuel Lutheran Church and Marathon House, have been donating their time, effort and elbow grease to bring the old structure, boarded up and decayed by neglect for several years, up to a level suitable for housing the couple and their 10 children.

City Health Agent Henry Brousseau has been at the house during the renovations and said that the home, though its appearance is that of a dilapidated dwelling, is structurally sound, with efforts needed only in the area of cleaning up, patching broken plaster, replacing broken windows and installing utilities.

Much of this work has been done in preparation for the move by the Demers into their new home. The move is expected shortly, long before the coming of cold weather which would make tent living both unhealthy and dangerous for the family.

The Demers will occupy the 12½ Holman side of the two-family structure, with a divider separating their nine-room section from the other section which will not be renovated at this time. Eventually the family may occupy the entire house.

To assist the family in getting back on its feet, donations are being made by the St. Vincent de Paul Society through St. John's Church and St. Joseph's Christian Youth Organization is also working on the home. Some companies in the city have made donations of furnishings to the home.

Those who doubt that the virtue of charity has gone out of this computerized, modernized and impersonalized world need only visit

12½ Holman Street to have their faith lifted.

TO LIMIT INDIVIDUAL CONTRIBUTIONS

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 19, 1971

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, in a November 11 edition of the New York Post, widely syndicated columnist Sylvia Porter discussed campaign spending legislation. Her article adds further insight into the urgent need for reforming the Federal Corrupt Practices Act. In concluding her article, Miss Porter describes four "essential provisions" of any final bill which the Congress passes. These four "must" provisions are:

First, full disclosure by candidates before and after the election of contributions and expenditures;

Second, reasonable ceilings on total campaign spending;

Third, effective enforcement rules by an independent agency with authority to halt abuses; and

Fourth, a ceiling on the amounts any individual may contribute to a candidate.

It is noteworthy that the Senate bill covers only points 1 and 3. I concur with Miss Porter that any bill which this Congress passes should contain all four.

The following is text of Miss Porter's article:

[From the New York Post, Nov. 11, 1971]

CAMPAIGN COFFERS

(By Sylvia Porter)

When a group of 60 millionaires met behind closed doors at an unprecedented luncheon in the 21 Club here a fortnight ago, they agreed that it was imperative to seek limits on spending for political campaigns.

Since the potential political contributions of these 60 millionaires alone will represent perhaps an astounding one-fourth of the funds necessary for the '72 Presidential campaigns, this single agreement at this extraordinary luncheon telegraphs the probability that for the first time in history, truly significant controls on political campaign spending are on the way.

Already—a full year before the 1972 elections—money to finance the '72 political campaigns from coast to coast has become a bitter issue and brutal headache. Not ever has the financing issue loomed so large so early in our election history.

Already, the phenomenal costs that will be involved have impelled Congress to debate major controls—including meaningful ceilings on the amounts candidates may spend plus strict enforcement measures and rules requiring disclosure of who contributes how much to each candidate's campaigns.

And already, the wide bipartisan support for action—both inside Congress and outside Congress, as illustrated by the attitudes of the 60 millionaires—makes it probable that a campaign financing law will be on the book before the '72 fights move into a high gear.

The background is exceedingly sobering: The total cost of the 1968 campaigns at all levels hit a record \$300 million, up a staggering 50 per cent from 1964 and nearly double the \$155 million spent as recently as 1956.

In 1968 the two main Presidential candidates spent more than \$35 million, 40 per cent more than in 1964. Today, the cost of

waging a single Presidential candidate's campaign is estimated at \$25 million.

In 1968, the two major political conventions cost more than \$2.5 million, \$796,263 for the Republicans and \$1,746,301 for the Democrats. These totals were merely to pay for the two short extravaganzas at which Humphrey and Nixon were nominated.

Today, it may cost tens of thousands, if not hundreds of thousands, to run for even a minor national office.

Candidates at all levels are being forced to make ever expanding use of such expensive new techniques as computer data banks, professional pollsters, speechwriters and political consultants who may charge \$500 or more a day for their services. Meanwhile, the cost of TV continues to soar: in the '70 elections, the cost of TV political advertising rose nearly 50 per cent above '68 costs.

As a result, it is becoming even more difficult for an unknown, or an American of limited means, to enter a political race. As a result, campaign fund raising has become a year-round burden for political contenders of all stripes. (I've received dozens of solicitations even at this early date for financial support from a variety of hopefuls, and probably so have you).

As a result, candidates of both parties are increasingly forced to lean on expensive mail blitzes and a relatively small handful of big contributors—leaving the little guy with a growing cynicism about the whole American political process and an equally mounting feeling of helplessness to make any changes.

There is no disputing the pressure for workable ceilings on campaign spending, nor doubting the need for controls on contributions. The details of the final bill Congress will vote are still to be written, but surely among the essential provisions will be:

Full disclosure by all candidates and political parties of the amounts of contributions and expenses, both before and after the elections.

Reasonable ceilings on total campaign spending be directly authorized by the candidates. The most popular total for such spending in the bills now before Congress is 10 cents per eligible voter for any given candidate.

A ceiling on the amounts any given individual may contribute to any given candidate.

Effective enforcement of the rules by an independent bipartisan elections commission with real power to halt abuses.

MURDER BY PROXY: THE CONTINUING AIR WAR IN SOUTHEAST ASIA

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 19, 1971

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, the President of the United States continues to tell us that American involvement in the war in Southeast Asia is rapidly winding down. He prolongs the withdrawal of American servicemen, yet regularly appears on television to announce that a few more combat ground troops will soon be on their way home. Despite the 1970 Cambodian incursion, he would like this Nation to believe that he is bringing peace to the war-torn region which we have bombed, strafed, defoliated, and wasted for a decade.

Something is wrong, however, when the President of the United States hides the slaughter of Southeast Asians behind a smokescreen of duplicity. That is ex-

actly what is happening in the air war in Indochina.

Recently, the Center for International Studies at Cornell University released its landmark report, "The Air War in Indochina." The study shows that in the first 3 years of the Nixon administration, more bomb tonnage was dropped on the people of Southeast Asia than in the last 4 years of the Johnson administration. Since 1965, the United States has dropped approximately 6,200,000 tons of air-delivered munitions on Indochina, in contrast to 2,000,000 tons in all theaters in World War II and 1,000,000 tons during the Korean conflict.

Our 6,200,000 tons of air-delivered munitions have been spread as follows:

[In tons]	
South Vietnam.....	3,600,000
North Vietnam.....	500,000
Ho Chi Minh Trail.....	1,400,000
Northern Laos.....	500,000
Cambodia.....	200,000

And, Mr. Speaker, this massacre by proxy, bombing from the relative safety of the skies, is going on today.

CONSUMERISM AND CONSUMERISTS

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 19, 1971

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, I recently reported to my people on consumerism and consumerists. I insert my report in the RECORD at this point:

RARICK REPORTS TO HIS PEOPLE ON CONSUMERISM AND CONSUMERISTS

Much publicity is being given today in accentuating the consumer movement and to the self appointed consumerists who purport to be the protectors of the rights of all consumers.

Who are consumers? They are buyers—anyone and everyone who buys anything is a consumer. You are a consumer. Do the radical militant consumerists speak for you or only because you are silent and others think they do?

I thought we'd talk today about the consumerists. Who they are and what they are really after.

Most Americans realize that there have always been short-change artists unbalanced scales, cutrate specials, and other frauds practiced upon the buyer. I think it is reasonably safe to say that such thievery has been going on in the marketplace from time immemorial. Many solutions and deterrents have been proposed but the most successful has been that the consumer once stung does not repeat. He or she goes elsewhere. This is called experience. It cannot be bought, taught, nor legislated.

Certainly many consumer announcements and proposals have merit. On the other hand, some of the crusade objectives are absurd to the extent of constituting an insult to every housewife in our land. For contrary to the contemporary rationalizations of some, most housewives and consumers who work hard for their money have enough commonsense to know what they want to buy without some Government bureaucrat taking their hand and leading them to the nationalized noncompetitive store stocking no choice of products from which to pick. That is why bars of soap have different colored wrappers and various scents—a choice.

Many people are awakening to realize that some consumer movements have become quite profitable—especially to the leaders. While others, promoting seemingly worthwhile causes, appear far more interested in developing impossible political issues and organizing a new bloc vote than in accomplishing results. Then there are those few informed onwatchers who have pierced the veil of emotion do-gooderism of helping consumers and see the threat from the national socialist movement dedicated not at helping the buyer but to a fully nationalized economy—full wage, price, and market control. And to that end the consumerism movement is contrary to the bona fide interests of the consumer whose only true source of relief is through competitive free enterprise.

Our people are hearing a lot these days about "consumerism" and the promised goals of so-called consumer pressure groups. Since the self-styled spokesmen of consumerism claim to speak for all of us, I feel these unelected leaders and their self-selected goals are entitled to some scrutiny and discussion.

I want to make clear that when I refer to consumerist groups, I am not talking about the several legitimate organizations, such as the Better Business Bureaus, which work constructively through the free enterprise system to protect the consumer. I am referring to self-appointed independently financed activists who would stir up conflict and dissension between producers and consumers. They have been referred to as the "disaster lobby." They proclaim disaster for the nation unless government action is promptly taken to remedy their every claim of discriminatory and unwise business practices which they say are harmful to consumers. They have attacked the automobile industry for making unsafe cars, packers and processors for contaminated food and for cheating the consumer with odd-size containers, and have charged industry and business with false advertising. They consider business a target; profit, their enemy. They advocate more controls over free enterprise. In the ultimate the consumer loses by price and selection. They would have the federal government nationalize industries and operate the machine of production along guidelines set by the consumerist whiz kids. Their real goal is the destruction of the free enterprise system by placing private industry under public controls. One of the leading consumerist spokesmen proposed that corporations abusing the public interest should be taken over by the government and their officers sent to jail. Who then would run the corporation and for how long would it produce and what would it produce?

The public has a right to know the background of the consumerist lobby which is after all supposedly working on the public's behalf since we are all consumers. The two most outspoken consumerist groups claiming to speak for Americans are Consumers Union and the Consumer Federation of America.

Consumers Union was formed in 1935 as a rival organization to a legitimate consumer group known as Consumers Research. A dissident group of employees of Consumers Research, unsuccessful in their attempt to gain control over Consumers Research, formed Consumers Union.

According to testimony before the House Special Committee on Un-American Activities in 1938, Consumers Union was formed as a result of a 1935 Communist Party directive to "launch a whole new series of united front organizations dealing ostensibly with the interests of consumers." Consumers Union has been cited as a communist front by the U.S. Government as well as by the governments of California and Pennsylvania.

The other major consumerist group is the Consumer Federation of America. It was formed three years ago. At the first national conference of consumers called the Consumers Assembly held in April, 1966, and presided

over by the President of Consumers Union, it was proposed by a Special Assistant to the President of the United States that a federation of consumers be established.

Two years later, the Consumers Federation of America was a reality. There is a close relationship between Consumers Union and the Consumer Federation of America. An assistant director of Consumers Union served at the same time as secretary-treasurer and a member of the executive Committee of the Consumer Federation of America.

It is of interest to note that when an executive of a large national retail chain asked about becoming a member of the Consumer Federation of America, he was told that his company did not qualify since it had no consumer program and since it was run for profit. Only members like consumer cooperatives are eligible to join.

Thus far, I have attempted to show briefly that there have been Communist influences in the drive for consumer rights and that the real purpose of the consumerists is not so much to protect consumers as it is to destroy free enterprise. Under the pretext of protecting rights of millions of consumers, the consumer lobby is launching an attack on the productive sectors of our society, both labor and management, in its ultimate goal of transforming our free enterprise economic system into a government-managed and controlled society.

There is no doubt that the consumerists have achieved considerable power and influence since their Consumers Union was formed in 1935. The Consumer Federation of America's President was selected in 1968 by the then HEW Secretary Wilbur J. Cohen to head the newly created Office of Consumer Services, and the two consumer groups were the only consumer organizations testifying at House hearings on the Consumer Protection Act of 1971, which the House passed on October 14. The consumer Lobby does constitute a threat to free enterprise. The best weapon for counteracting the threat is truth—truth about the fabricated charges of the disaster lobby and truth about the proven superiority of free enterprise over any other economic system.

Take air pollution for example, while the consumerists clamor that industrial leaders should be jailed for polluting the atmosphere, the truth is that the amount of pollutants in the air has steadily decreased in almost every major city.

And the charge that the planet will soon have standing room only if we don't reduce population is false. The birth rate in just about every major country in the world has been declining so fast that there is a genuine concern about underpopulation.

A good example of how the American housewife was fooled by those who pretend to protect the consumer is the use of phosphates in laundry detergents. Following a campaign by the consumerists to abolish the use of phosphates as being unsafe and dangerous, various communities prohibited their use. Producers had to change their formulas and spend millions in advertising to tell the people which soaps did not contain phosphates. Then it was discovered that phosphates were perfectly safe but that the substitutes for phosphates were harmful to children. This illustrates how the unfounded scare tactics used in one so-called consumer protection program cost American industry and consumers millions of dollars, harming rather than helping the consumer.

Many more examples might be cited to show how consumerists exaggerate by nit-picking to mislead consumers.

The nation's news media and schools would render a real service in the cause of freedom by frequently proclaiming the benefits of the free enterprise system, which along with the two other main sources of our strength—the Holy Bible and the U. S. Constitution—made America the most prosperous coun-

try in the world and the emulation of other nations.

Let us emphasize that the consumers' best friend is competitive free enterprise which responds to their needs much more readily than government bureaucrats. Is the record of the government bureaucrats so successful in other fields that we can now in confidence trust them with another control over our lives?

Let us constantly remind citizens that government has nothing to give that it doesn't first take from people. Likewise socialism only works where it has been allowed to feed from the progress of free enterprise produced taxes to pay for government corruption and political promises.

Let us impress upon the citizenry that the struggle between communism and capitalism is a struggle between dictatorship and a free economic system—between slavery and freedom.

Let us explode the myth that a planned socialist economy under the direction of government is more efficient than a productive free enterprise economy.

And let us remember our experiences that the only thing governments can control is people. And that governments can control people, only by taking away the people's right to control themselves. Governments don't control prices, only people. A pound of tomatoes doesn't care what the price is. But people care—the people who grow the tomatoes, the people who sell the tomatoes, and the people who buy the tomatoes.

By proclaiming the truth about the superiority of a competitive free enterprise system over a controlled economy and acting in accordance with this truth, we can counteract the propaganda by so-called consumerists to one of the pillars of America's greatness—the free enterprise economic system.

NATIONAL BIBLE WEEK

HON. WM. JENNINGS BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 18, 1971

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, it is most fitting and proper that we observe National Bible Week during the week of Thanksgiving, November 21 through 28. America, more than any other nation, has much for which to be thankful. We are the bastion of democracy and the hope of the free world. We have reached this position of strength and abundance as "one Nation under God." Religion and Bible reading are basic and fundamental to our national heritage. We are all familiar with the picture of the American pioneer heading west with few personal possessions other than his Bible. For our forebears, as it is for many of us today, the Bible was a living book. The Bible is timeless literature. It is rich history. It is the supreme code of ethics for our daily lives. The Bible can be the source of all true wisdom. Especially during these troubled times, Mr. Speaker, the Bible can be the invaluable source of strength, guidance, and comfort.

Throughout American history no other book has been more closely bound with our national destiny. President Abraham Lincoln relied on the Bible for many of his decisions. Some of his most memorable speeches and proclamations borrowed from Biblical text and wording. There are innumerable examples of how phrases from the Scriptures have become

part of our daily language. The Bible is today a strong and vibrant force in the life of our Nation. I firmly believe, Mr. Speaker, that our Nation's dedication to those great principles enunciated in the Bible is largely responsible for the strength, liberty, and abundance of this great land.

Yes, at this Thanksgiving season we do have much to be thankful for. Some nations suffer untold misery and human degradation, while others feel the harsh yoke of atheistic and materialistic oppression. In America, we are on the right track. We are moving in the right direction. We are, more than any other nation in the history of the world, one Nation, under God, with liberty, justice, and abundance for all.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I commend the coordinators of this the 31st annual National Bible Week. It is highly fitting and proper in the Thanksgiving season for us to encourage the reading and study of the Holy Scripture and to reaffirm the close and lasting connection of our national heritage to the word of the Bible. I commend to my colleagues in the Congress and to all Americans renewed study of the greatest Book of all.

SUSAN ANTHONY

HON. JACK F. KEMP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 19, 1971

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, our distinguished and able colleague, the Honorable SEYMOUR HALPERN, has introduced an excellent bill, of which I am pleased to be a cosponsor, to provide for the portrait of Susan B. Anthony to appear on the \$2 bill. The Treasury Department has indicated that the revitalization of the \$2 bill would save the taxpayers a considerable amount in printing and distribution costs, and I feel it most fitting that women be represented on this denomination by Susan Anthony, who contributed so much to womanhood and our national heritage.

Mr. HALPERN's bill has gained wide support here in the House, from the Governors of many States and from dozens of women's organizations. At this point I would like to share with my colleagues one of many endorsements of the legislation, this one from Louis Rukeyser, ABC News, New York. Rukeyser's comments follow:

RUKEYSER'S WORLD

I'm Louis Rukeyser, ABC News, New York, and this is "Rukeyser's World" on the American Information Radio Network. I'll have a look at liberated money in sixty seconds.

At last comes an idea from the fanatics of women's liberation that even an old male chauvinist can support. The suggestion that women replace men on the faces of at least some of the nation's currency is aesthetically pleasing, culturally fair and financially realistic.

The faces of the bills would then be of the same gender as the hands that so often spend them, and what could be more reasonable than that?

The actual opening suggestion, as sponsored in Congress by New York's Representa-

tive Seymour Halpern, calls for a substitution on the face of the two-dollar bill, Susan B. Anthony going in for Thomas Jefferson.

It would be taken as frivolous, I gather, to comment on the physical appearance of the stern suffragette, or to propose some more voluptuous type for some higher denomination. After all, George Washington and Andrew Jackson didn't win any beauty contests, either, yet their rugged countenances have adorned our currency for years.

You will notice that I have not mentioned, as an argument in favor of this change, the traditional statistics indicating that women already own most of the nation's wealth.

Julia Montgomery Walsh, a dynamic lady who combines looking after twelve children with being the first woman member of the American Stock Exchange, once told me that these statistics are misleading, because much wealth nominally owned by women is in fact controlled by men.

A similar point was made by that devoted liberationist, Gloria Steinem, who grumbled that all the nation's money now has men's faces on it, which she said was, and I quote, "symbolic of where the power is."

Well, that's going a little too far, I think—at least at my house. And while I support the movement to end sex discrimination on crumpled dollar bills and battered quarters, I would caution the more militant ladies that as a contribution to economic prosperity, the face on the currency is only skin deep.

After all, the British have had Queen Elizabeth's face on all their money since her reign begun, yet the pound still gets devalued just as often as if they still had a King.

I'm Louis Rukeyser, ABC News, New York, and this has been "Rukeyser's World" on the American Information Radio Network.

THE COLLEGE VOTER

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 19, 1971

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, in the October 1971, edition of State Government News, a monthly publication of the Council of State Governments, the question of where students may vote—at home or at college—is discussed. The article summarizes the opinions of a number of State attorneys general. Some of them advise students that they are free to choose their own residency without being required to offer evidence of intent or undergo extensive questioning, and others caution that a student's residence is presumed to be that of his parents' and to change it requires factual proof of intent. Thus, the laws on voter residency differ widely among the several States.

In order to carry out the full intent of the constitutional amendment grant to 18-year-olds the right to vote, it is logical that the States should modernize their voter residency statutes to permit student voters the right to register and vote either at their parents' home or at their college home.

The text of the article follows:

WHERE MAY STUDENTS VOTE—HOMETOWN OR COLLEGE?

Attorneys General are divided on what qualifications students should possess to vote in their college towns.

Some Attorneys General are advising that

students and minors are as free as adults to choose their own residency without being required to offer evidence of intent or submitting to extensive questioning.

Others are cautioning that a student's residence is presumed to be that of his parents' and to change it he should offer factual proof of his intentions. These opinions suggest questions registrars may ask in determining residency.

Laws on establishing voter residency differ among the States. Opinions on the state residency laws were issued primarily to aid election officers in registering the newly enfranchised 18- to 21-year-olds. The Attorneys General stressed that the registrars would have to determine each case individually and no blanket guidelines could be given.

It is the student's intent which is a major point of contention. Attorneys General differ on whether the student's intent to reside in a community while a student is sufficient to meet state requirements. The liberal view was expressed by the Attorneys General of Florida, Massachusetts, Missouri, and Washington. They declared adequate the intent to remain while a student, coupled with an intent not to return to the previous residence.

Many States have a law or constitutional provision which stipulates that a person is not deemed to gain or lose a residence by attending an institution of learning, serving in civil or military duty of the United States, engaging in navigation, or residing in a public institution.

The Michigan Supreme Court held unconstitutional this provision in *Wilkins v. Bentley* (August 27, 1971) because the State could demonstrate no compelling interest for placing this burden of a rebuttable presumption on the right of students to vote and thus had denied them equal protection of the laws.

Attorneys General of States which have this provision generally interpreted it as meaning that physical presence in a community while at school must be coupled with an intent to remain.

The first State Supreme Court ruling on the 26th Amendment was the California decision that 18- to 21-year-olds must be treated the same as adults for voting purposes. In *Jolicoeur et al. v. Mihaly et al.* (August 27, 1971), the Court held it would violate minors' rights to require them to vote in their parents' district, even by absentee. It also concluded "strong state policies require that voters participate in elections where they reside." The Court ruled applicants could not be specially questioned because of their "age or occupational status."

The California Supreme Court ruling overturned an opinion issued by Attorney General Evelle J. Younger that the voting residence of an unmarried minor was the parents' home. He noted there was no specific state law on the question and requested judicial or legislative clarification. He commented that 21-year-old students could vote at their school residency if they met requirements and abandoned their former residence.

Summaries of Attorneys General's opinions which declared minors and students eligible to freely establish their own voting residency follow.

Florida Attorney General Robert L. Shevin advised: The only voting requirement is one-year state and six-month county residency. Student vacations away from college towns, like temporary absences of all voters, do not affect residency. Students are eligible to vote in municipal elections, regardless of whether or not they live in a dorm. To apply different standards to students and other voters would violate "equal protection" of the law. Students are affected by local legislative, executive, and judicial decisions. They observe local conditions, have access to news, and

often work in the community. Students should be treated no differently than corporation employees, assigned to localities for limited periods.

Georgia Attorney General Arthur K. Bolton explained: A person with more than one residence may choose which is his domicile. For voting purposes, a minor has this choice.

College towns benefit from the census count of students in larger state and federal grants and more legislative representation. Students are affected by local decisions, have access to news, and have the "same stake in the outcome of the elections as any other citizens in the community."

A 1970 U.S. Supreme Court decision (*Evans v. Cornman*, 398 U.S. 419), allowing residents of a federal enclave to vote in state and local elections, could be applied to college students, who also are included in a census of the town, affected by state and local laws, and pay taxes.

Idaho Attorney General W. Anthony Park stated: Residence for voting is the place of an elector's fixed habitation and to which, whenever he is absent, he has the intention of returning according to law. "Intent to stay in a place permanently or temporarily is subjective, and thus not ascertainable by objective observation . . . the residence determination for voting purposes should be left for the voter himself to determine."

An out-of-state student is qualified if he is a six-month resident and declares his intent to become a permanent Idaho resident. Vacations do not affect residency.

The county clerk may register voters at branch locations and the "registration of students for their college classes would be an optimum time to register them to vote . . ."

Illinois Attorney General William J. Scott pronounced: Students and those 18 to 21 must be treated the same by registrars as those over 21. They cannot be asked about parental support, driver's license address, or denied registration because they live in a dorm.

The law requires only proof of age, six months residence in the State and 30 days in the precinct. However, they must be "permanent residents" as required by the new constitution or risk having their vote challenged at the polls. The State Supreme Court, in a number of rulings, has held that in order to vote in a college town a student must prove that he has a "permanent" residence there, and not at the home of his parents.

Louisiana Attorney General Jack P. F. Gremillion explained: Under the constitution a person is not deemed to gain a residency by attending an institution of learning. "To overcome this presumption," a student should file a bona fide residence six months prior to registering to vote and file a letter of intent with the clerk of court to establish residency. The filing of the letter shows the intention of the student to vote in the parish and serves as proof that he has resided there.

The 18- to 21-year-olds are emancipated for voting purposes and not tied to their parents' residency.

Massachusetts Attorney General Robert H. Quinn declined to give guidelines to use in specific cases, but announced the following general principles: Students who are six-month residents and declare an intention to stay in the community for an indefinite period are eligible to register. The fact that the applicant is a student should "place on him no greater burden of proving his domiciliary intent." It is of no relevance whether a student has parental support, resides in a dorm, or whether his parents reside out of State. "The basic question to be answered is whether he intends to return to his former home as soon as his course of studies is completed."

Missouri Attorney General John C. Dan-

forth stipulated that: A student may change his residency if he (1) declares he has abandoned his original residence and does not intend to return to it, (2) declares his intent to reside in the community for an indefinite period, and (3) his declarations are consistent with facts. "Indefinitely" can be for the time necessary to complete an education with an intent not to return to the previous residence. Neither parental control nor support precludes a minor from establishing his own residency.

Courts have considered church and other membership and listed addresses in determining residency, but none of these are "conclusive."

North Dakota Attorney General Helgi Johanneson said: "Residence is acquired by an overt act coupled with intent." A student may vote in his school community if he meets residence requirements. ". . . one of the basic questions which must be answered is the intent of the student . . . If he intends to return to his home and does not make the place where he is staying while attending school his residence," he does not qualify. Under state law, persons 18 and over are adults and thus not considered minors bound to their parents' residence.

The fact that the census counts students in their college town does not affect state laws dealing with residency.

Oklahoma Attorney General Larry Derryberry declared: Eighteen-year-old students may register in the community where they attend college if that is their legal residence and if they are otherwise qualified electors. When a person becomes a "resident" for voting purposes involves a question of fact and is "largely determined by the acts and intentions of the particular person desiring to vote." This applies to students "as well as all other persons in determining whether they are qualified electors."

Washington Attorney General Slade Gorton advised State Representative Arthur C. Brown: Existing law would not be changed by a statute providing that students could vote at their school residence if they declare they have no present intention to move to any other voting area. A constitutional provision, which states a student does not "gain or lose" a residence while at school, does not prevent establishment of a voting residence at school if there is an intent to remain permanently or indefinitely.

On the issue, 25 Am. Jur. 2d, Elections, Section 72, is quoted, "As a general rule, a residence for voting purposes may be acquired where a student attending school or college has no intention of returning home, but is not certain as to the place of his future residence . . ."

Synopses of Attorneys General's opinions which generally held applicants must offer some proof of their eligibility to vote in a new district follow.

Alaska Attorney General John E. Havelock stated: The law provides that the residence of a student who meets the voter qualifications is the "residence shown on his last registration at the institution (of learning) made at least 30 days before an election."

Arkansas Attorney General Ray Thornton in a fact sheet on voter registration sent to all county clerks instructs: For a student to register in the county where he attends school, he must first establish his legal residence there. The Arkansas Supreme Court ruled, in *Ptak v. Jameson*, 215 Ark. 292, "A student who comes to Fayetteville for the sole purpose of securing an education does so without making a change of residence. It is necessary to have a bona fide intention to make Fayetteville his home permanently or for an indefinite period and not to limit it to the time necessary to get an education."

Delaware Attorney General W. Laird Stabler, Jr., approved an opinion issued by State Solicitor C. Edward Duffy which states: A student may establish a voting residence

where he attends school if he meets durational residency requirements, abandons his previous residence, and has actual intent to establish his new residence for an appreciable period of time. It is the intention of the prospective voter to abandon his old residence and adopt the new which must be determined. All the facts and circumstances of each case must be considered.

An out-of-state married student attending school nine months a year does not qualify. A student who remains during vacation with an idea toward settling in Delaware in the future might well qualify.

Iowa Attorney General Richard C. Turner pronounced: Residence for voting means domicile which is largely a matter of intent. A student may intend to make the community where his college is located his domicile or permanent residence after he leaves college. But, if he intends to move after graduation or does not know what he is going to do, that place is not his residence. While this test of residency is subjective and inquiry into a person's state of mind somewhat difficult, the student can be asked under oath by challengers: his original residence, his vacation residence, what address is listed on his college registration, his driver's license or draft card, and "to produce anything he is carrying on his person to substantiate his testimony."

A student, like any other prospective voter who is challenged, must sign a "declaration of eligibility," and be permitted to vote. The State must look for its remedy in prosecuting the voter for false swearing.

Kentucky Attorney General John B. Breckinridge declared: "... the general rule is that a student in a college town is presumed not to possess legal residence and the fact that he has resided there the necessary length of time to qualify to vote . . . does not of itself entitle him to this right." A student must have no intention of returning to his parental home. His intentions cannot be ascertained solely on his own statement, but "determined in the light of all the facts and circumstances." The facts must be "wholly independent and outside of his presence as a student and should be very clear and convincing. . . ."

A student also is eligible who is free of parental control, regards the community as his home, and has no other to which to return in case of sickness or domestic affliction. Marriage emancipates a minor from parental control.

Maine Attorney General James S. Erwin related: "Our law specifically decrees that a student does not acquire, nor can he claim, residence for voting purposes from the fact of his attendance at an educational institution." It is up to local boards to decide whether an applicant meets residency requirements. "Mere verbal claims of intent are not enough. The local boards must be satisfied in each individual case that the totality of circumstances indicates a good faith intent to reside indefinitely in the State."

Maryland Attorney General Francis B. Burch advised: The registrar must determine whether there are affirmative facts which establish the bona fide intent of a student to abandon his old domicile and establish a new one in his college community. The same standards must be applied to all seeking to change residency, whether student or businessman. "Neither age nor occupational status are valid reasons for unequal treatment by the registrars."

A list of 14 factors which courts have used in determining residency include frequency of return to previous domicile, employment, address on income tax and driver's license, and parental residence and intent to return to it. No certain number must be answered and each case must be judged individually.

New Hampshire Attorney General Warren B. Rudman said: Although there may be special circumstances where a student's legal residence is the place where he at-

tends school, generally speaking, the legal residence of a student is that of his parents. This applies equally to in-state and out-of-state students. "If anyone contends his name is illegally kept from the checklist, he may file a complaint in the Superior Court and he will be entitled to an immediate hearing. . . ."

The law is that a student does not gain or lose a residence by a temporary absence.

Virginia Attorney General Andrew P. Miller stated: The registrar must ascertain the intent of the student. "The intention to remain in a given jurisdiction only so long as a student . . . is not sufficient." The intent to remain for an indefinite period is necessary. There can be no official guidelines that registrars might employ in making this complex determination. Various courts have considered student plans after graduation, payment of out-of-state tuition rates, vacation home, parental control and support, driver's license address, and bank account location.

A law that students are not deemed to gain or lose a residence at school does not prohibit them from registering there.

STRUCTURE, OPERATION, AND REGULATION OF SECURITIES MARKETS

HON. W. S. (BILL) STUCKEY

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 19, 1971

Mr. STUCKEY. Mr. Speaker, since coming to Congress in 1967 a major portion of the work of the Commerce and Finance Subcommittee of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, on which I serve, has been devoted to the securities industry.

During this period, the financial community has been shaken by internal crisis. In 1969 alone, an estimated 150 brokerage firms liquidated and others either entered into mergers or cut back their operations.

The changes within the industry can be attributed in large measure to internal structural change. Because this is a complicated industry, there are still many aspects of it that are not clearly understood.

At the present time the Securities and Exchange Commission, the Commerce and Finance Subcommittee of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and the Securities Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs are conducting investigative studies in an attempt to add additional insight into the vast body of data already published on this industry.

Earlier this week, Arthur Lipper III, president of Arthur Lipper Corp., a New York Stock Exchange firm, which serves only institutional clients, announced that his firm would shortly withdraw from the institutional brokerage business. The unusual aspect of the announcement was that Arthur Lipper Corp. is withdrawing from the business at a time when the firm's net worth is close to its alltime high. Mr. Lipper cited as a principal reason for his decision the fact that structural changes taking place within the industry cast doubt on the future ability of his firm to earn an adequate, risk-related, return on the ever increasing amounts of capital which are

required in the operation of such a business.

Yesterday, in testimony before the SEC's investigatory hearing on the "Structure, Operation, and Regulation of Securities Markets," Mr. Lipper explained in greater detail basic structural changes he believes to be necessary to insure a sound securities market in the future.

Because of widespread interest in this topic, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Lipper's introductory remarks and a text of his statement presented to the SEC be included at this point in the RECORD:

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS OF ARTHUR LIPPER III

Gentlemen: Having submitted an intentionally brief, prepared statement, I am hopeful that it has been read and that I can now constructively answer any questions which may have been stimulated.

In short, I believe the following to be in the public interest in the restructuring of our securities markets.

1. Competitively negotiated commissions.
2. Institutional access.
3. A communication system based central market.
4. A single, common Central Clearance and Depository Agency.
5. A separation of those activities giving rise to irreconcilable conflicts of interest, specifically those of investment advisory and broker/dealer functions.

In order of priority, I would suggest the establishment of a central market system as being the most important, with the Central Clearance Agency being the next most vital.

Before I begin answering whatever questions you may have, I would like to make two broad points not included in the prepared presentation.

Firstly, there exists an overall investment industry problem of major proportions. That is simply the fact that, at presently existing levels of investment management fees, there is no profit possible for many of the organizations currently offering investment management services without resorting to practices which are adverse to the beneficial investors' interest. For example, I believe that only a small number of the very largest trust departments of commercial banks would be profitable on the basis of true cost allocation offset only by the advisory fees charged. Similarly, management fees alone are not sufficient to earn a profit for most fund management companies, were commission charges to be either considered discretionary expense items and, therefore, subject to limitation, or for Moses V. Burgin type reasons. Even with the use of commissions for the acquisition of services, including those of investment advisory, in the form of brokerage firm research, I estimate that individually the vast majority of management companies themselves lose money. I believe that the focus of attention on the fee level is misplaced.

Detailed disclosure of the investment related services being provided would be a competitively effective manner of insuring that investors received value for their fees. For example, I suggest new investment company prospectus requirements regarding investment related personnel and facilities with disclosure of compensation, experience and areas of responsibility for all individuals playing a meaningful decision making role. Specific costs of maintaining investment related facilities and services should also be disclosed.

The focus of attention must be shifted to the positive achievement of valid investment objectives from that of stated compensation minimization. The present emphasis on limiting or reducing the visible fee structure causes many of the less visible practices which, in the end, are more costly to the investor.

Secondly, even with its faults and inequities, ours is the finest securities market in the world. I believe that there should be a Commission sponsored attempt to make our hopefully central market the international center of securities transactions. To accomplish this, a greater sophistication and flexibility will be required of the SEC, participating issue companies, banks and broker/dealers than has been demonstrated in the past. It will also be necessary perhaps for Congress to recognize the potential importance of the United States achieving the competitively advantageous position of providing the forum for international securities ownership exchange in that possibly enabling legislation will be required.

Due to the highly regulated nature of our markets and the breadth and depth of our distribution, the United States could be the focal point in the internationalization of world securities markets. I believe this to be a desirable result from the standpoint of our national interest.

I am now ready to answer your questions, and thank you for the opportunity.

STATEMENT OF ARTHUR LIPPER III

My name is Arthur Lipper III, and I am genuinely pleased to have been provided this opportunity to present my views regarding a number of the issues currently being studied relating to the structure of the U.S. securities markets.

I believe that many basic structural changes must occur for our securities markets to function in the most efficient manner possible from the standpoint of both the individual and institutional investor.

As the changes in market structure and practice which I propose will be considered by many to be extreme, and clearly contra personal interest, and because I believe these changes partly inevitable, a brief description of my firm may be in order. Although this description is accurate in terms of the range of activities in which we have engaged, it is not reflective of our future corporate interests, as we have this week announced our intention to withdraw from the securities brokerage business. Much of the rationale for the decision to leave the institutional stock brokerage business is contained in this presentation. Many of the activities might therefore more appropriately be described in the past tense as in the future, we intend to concentrate our efforts towards our corporate capital enhancement rather than client service.

Arthur Lipper Corporation, of which I am the principal stockholder and President, is or has been a member of the New York, American and most regional stock exchanges. Serving institutions primarily, we have more than 1500 institutional accounts on our books. We maintain offices in New York, Washington, London, Geneva and Tokyo. We provide clients with research studies relating to investment companies, investment management companies, and foreign issues of U.S. institutional interest. Our Washington office monitors and prepares reports regarding the activities of governmental agencies which affect corporate earnings, and our Tokyo office provides a constant flow of information regarding Japanese investment companies and industrial corporations.

Except as relating to our publications, we do not engage in the investment advisory area, nor do we "handle" or manage accounts other than our own. We do not act as underwriters nor do we generally participate as members of selling groups. We do not have a sales agreement with any mutual fund, nor do we recommend the purchase or sale of investment company shares.

As agent for institutional clients, we provide an expert execution capability through a fully staffed and highly experienced transactions department. We do employ firm capital to facilitate many agency transactions, in that we are frequently forced through competitive pressures to be at risk in assum-

ing long or short positions contra those of our client to earn the right to charge that client a commission. We are, on those occasions, in the ridiculous and uncomfortable position of being able to profit only if, in the short term, our client's market judgment is not as good as our own. As principal, we are an important dealer (market-maker) in the American Depositary Receipts of major foreign companies and also conduct a dealer business in U.S. equity and debt issues. Foreign arbitrage is one of our important activities.

The existing market structure has been so enormously profitable for those vested industry interests that it is difficult to envision these interests voluntarily accepting change. However, if the public interest is to prevail, change must come and the areas of conflict resolved in favor of the public interest. Over the longer term, the interests of the users and the sponsors of any system must be similar, or the users will find alternative means of achieving their objectives.

Unfortunately, a number of the specific structural and regulatory changes which I advocate as being in the public interest are sufficiently adverse to the interests of firms such as my own, as to make the continued viability of such institutionally-oriented, client-service organizations highly questionable. However, I do believe that securities firms, not unlike other commercial organizations or groups, must either profitably accommodate themselves to the changing needs of those whom they serve or perish.

The creation and maintenance of anti-competitive and restrictive membership and trading barriers intended to thwart the legitimate objectives of institutional clients or fiduciaries is not an appropriate method of serving those clients. The New York Stock Exchange's denial of membership to a qualified and experienced brokerage affiliate of a major investment company advisor while, at the same time, accommodating a number of basically similar arrangements is at best inconsistent, and at worst exemplifies the reasons why Congress originally enacted antitrust legislation. Another restrictive practice is embodied in the New York Stock Exchange's Rule 394. Rule 394 theoretically places every NYSE member receiving an order (which is not designated by the client "stock exchange execution only") in jeopardy in terms of his fiduciary obligations and certainly raises questions for the institutional investor in similar terms of achieving "best execution." In this regard, I understand that several of the country's largest banks are currently using the third market for more than 30% of their executions.

For most institutionally-oriented exchange member brokerage firms, it is no longer feasible to serve institutional investors on an agency basis, where that specific activity must stand the test of profitability. Moreover, improved communication systems cast serious doubt, from the institutions' standpoint, on the necessity or desirability of utilizing the services of securities brokers or, in fact, the Stock Exchanges.

Therefore, I believe the following developments are logical and desirable in light of current investor needs, market structure realities and the public interest.

I. Competitively negotiated agency commission charges on all securities transactions.

II. Establishment of a central market in the form of a computer-based communications system.

III. Institutional access to the central market system.

IV. Establishment of a mandatory industry-wide, central Common Clearance and Depository Agency.

V. Separation of investment advisory activities from those of broker/dealer functions.

In my discussion of each area, I have not assumed acceptance of any of the above proposed specific developments and will, there-

fore, discuss them primarily in relation to the current industry situation.

I. COMMISSION CHARGES

The concept of an enforceable schedule of fixed minimum agency commission charges, as applicable to institutions, is fallacious. In actual practice, all exchange member brokerage firms—while nominally adhering to a fixed level of commission charges—provide a wide range of complimentary services of widely varying and, in some cases, indeterminable value to their clients. These complementary or "bundled" services range presently from all types and qualities of research to security safekeeping and dividend collection, entertainment, block positioning, and tax and estate planning advice. The range of services is broad and the cost of providing services is the principal form of competition between firms. Professor Seymour Smidt of Cornell has testified that, in his opinion, which I share, "There is a strong tendency for the level of costs to adjust itself to the brokerage rate schedule, since firms can attract customers from their competitors only by offering more service, even when the services cost more than they are worth to the customers."

It could be stated that the "quality" of research or investment advice is the truly distinguishing factor between competing firms. This position is, however, considerably weakened when it is recognized that specific individuals are most responsible for creating research or investment advice and are highly mobile. They can, for the most part, be recruited by competing firms on the basis of the competitor being willing to spend more of gross commission revenues for the services of those individuals. In other words, brokerage firms adhering to fixed commission levels compete by allocating discretionary and varying percentages of gross commission income to provide services over and above the cost of physically settling transactions.

Would it not be more logical to encourage firms to charge clients fees which permitted profitable operations based on each firm's cost of providing the services necessary to attract each client? The argument that the large brokerage firms could provide their clients certain services, at a cost of considerably less per unit of service than that of smaller firms (due to economies of scale), is certain to be put forth. It is also probably valid. So what! Larger firms would, in time, due to competitive pressures, reduce their charges to competitively realistic levels. Of course, this process would be hastened and assured were free institutional access possible, since major financial entities would enter the general brokerage business if lack of competition made profit margins exceptionally attractive.

Although I do not believe that all smaller brokerage firms would be forced out of business, I do believe that most would assume the role of investment advisors, using the mechanical brokerage services of other organizations. Almost of necessity, the investment advisory business is a personal service business, a one-to-one relationship between investor and advisor, not unlike the practices of medicine, law and accounting. Most individual brokers are really, from the clients' standpoint, advisors, and should, therefore, be viewed in that context. Many investors desire professional investment advice and are willing to pay the necessary fees. There is still ample opportunity for the competent individual practitioner and smaller entity to profitably serve the real need of investors for sound investment advice.

The public interest would appear to be served by permitting competitively negotiated commissions, thereby allowing the natural laws of supply and demand to function for the benefit of the "market" in the broadest sense.

II. CENTRAL MARKET SYSTEM

Assuming the desired function of a governmentally supervised securities market is to

provide a fair, equitable and efficient method for the mobilization of capital and, therefore, the exchange of ownership of publicly traded securities, it is clear that the current system is far from perfect. That which is needed, in my opinion, is a central market system having continuous ability to consummate transactions within a reasonable period of time, to broadly disseminate market related information to both actual and prospective buyers and sellers and to equitably represent both agency and principal orders.

A stock exchange or federation of competing stock exchanges utilizing a common or composite tape does not a central market make. A central market, in the United States, in the 1970's, is not a building or group of buildings having large unobstructed floor spaces—it is a communication system—a computer-based, nongeographically dependent communication system. In prototype form, it exists today. It is called NASDAQ.

There are, of course, other systems which contain useful elements, among them AutEx, Instanet and even the NYSE's BAS. The New York Stock Exchange's proposed Automated Trading System may possibly be constructive, but not nearly so as the Trading Terminal Plan which was rejected by the NYSE because "... among other considerations, this plan (TTP) would effectively eliminate the trading floor ...". The NYSE states as one of the reasons for favoring its Automated Trading System that "it builds upon a prime Exchange asset, the Specialist system." As regarding the virtues of the current Specialist system, I would refer interested parties to Professor Seymour Smidt's testimony on October 12th, 1971. I believe that the highly qualified Professor Smidt pinpointed some of the basic weaknesses of the currently non-competitive NYSE specialist system, and has, in a totally logical and understandable manner, described a central market concept which the Commission should seriously consider implementing.

Were a NASDAQ-type system to be used as the basis for the Central Market, as I believe is currently practical, then a number of structural, regulatory and mechanical improvements should be implemented. These include:

1. Competing specialist/market-makers should designate the size of their quoted dealer markets by class of market. In other words, a class A market would be one in which a specialist/market-maker was prepared to buy or sell upwards of 5,000 shares, a class B market would require upwards of 2,000 shares being "good" on both the offer and bid, and a class C market would be the one for less than 2,000 shares. It should be possible for a market-maker to display within the system more than one class of quoted market. For example, a class C market quote by one specialist/market-maker in a given security might be 50½-¾, whereas 50-51¼ might be the class A market (more than 5,000 shares bid for and offered) quoted by the same dealer.

2. Agency orders accepted by a specialist/market-maker should take precedence over that specialist/market-maker's principal bids or offerings. Within the quoted market spreads, specialist/market-makers should disclose whether acting in a principal or agency capacity.

3. The system must be capable of creating a sequential trade tape, as well as having recall capabilities to display historical information such as: last sale, volume, firm involved in latest transaction, summary of individual firm transactions, etc. It would be desirable if the same system could store and recall fundamental corporate data relating to each issue such as: latest earnings, dividends, news flashes, etc.

4. The system should be capable of transaction consummation without requiring direct contact between specialist/market-makers, thereby "locking in" trades. Transactions

would be cleared through a Central Clearance and Depository Agency which I will discuss later. Direct negotiation would still be required for transactions involving any substantial number of shares.

5. All securities transactions should be required to be consummated within the system and all users of the system should be regulated equally.

Although the totally automated mechanism envisioned by Professor Smidt is probably the ultimate ideal central market concept, I believe that a NASDAQ-type system, mechanism possible in terms of existing hardware, software and vested securities industry political considerations.

III. INSTITUTIONAL ACCESS

I believe it appropriate for institutional investors and fiduciaries to be accorded full access to whatever form of central market ultimately evolves. I believe that many of the problems of nonuniform exchange regulation and undesirable reciprocal practices which have plagued the investment and securities industries are directly traceable to denial of full access. I also believe that all brokerage profits earned by fiduciaries from securities transactions should be used to reduce related investment management fees. However, protection from legal action should be afforded a fiduciary who decides not to enter the brokerage business based on a bona fide judgment that the costs outweigh the savings to the institution he advises or that the institution's best interest would not be served.

As a practical matter, the members of the NYSE should accept institutional access at the same time as they may be forced to accept competitively negotiated commissions, as the practical effect would be to relieve the pressures for reduced commission rates on institutional sized transactions.

It is simply illogical to believe that the securities industry can be an exception to a basic law of the marketplace which dictates that a large quantity customer or user will deal on different and more favorable terms than the small customer or user. It is also illogical for an exchange to welcome as members wealthy individuals who join for purposes of personal transaction expense reduction and market mobility and, at the same time, deny membership to organizations having an obligation to achieve the same ends for others.

If a central market is intended to create an environment of maximum capital mobilization, it would then follow that all responsible asset management entities should be encouraged to participate directly.

IV. COMMON CLEARANCE AND DEPOSITARY AGENCY

If there is one single cause of the securities industry's chronic earnings cyclicality and related concern for the safety of customer assets, it is the massive duplication of operational and administrative facilities which currently exists. Were the overhead burden of unevenly utilized, and for the most part unnecessary, personnel, equipment and real estate removed or lessened by the establishment of a Common Clearance and Depository Agency, many presently troubled brokerage organizations could anticipate an extended and profitable existence, while, at the same time, reduce client charges.

This concept can only work, for political reasons, if it were required that all securities dealers exclusively utilize the Agency and be denied the ability of holding customer assets within their own control. The method of financing the Agency is envisioned as being similar to that of financing exchanges presently. In fact, I believe that one of the basic functions of any exchange is, or should be, to provide its members with mechanical services to settle transactions which would otherwise have to be duplicated by many of the individual member firms.

The proposed Common Clearance and Depository Agency could pay an appropriate rate of interest to the clients of securities firms based upon free credit balances left with the Agency.

The Agency could also play a leading role in the movement towards reducing the necessity for individual stock certificates, as well as assuming corporate stock transfer and registrar functions. Also the establishment of such an agency would reduce, if not eliminate, the problem of brokerage firm securities thefts.

I believe that, as regards the establishment of a Common Clearance and Depository Agency, the public interest and that of the securities industry are similarly served.

V. SEPARATION OF INVESTMENT ADVISORY AND BROKER/DEALER FUNCTION

In the structuring of a central market, whatever be the ultimate form, I believe there should be a separation of functions wherein unresolvable conflicts of interest exist.

The Martin Report identifies exchange member control of investment company advisors as one such area. I choose to believe that the basis for concern resides in the possibility of the investment advisor generating transactions for personal profit, and is not simply an attempt to "trade off" this area to preserve the brokerage business exclusively for the New York Stock Exchange membership.

While I agree that meaningful conflicts of interest exist in this area, I believe the same conflicts exist in the investment management control of other types of discretionary institutional accounts. Furthermore, I believe that the identical problem exists with respect to the vast majority of individual retail accounts, since in most instances specific recommendations made by registered representatives are generally accepted. The individual client is, of course, provided with "facts" and reasons for the recommendation, but normally is not in a position to either verify the factual content nor assess the validity of the opinion. Therefore, it would appear that the distinction between retail discretionary and non-discretionary accounts is more legal than real.

Because of prevailing reciprocal practices, the ability to direct the placement of substantial brokerage business on a discretionary basis is one of the most valuable assets any organization can have whether or not it is a member of a stock exchange.

The situation whereby an advisor generates revenue for himself through client activity regardless of investment result is one of continuing concern. Obviously, an even greater conflict of interest is present in situations where the advisor is acting in a underwriter or dealer capacity.

Therefore, it is suggested that all advisory functions be separated from those of a broker/dealer. Mechanically, this could be accomplished by requiring those organizations which have confidence in their advisory abilities to concentrate in this area and be compensated by investors on a fee basis. In certain rare instances, performance incentive fees may be justified. Those broker/dealer organizations which choose to remain in the business of trading securities or investment banking would then have as prospective clients a materially expanded number of investment advisory firms whose sole interest would be achieving satisfactory investment results for their advisory clients. To avoid conflict, the investment advisory clients should designate broker/dealers to be used by their investment advisors on their behalf. Investors wishing to make their own investment decisions would be free to use the services of broker/dealers, but broker/dealers would not be permitted to render investment advice.

I believe that only through such an enforced separation, as suggested, will this area of conflicting interests be ultimately resolved

in favor of the investor and, therefore, the public interest.

In summation, I believe that:

I. Commission charges should be fully negotiable.

II. A central market communication system should be established.

III. Institutions and their fiduciaries should be accorded the same degree of access to the central market system as qualified wealthy individuals or corporate investors.

IV. A Common Clearance and Depositary Agency should be established to settle all securities transactions and, at the same time, have the responsibility of safeguarding investor assets.

V. Investment advisory and broker/dealer functions should be separated.

I am sincere in my concern relating to the areas discussed and am anxious to answer any questions which I hope my presentation has stimulated. I would also welcome the opportunity of cooperating with the Commission in any detailed study of these areas as well as making a contribution in any way deemed appropriate.

Thank you.

A MEDICAL AUTHORITY COMMENTS ON THE PROBLEM OF LEGALIZED ABORTION

HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 19, 1971

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, reference to the voices and recommendations of authority and experience on both sides of the question is always an invaluable asset in our everlasting efforts to study and solve the very complex and challenging problems of our time.

Such a modern problem is the matter of legalized abortion in this country and an acknowledged authority on this subject is Dr. Denis Cavanagh. Dr. Cavanagh is a non-Catholic physician with extended experience in this area as professor of obstetrics and gynecology, Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology, Royal Hobart Hospital, Tasmania, Australia, and consultant to the dean of obstetrics and gynecology, St. Louis University School of Medicine.

Last May, Dr. Cavanagh addressed an assembly of the Texas Conference of Catholic Hospitals in San Antonio on the subject of legalized abortion and excerpts from his very thoughtful and timely analysis of the problem appeared in the August 1971 issue of the magazine, *Hospital Progress*, and I wish to include the article at this point:

LEGALIZED ABORTION: THE CONSCIENCE CLAUSE AND COERCION

(By Denis Cavanagh, MD)

There is a small but very active group of individuals in this country who favor abortion as a measure of population control. Most of them are very active in the movement for liberalization of the abortion laws and, as a blind for their activities within this movement, they use the well-meaning and conscientious physicians who merely desire clarification of the laws.

In the State of Missouri, we are faced at the present time with a determined effort to achieve liberalization or repeal of the abortion laws, and I'm sure that a similar campaign is being waged in Texas. In 1968, I ap-

peared at the Missouri Senate hearings to speak for moderate liberalization of the abortion law on the basis of the American Law Institute proposal because I felt that this was a "middle-of-the-road" solution which most people wanted, although I believed personally that abortion was only justified to save the life of the mother. In 1969 and again this year, because of the experience in Colorado and California, I spoke against liberalization in Missouri. I am not completely opposed to any liberalization of the abortion laws for a number of reasons, and I think these are reasons that anybody with an open mind can understand.

The California and Colorado liberalized abortion laws were well-written laws, but they have led to more dishonesty on the part of both patients and doctors than ever existed before. For example, in California in the first year, over 50 per cent of women treated were unmarried and most were affluent,¹ although the law was supposed to help the married and the poor. Almost 90 per cent of the indications were psychiatric vs. five per cent for organic disease. (If you believe that the doctors and patients were being honest you must also believe that serious mental illness is 18 times more common than serious physical illness in pregnant women in the State of California.)

From these examples it is evident that dishonesty is more prevalent with liberalization of abortion laws than without it. Certainly, when mental health is substituted for serious mental illness you will have *de facto* "abortion on request."

MONEY IN ABORTIONS

My second reason is that I believe patient care is suffering in the presence of liberalized laws and a significant number of complications are occurring most of which are not being reported.² The complications are being concealed because: 1. Doctor abortionists do not want to face malpractice suits; and 2. they want to be allowed to continue to make enormous sums of money doing abortions. (Suction curettage, saline induction, and hysterotomy are all relatively simple procedures but the average fees charged private patients in California are \$350, \$550, and \$650 respectively.)

When all is considered it is now generally accepted that liberalized laws, especially those including psychiatric and environmental indications, have created more problems than they have solved. As a result the question is no longer whether you will accept liberalization of your abortion laws, but whether you will accept "abortion on demand."

In view of this, I strongly advise against any liberalization of the current abortion laws. I speak especially against any law which would allow abortion for non-medical reasons. I speak as a Christian, as a citizen, as a gynecologist, and most important of all as a grown-up fetus.

There is a great deal of talk about "not getting emotional" about this subject, but how unemotional can you get when you consider that a change to "abortion on demand" in Texas could result in the killing of thousands of unborn babies every year?

We hear statements made by doctors to the effect that there is disagreement about when human life begins. There is no real disagreement as to the scientific facts, but only as to the ethics of the situation.

In support of this statement, I would like

¹ Keith P. Russell, MD and Edwin W. Jackson, MD, "Therapeutic Abortions in California," *American Journal of Obstetrics and Gynecology*, Nov. 1, 1969, p. 757.

² William Droegemueller, MD, et al., "The First Year of Experience with the New Abortion Law in Colorado," *American Journal of Obstetrics and Gynecology*, March 1, 1969, p. 694.

to cite the following excerpt from the editorial entitled, "A New Ethic for Medicine and Society" from *California Medicine*, September, 1970. This is the official journal of the California Medical Society and the article is written by a pro-abortionist, with reference to the present attempt to move from liberalized abortion to abortion on demand in the State of California.

... Since the old ethic has not yet been fully displaced it has been necessary to separate the idea of abortion from the idea of killing, which continues to be socially abhorrent. The result has been a curious avoidance of the scientific fact, which everyone really knows, that human life begins at conception and is continuous whether intra- or extra-uterine until death. The very considerable semantic gymnastics which are required to rationalize abortion as anything but taking a human life would be ludicrous if they were not often put forth under socially impeccable auspices.

Even the people who are introducing bills to legalize abortion apparently recognize that it is wrong to kill a viable fetus, and in their bills usually prescribe punishment for those guilty of this offense. In doing so, they are apparently supporting the view that an unborn baby has rights, and so the main disagreement appears to be *when* the fetus is to be granted that most precious right of all, the right to life itself.

The crux of the moral and legal debate over abortion is, in essence, the right of the mother to determine whether or not she should bear a particular child versus the right of the child to life. The most vigorous proponents of legalized abortion talk about the fetus as "a blob of protoplasm," and feel it has no right to life until it has reached a certain stage of development. This is given variously as from 12 weeks to 28 weeks of intra-uterine life, and some apparently feel it has no right to life until after full-term delivery. If we take the definition of life as being said to be present when an organism shows evidence of individual animate existence, I think that certainly from the blastocyst stage the fetus qualifies for respect. It is alive because it has the ability to reproduce dying cells. It is human because its parents are human. It can be distinguished from other non-human species, and once implanted in the uterine wall it requires only nutrition and time to develop into one of us. If it contains an intrinsic genetic defect, or if it is deprived of nutrition and time, it becomes a dead human fetus.

I think that this is a reasonable, philosophical conclusion based on biological knowledge. It recognizes that human development is a single continuous process from implantation of the fertilized ovum in the uterine wall to the achievement of adult personhood. It seems quite irrational, even if convenient, to choose a given point in this biologic continuum, e.g., the appearance of the heartbeat, or the feeling of movements, viability, or even expulsion from the uterus, as the beginning of human life. It seems evident then that the fetus is only different from you and me in that it has not yet been given the time to develop its whole potential.

SOME FACTS OF LIFE

Let us consider a few embryologic facts. The ovum is usually fertilized in the lateral portion of the fallopian tube, and in from seven to 14 days the blastocyst becomes implanted in the uterine wall. At the end of the second week differentiation of the cardiovascular and nervous systems begins. At the end of six weeks all of the internal organs of the complete human being are present, although still in a rudimentary stage of development. Brain waves have been detected at 43 days. By the end of the eighth week the skeleton has begun to form, and the eyes, fingers, and toes are evident, so that the embryo is now called a fetus.

After the eighth week, no new major structures will be added, and the heart can be picked up by ultrasonic techniques. Further growth will consist of maturation and the development of the existing structures rather than the creation of anything new. By the end of the 12th week, the fetus can swallow amniotic fluid. If delivery occurs after the 20th week, and the baby weighs approximately 500 grams (1 lb.) it is referred to as a premature infant rather than as an abortus. I would point out that in the *Canadian Medical Association Journal* in 1939, Monroe reported the case of a baby which weighed 397 grams on the second day of life, and which developed normally. I submit that to this very durable individual the term "abortus" can scarcely be applied.

Today, it seems evident that the age of "viability" or survivability can no longer be considered as immutable, because too many variables, such as DNA synthesis, test tube incubation, intra-uterine transfusion, and chromosomal manipulation, are involved. Legislative communities should realize that, in view of recent technological advances, the 20-week survivability standard is about as sacred as the four-minute mile. With the development of an effective artificial placenta, probably within the next decade, the 20-week or perhaps the 12-week fetus may survive to become as you and me.

Sir John Peel, former president of the Royal College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists, in an address to the faculty at the University of Melbourne, put the subject of abortion in perspective as follows:

Let us be quite clear in our minds. The deliberate termination of a pregnancy at whatever stage in pregnancy it is undertaken before viability is the same procedure. Attempts to determine an artificial dividing line before which a pregnancy may be terminated for nonmedical reasons is pure sophistry. A fetus of 10 weeks is not essentially different from one of 20 weeks, or one of 20 weeks from one of 30 weeks. It may be safer medically to terminate pregnancies at 8 rather than 16 weeks, but one is no more or less justified than the other if the alleged indication is a nonmedical one.

... If society gives sanction to the destruction of life for one set of circumstances for what it claims to be the good of society, why should it not sanction the killing of the abnormal neonate, the mental defective, the delinquent, the incurable, the senile? The mind recoils from such suggestions, but let us face it, society in the past has sanctioned all of these. Is it fanciful to think that we may be moving toward a situation in which the sanctity of human life is no longer recognized—where life can be created artificially at will, and equally at will expunged?

For those of you who think that Peel was being fanciful, let me remind you that the very liberal British Abortion Act was passed in 1967, and in 1969 a euthanasia bill ("mercy killing") was only defeated in the House of Lords by 61 votes to 40. In the State of Florida, a euthanasia bill was defeated by fewer votes than the bill to liberalize abortion. In the State of Colorado, the bill to liberalize abortion was passed in 1967 and in 1970 the Colorado Nurses' Association voted 173-109 in favor of euthanasia with 55 abstentions.³

And why not? Because when we sanction legalized abortion we adopt a new ethic. This is the ethic of Aldous Huxley's *Brave New World*. It is being embraced by many of the intelligentsia. Francis Crick the Nobel laureate has said that a baby should not be declared alive until 48 hours after birth and there should be compulsory death at the age of 80 years.⁴ Is this the course that we want to follow?

In 1970, piglets conceived in Canada were flown across the Atlantic in a tube and im-

planted in the uterus of a sow of a different breed. The parents then presumably were two sows and a boar of the Canadian Yorkshire breed, and the embryos were conceived on March 16 on a Canadian Department of Agriculture farm at Hull, Quebec. The foster mother at Weybridge, Surrey, has now delivered her litter of piglets successfully. It would seem that it is technically quite possible that we will be able to do this in the human within the next decade. The "responsible" mother with an unwanted pregnancy could then be given the choice of having the embryo removed and transferred to the uterus of an infertile foster mother, or going to term and giving the baby up for adoption. In this way the natural mother could be given the right to make the decision as to whether she wants to continue to carry her unborn child, and the right of the unborn to life would not be denied. But "prenatal adoption" is not available yet and, until such time as it is, the right of the fetus to life must surely be held above the convenience of the mother or of society. Many good people who say they are for legalized abortion simply don't know what abortion is all about. There are pressing social problems to be solved and abortion provides a quick solution to many of them.

Let's get abortion in true perspective. Let's look at the abortion "specimens." Currently the three most popular methods of abortion are: 1. Suction curettage (done up to 14 weeks); 2. saline induction or "salting out" (done after 14 weeks). 3. hysterotomy (done usually when saline induction fails).

However, we should realize that many of the pro-abortionist civil libertarians feel genuinely that they, by their activities, are building a better world for you and me. These well-meaning people could be classified as "seduced idealists," and this, of course, was the defense presented by German doctors at Nuremberg. I believe that the pro-abortionists are wrong and that they must be stopped.

The informed pro-abortionists know that the fetus is a living human being. The informed pro-abortionists know that the fetus is innocent, but they feel that a new ethic is called for to bring quick solutions for the problems of society. This is the type of thinking that led to Belsen and Dachau. Inconvenient as the fact might be for you, for me, or for society, the fetus is not a potential human being, the fetus is a human being with potential.

THE "CONSCIENCE CLAUSE"

The pro-abortionists, when pushing for legalized abortion, almost invariably assure us that no medical personnel will be forced to participate in abortions and no hospitals will be forced to permit them. Already, however, questions are being raised which suggest coercion will be applied.

One of the questions now being raised is: Why shouldn't a doctor or a hospital be required to refer a patient after refusing her an abortion?

Initially, it seemed that the suggestion of patient referral was intended to keep the patients out of the hands of illegal abortionists. But consider what Harriet Pipel, a prominent American Civil Liberties Union attorney, wrote on the subject in the *New York Times*, in her review of Daniel Callahan's book *Abortion, Law, Choice and Mortality*.

As our laws in the United States are repealed or liberalized or declared unconstitutional, it becomes clear that only half the battle is won and that public and professional attitudes and the will (or lack of will) to implement the freedom conferred are also crucial. The Callahan book pays too little attention to the practical aspects of what he is talking about. For example, although his "ideal law" would include "a conscience clause" for doctors and nurses, it apparently would not include the obviously necessary further requirement which most students of the question believe necessary,

namely, an obligation to refer the patient elsewhere if she is refused on conscience grounds.

It must be clear from this statement that enforced referral is looked upon as a means of changing public and professional attitudes toward abortion. The more abortions that are performed, the less abhorrent they become. Thus, even those doctors who refuse to perform abortions will become, by the referral device, unwitting tools in the forging of an abortion mentality.

Dr. Robert Hall, in an article in *Playboy Magazine* writes:

Doing an abortion properly requires medical training, but deciding whether to do it, in most cases, does not. The only excuse for a doctor refusing to do an abortion should be the contrary dictates of his conscience, and then he should be obligated to refer his patient elsewhere.

It is becoming evident, then, that relaxed abortion laws, far from giving the doctor greater freedom to practice medicine, actually put him in the position of a puppet who must react when his patient pulls the strings. Objections of conscience aside, is a doctor always required to perform surgery or refer the patient? If a patient came to a doctor and asked, without any medical justification, that he amputate her left hand would that doctor also be required to do it (or refer her) to the exclusion of his judgment on whether the operation was medically necessary?

Another question being raised is what steps can be taken against hospitals and doctors who refuse to perform abortions or strictly limit abortions?

I believe they will be subjected to all sorts of pressure:

1. *Community pressure.* As pointed out by Robert Byrn the hijacking of hospitals is running "a respectable third" to the hijacking of airplanes and universities. Radical community groups, aided and abetted by pseudo civil libertarians, are already claiming that all hospitals "belong to the people." In pursuance of that claim, some are prepared to take over a hospital and intimidate its personnel until such time as the group's demands are met. We should anticipate that in states where the law has been liberalized these tactics may be used against hospitals which forbid or severely limit the practice of abortion, regardless of whether or not the hospital is religiously affiliated.

2. *Pressure from the media.* The *New York Times* has characterized the reluctance of doctors to get involved in the "messy business of abortion" as "foot-dragging medical conservatism." In states with liberalized laws we should anticipate increased pressure from the media, perhaps in the form of an exposé of the overcrowded conditions at hospital X (due to abortions) while down the street hospital Y (which performs no abortions), is "refusing to carry its fair share of the health-service burdens in the community."

3. *Pressure from doctors doing abortions.* Resident doctors in Orange County Hospitals, taxed with an overload of abortions, complained to the county medical officials that other hospitals in the area should be required to perform their "fair share" of the abortion load. The same charges have been made in the State of Maryland. In many university hospitals, in states where the laws have been liberalized, both the faculty and house staff are split over abortion, and when a staff appointment is being contemplated the question, "Do you do abortions?" is being asked increasingly. Also, in private practice many a prospective associate is being turned down because of his unwillingness to participate in the lucrative business of "elective abortion."

4. *Intra-hospital pressures.* Consider the situation of Catholic medical and nursing personnel in a non-Catholic hospital: There is nothing in most proposed abortion bills which protects personnel from being dismissed from their positions for refusing to participate in abortions. They should not

³ *RN Magazine*, July, 1970, p. 7.

⁴ *London Daily Express*, Oct. 31, 1968.

count on a shortage of such personnel as protection against dismissal. After all, claiming a shortage of funds, we have, for years, countenanced a high infant mortality rate in the big city ghettos, yet now in New York, thousands of dollars are being spent to advertise abortion and set up abortion clinics in the ghetto, using money which could have been spent for improved maternal and infant care.

Consider the situation of a Catholic hospital administrator: It seems obvious that administrators who forbid or limit the practice of abortion should be prepared to face lawsuits by doctors claiming that their rights (to give their patients the accepted standard of medical care) are being denied by restrictive hospital regulations.

5. *Legal pressure.* Consider the situation of a doctor refusing to do an abortion on a woman threatening suicide: He may find himself being sued for failure to perform an abortion when the pregnancy is considered to be a serious threat to a patient's physical or mental health. Obviously, if I was in a hospital where a medical abortionist had just perforated a woman's uterus and she was in shock from severe blood loss, I would do all I could to save the woman's life even if a hysterectomy with removal of the remaining fetal tissues was necessary. On the other hand, I would not agree to terminate a pregnancy for an acute psychiatric emergency, since even psychiatrists are not agreed on psychiatric indications for abortion. This is the problem with the conscience clause in the British Abortion Act and the inclusion of a mental health loophole will be the problem with almost all conscience clauses associated with liberal laws.

OUTRIGHT LEGAL "BLACKMAIL"

Consider the situation of hospital administrators who will be faced with outright legal "blackmail" under the guise of civil liberties: In New York, there have already been threats of lawsuits to cut off public funds from Catholic hospitals on the grounds of their refusal to perform abortions. It will probably be claimed that the church-state constitutional issue overrides any statutory exemption in favor of such hospitals. I may say that having grown up in Scotland (a Protestant country) and having had my education free in a Catholic school, I feel that the overemphasis on the separation of church and state in the United States seem to benefit only those who are churchless and those who are stateless.

The answer to this threat is to have a plan of action and to realize, as other minority groups do, that the more active you are in defense of your principles, the more likely your principles will be able to survive.

As Sister Mary Maurita, executive director of The Catholic Hospital Association, has pointed out, Catholic hospitals have gone on public record against abortion in two special actions taken by the CHA Board of Trustees and House of Delegates on June 10, 1970.

It seems clear that no Catholic hospital may either directly or indirectly permit elective abortion. Presently, Catholic hospitals in states with liberalized abortion laws are exempt from performing such procedures. But they should commit their time, energy, and resources to work with all groups dedicated to "The Right To Life." These groups are growing in strength, as more Christians realize that abortion is indeed the killing of an unborn baby and that "termination of pregnancy" is a euphemism. I feel that every Catholic hospital has a moral obligation to officially communicate its position against abortion and for the right to life of every unborn baby, not only to its personnel, its physicians, its patients, but also to the community it serves. Every person working within the Catholic hospital must understand and, I say, accept this position. (There are all too many doctors working both sides of the street.)

Furthermore, Catholic hospital administra-

tors, trustees, and personnel should pledge themselves to work with any agency or any group to assist medically, economically, socially, and culturally all mothers, whether unwed or wed, to assume the responsibilities of motherhood, in keeping with the role of woman and with the dignity of man. The fetus is not a potential human being; the fetus is a human being with potential. The fetus is our brother and we must be our brother's keeper.

THE SO-CALLED CHILD DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

HON. FLOYD SPENCE

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 19, 1971

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, the so-called child development program incorporated into the OEO extension bill raises serious questions about the proper role of the Federal Government's intervention into the private lives of family and children. Increasingly, this aspect of the "child development" issue is coming under discussion, as doubts spread concerning the wisdom of this proposal, which would put the Federal Government in the position of contending that it can bring up infants and preschool children better than the individual attention and love of the child's parent.

There are, however, two points which I feel should be made regarding the debate over child development. First is an issue which is not being discussed: Need. To the best of my knowledge, the last major inquiry into need was made in 1965: "Child Care Arrangements of Working Mothers in the United States," by Seth Low and Pearl G. Spindler, published by the Children's Bureau Publications Office. In the study—in 1965, remember—the researchers found that less than 10 percent of all children under the age of 6 were in need of day-care centers. One should note from this that the figure would: First, be much lower for comprehensive child development services; and second, since 1965, many churches, private organizations, and former schoolteachers have gone into providing child-care services for families and mothers in need of the services. In fact, day-care centers have become a significant growth industry in this Nation during the last few years. I am confident a more up-to-date study would show a much diminished need for Federal intervention. I do not fail, of course, to recognize that a valid need does exist for Federal assistance in providing day care for children of mothers who need and want to work. But this is not the issue involved in the "Child Development" title of the OEO bill.

The second issue is one which seems to be getting the lion's share of consideration, and that is the issue of money. How much we are willing to pay for this program is a vital concern, but it does not come before that of whether we ought to graft these child development centers into the American scheme of things. Quite honestly, Mr. Speaker, the notions behind this proposal are definitionally wrong and no amount of money, however large or small, would change that fact.

It is the substance of this proposal that is unwise, regardless of the cost.

Still, just in case anyone is not informed of the planned for extensiveness of this project, let me give the figures. Based on the provisions of the bill which call for eventual universality of the program, we are talking about a project which ranges from \$20 to \$30 billion, depending on the amount finally agreed upon by the conference, to determine who gets free treatment and who does not. It would be very wrong if we allowed financing to become the legislative question when we ought to be discussing and debating the merits of the proposed federalization of child rearing.

Mr. Speaker, to say that I am deeply concerned with this proposal is to engage in understatement. I firmly believe that this House should do what is necessary to insure that the final OEO bill does not include this most unworthy experiment with the children of American parents.

IMPORTATION OF CHROME FROM RHODESIA

HON. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, November 20, 1971

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, by a vote of 106 to 2, with 13 abstentions, the United Nations General Assembly condemned the Congress of the United States for passing legislation permitting the importation of chrome from Rhodesia.

Chrome is a vital U.S. defense material, essential for nuclear submarines, jet aircraft, and all stainless steel products.

Because of an Executive order by President Johnson in 1967 resulting from a mandate from the United Nations, the United States has been prohibited from importing chrome from Rhodesia. Thus, having no chrome of our own, we have become dependent on Communist Russia for this vital defense material.

On September 23, the Senate of the United States decided to call a halt to such a ridiculous situation; and on November 10, the House of Representatives concurred. The House vote on the direct issue was a smashing 251 to 100.

It was not a regional vote or a party vote.

Analysing these two critical votes, we find that the proposal to remove the embargo on Rhodesian chrome received strong support from members of both political parties—and from Representatives from 46 of the 50 States.

Leading the list were California, Texas, Pennsylvania, Illinois, New York, Ohio, and Michigan.

The legislation was signed into law by President Nixon this week.

The Rhodesian trade ban, besides being foolish and unprincipled, is a bankrupt policy.

Even the New York Times, which strongly supports the trade ban, published a report from Salisbury, Rhodesia, dated November 17, from its correspondent, Anthony Lewis, which made clear just how bankrupt and ineffective the Rhodesian trade ban is.

It is a significant article. Its lead paragraph reads:

Despite the total British ban on trade with Rhodesia, a \$3 million paper mill which was in England until recently, is now operating here. It was moved first to a third country, then to Rhodesia.

The times reporter says that is just an example of just how ineffective the U.N. trade ban against Rhodesia has been.

The New York Times reporter then adds:

Everything from Kodak cameras to Kleenex is available in the shops.

In a recent editorial, the Chicago Tribune chided the United Nations for its hypocrisy, pointing out that many of the nations voting to condemn the Congress of the United States are themselves ignoring the trade ban with Rhodesia.

I ask unanimous consent that the page 1 article in the New York Times of November 17, be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

RHODESIA TRADE BAN FOUND INEFFECTIVE
(By Anthony Lewis)

SALISBURY, RHODESIA, November 17.—Despite the total British ban on trade with Rhodesia, a \$3-million paper mill that was in England until recently is now operating here. It was moved first to a third country, then to Rhodesia.

The story is told by one of the businessmen working to break the net of world economic sanctions imposed by the United Nations Security Council in 1966. It is just one example, a particularly dramatic one, of how ineffective the trade war against Rhodesia has been.

The casual visitor to Salisbury—in these days when Sir Alec Douglas-Home, the British Foreign Secretary, is here to try to negotiate a settlement of the six-year rebellion of this former self-governing colony—sees at once that the country is not starving for consumer goods. Everything from Kodak cameras to Kleenex is available in the shops.

[President Nixon signed legislation that would effectively terminate the ban on the importation of Rhodesian chrome as of Jan. 1. Page 13.]

On the import side, it appears that Rhodesia is able to buy just about anything she wants. Orders are placed through South Africa or Portuguese East Africa or through middlemen elsewhere—as in the paper mill saga.

But there is a cost to Rhodesia in getting imports through the barrier. The middlemen naturally want a fee, and that raises the prices of goods for the customer—and uses up the country's precious supply of foreign currency.

Foreign currency is the crucial problem for Rhodesia. And informed sources say that, despite the evident success in circumventing sanctions, there are now pressures in the currency situation, for two reasons.

First, Rhodesia benefited greatly, after she declared her independence from Britain unilaterally in 1965, from a world rise in prices of base metals. She is an exporter of copper and nickel, for example, and was able to keep exporting these, through intermediaries, at rising prices.

But more recently the trend has gone the other way. Copper is down from \$1,440 a ton 18 months ago to \$986 now, according to Rhodesians, and nickel is hard to sell at any price. The term of trade generally have turned against the developing countries, and Rhodesia among others is suffering.

Second, Rhodesia needs to make big new investments in capital goods. For example, replacement and modernization of her railway system have been postponed: picturesque steam engines can still be seen puffing up to Salisbury from Umtali on the Mozambique border.

New locomotives must come from abroad, and so must other items for the economic structure. The demand for foreign currency for these purposes is soaring—and sanctions are an obstacle there.

The need for more foreign exchange makes most businessmen urgently desire a settlement with Britain and the end of sanctions. But the record of the last six years makes clear that they will carry on if there is no settlement.

The American Congressional action No. 4 to lift the ban on imports of Rhodesian chrome is seen here as only a more candid expression of what other countries have in fact been doing. The authorization for American imports of chrome from Rhodesia is contained in a military procurement bill that President Nixon signed today. Yesterday, by a vote of 106 to 2, with 13 abstentions, the United Nations General Assembly cautioned the United States that imports of chrome from Rhodesia would be a breach of its international treaty obligations.

Exactly who buys what is a dark secret, but Rhodesian mines have been at full production for years—and the asbestos and chrome and copper are going to the rest of the world. There are even reports, believed here, that the Soviet Union has been buying Rhodesian chrome and then selling its own chrome ore to the United States at twice the price.

Nevertheless, the American Congressional action is undoubtedly significant psychologically. African leaders have spoken bitterly of it to visitors here for the talks being conducted by the British Foreign Secretary. One group that visited Sir Alec today said he had told them that the American decision was an important sign of how sanctions were eroding.

The original purpose of the United Nations sanctions was to bring political pressure on the white Rhodesian public. In those terms the campaign has been ineffective.

Most businessmen were opposed to the Rhodesian declaration of independence and, five years ago, were gloomy about the chance of withstanding sanctions. But world pressure led them to fight back, unifying opinion behind the rebel Government of Prime Minister Ian D. Smith. The businessmen have plainly had much pleasure in the struggle.

VALLEY DISTRICT DENTAL SOCIETY CELEBRATES ITS 75TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 19, 1971

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, the Valley District Dental Society, 1 of 13 chap-

ters in the Massachusetts Dental Society, has just celebrated its 75th anniversary. Serving three counties—Hampden, Hampshire, Franklin—the Valley Society has been promoting dental health throughout western Massachusetts ever since 1895.

Its membership, just a handful of dentists when the organization was founded, now reaches past 300. And its services cover the entire spectrum of modern dentistry: general practice, prosthetics, periodontia, endodontia, pedodontia, oral, and maxillary surgery.

Seven members of the Valley Society have served as presidents of the parent Massachusetts Society, just one index of how significant a role this organization plays in the State's dental programs.

Aside from the vital services it provides for its dentist members, the Valley Society takes part in a broad range of civic and social activities—activities that have made the public aware of the need for scrupulous dental hygiene and preventive dentistry.

I am sure my colleagues join me in congratulating the Valley District Society and wishing it the best for the future.

A PETITION TO CHANGE HALLOWEEN FROM OCTOBER 31 TO JUNE 22

HON. DAVE MARTIN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 19, 1971

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I have received a petition signed by 37 grade school students in Gordon, Nebr., giving cogent reasons why Halloween should be changed from October 31 to June 22. I feel that their arguments are logical and carry a great deal of weight.

I am today introducing such a resolution, as I believe there is more logic to changing this date than those of the four holidays that were changed to a Monday 2 years ago.

The petition is as follows:

We the undersigned wish to have the date of Halloween changed from October 31st to June 22nd.

Halloween comes when our section of the Country is cold. Many times we are subjected to cold and snowy weather on Halloween. This is dangerous to us as roads and streets are icy. We have to wear coats and mittens over our costumes, this hinders and interferes with our vision, besides there is always the danger of catching cold or pneumonia.

Many times Halloween comes on a week day and we have to get up early for school, so we aren't allowed to celebrate Halloween.

More hours of daylight are in June. This would add to our safety. Congress can change other holidays. We would appreciate having this one changed to a more suitable month.