

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL
RESOURCES

HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 10, 1971

Mr. ROBISON of New York. Mr. Speaker, I felt that the March 9, 1971, editorial of the New York Times relative to President Nixon's proposed Cabinet reorganization was perceptive enough to warrant the attention of my colleagues. The article applauds the President's recommendation that the present Department of Interior be transformed into a coherent Department of Natural Resources. The editorial also presents some useful background material, which will prove useful to us as we discuss and consider the President's valuable initiative. The full text of the editorial follows:

NATURAL RESOURCES DEPARTMENT

Government reorganization and revenue sharing may not add up to a "second American Revolution," in President Nixon's soaring phrase, but they are disturbing enough to raise the hackles of many influential people in the permanent bureaucracy, in Congress and in the various lobbies. This is particularly true for the proposed regrouping of social and economic programs and of six Cabinet-level departments; but it is even true for the more familiar and widely supported plan to transform the Department of the Interior into a coherent Department of Natural Resources.

The need for such a department has long been plain to experts on the organization of the Federal Government. The Brownlow Committee recommended it to President Roosevelt in 1937 and a task force of the first Hoover Commission made substantially the same proposal a dozen years later. Now President Nixon has adopted the idea.

As envisaged by the President's Advisory Council on Executive Organization headed by Roy L. Ash, the new department would consist of four major divisions. The nucleus of each already exists in the Department of the Interior. The opposition arises over the transferring of logically related agencies from other departments.

The first division would administer land and recreation programs. It would include the National Park Service, the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation, the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, and the Bureau of Land Management, all of which are now in Interior. To them would be added the Forest Service from the Agriculture Department.

The Forest Service now engages in a multitude of activities which exactly parallel those of the companion agencies in Interior. It is a recreation agency with as many visitors as the National Park Service. It manages public land like the Bureau of Land Management. It manages wildlife as does the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife. The Ash Council report observes: "Common management would enable better planning of timber harvest, better location of facilities to meet recreational demands, overhead savings."

Everything points to a transfer of the Forest Service; everything, that is, except the desire of successive Secretaries of Agriculture to hang on a sizable bureaucratic kingdom and the desire of the timber industry to have nothing disturb its comfortable relations with an agency it has come to know very well.

A second division of the proposed new department would for the first time provide a sensible arrangement of water programs. The Ash Council understates the truth when it refers to "interagency rivalry, duplicative planning and conflicting policies." The new plan would end this internecine warfare by centralizing river basin planning and the final evaluation of all water projects in the Secretary. The Corps of Engineers in the Army, the Soil Conservation Service in Agriculture and the Bureau of Reclamation in Interior would continue to do engineering construction and maintenance but would have no policy-making roles.

A third division of the new department would comprise energy and mineral resources. It would be made up of the Bureau of Mines from Interior, the Rural Electrification Administration from Agriculture, and the peaceful uses of nuclear energy which now make up about 20 per cent of the activity of the Atomic Energy Commission. The Ash Council sets forth an ingenious plan for the reorganization of Indian services and persuasively rebuts the plausible idea that they might be better off in the Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

Broadly speaking, the wisdom of this reorganization is self-evident now, as it has been to Presidents and outside experts for more than thirty years. The political difficulties in Congress are equally visible. Members of the House and Senate Agriculture Committees, for example, are reluctant to lose jurisdiction over two major agencies, the Forest Service and the R.E.A. The Joint Atomic Energy Commission may not wish to let go of the peaceful side of the A.E.C. If President Nixon would lead vigorously enough and if the public would interest itself in the struggle, this selfish resistance could be overcome. A successful outcome would be a major advance in the nationwide effort to improve the physical environment.

INTRODUCING BILL TO PROVIDE
FOR CONTINUED OPERATION OF
PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE HOS-
PITALS AND CLINICS

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 10, 1971

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill which would appropriate the \$21 million needed by the Public Health Service to maintain the present operations of the eight Public Health Service hospitals and 30 outpatient clinics.

As you know, the administration has suggested the closing of the eight Public Health Service hospitals and 30 outpatient clinics. Last year, Congress appropriated \$87,822,000 for this program. However, this year as part of an apparent phasing out process, the administration has cut this back to \$66 million.

My bill, H.R. 5800, would restore funding to last year's level, which I feel is a bare minimum. However, I feel we must not only maintain present services, we must expand, modernize, and upgrade these facilities to provide better care for those in need.

Mr. Speaker, I am appalled at any suggestion to close down a hospital pro-

gram, especially at a time when the health care service in the United States is at a critical low. Such proposals are incongruous in light of the increasing workloads which hospitals and clinics are bearing, the ever-escalating costs for doctors, drugs and hospital care, and the critical need for such services in many areas. There is a dearth of hospitals in this country.

Instead of curtailing services, every effort should be made to augment and expand health services and take positive steps toward providing meaningful, comprehensive, and professional health care for all citizens.

I protest the plans to close any of the existing Public Health Service hospitals or clinics. The PHS hospital system was established in 1798 as a means to provide medical care for merchant seamen. This system not only provides medical care for seamen but it protects our Nation against disease catastrophes. Further, it has introduced and maintained a public service concept that benefits the medical profession, and our Nation, as well as the seamen and other recipients of such hospital and medical care. The proposal to terminate this public service concept of medical care is shocking.

It is even more incomprehensible when we consider the total service which the Public Health Service hospitals provide. At one time there were 30 PHS hospitals. Today, there are eight along with 30 PHS clinics, one of which is located in my district in San Pedro, Calif. These facilities provide care to merchant seamen, Coast Guardsmen and their dependents, as well as to active and retired military personnel and their families.

The contributions which these hospitals make are truly of great magnitude. Each facility is an integral part of the health care system of the community in which it exists and is helping to meet the rising demand for quality health care. It serves as part of the training forum for badly needed medical personnel. There are 500,000 beneficiaries of the PHS program. In short, the PHS hospital system provides much-needed service and should be expanded—not eroded.

For example, in the PHS clinic in San Pedro, Calif., in a 3-month period—July-October, fiscal year 1970—there were 26,777 outpatient visits. This workload average, of over 8,500 outpatient visits a month, was handled by a staff of 54 people.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to submit for the record, at this point, three tables which give an accurate picture of what just one PHS clinic, the clinic in San Pedro, Calif., is doing. Table No. I lists the total outpatient visits and number of different individuals visiting the San Pedro, Calif., Outpatient Clinic by class of beneficiary. Table No. II outlines visits to outpatient services as well as adjunct services and selected procedures. Table No. III gives a picture of the heavy laboratory workloads handled by the San Pedro clinic.

The tables follow:

TABLE I.—TOTAL OUTPATIENT VISITS AND NUMBER OF DIFFERENT INDIVIDUALS VISITING THE SAN PEDRO, CALIF., OUTPATIENT CLINIC, BY CLASS OF BENEFICIARY, FISCAL YEARS 1965-69

Class of beneficiary	1965		1966		1967		1968		1969	
	Total	Individual	Total	Individual	Total	Individual	Total	Individual	Total	Individual
All beneficiaries, total.....	61,184	26,334	70,816	25,474	84,048	29,023	84,527	32,851	82,803	33,083
Nonreimbursable, total.....	60,454	25,814	70,020	24,852	83,240	28,276	84,024	32,450	80,000	31,258
American seamen.....	27,625	5,206	34,022	5,180	40,581	6,583	42,087	7,840	41,814	8,266
BEC.....	1,468	207	1,519	198	1,977	255	2,031	311	1,570	437
ESSA (formerly C. & G.S.).....	18	4	10	4	12	3	32	14	48	9
Coast Guard.....	9,150	5,151	10,544	5,121	12,789	5,928	10,848	7,482	10,243	6,814
Department of Defense.....	1,198	272	1,195	210	1,592	316	1,787	379	1,325	288
Dep., DOD.....	1,975	597	3,654	717	6,144	1,054	6,853	1,244	6,154	1,126
Dep., CG, ESSA, and PHS.....	4,425	969	5,355	894	5,247	851	4,597	1,025	3,977	989
Emergency.....	15	13	11	11	17	17	4	4	3	3
Federal employment (physical examinations).....	394	280	511	413	354	302	359	298	191	139
PHS commissioned officers.....	490	182	632	261	640	300	718	208	507	116
Special study.....	21	1	57	5	261	76	291	248	299	162
Patients with leprosy.....	76	4	322	123	940	230	929	174	586	148
Inoculations and vaccinations.....	9,667	9,667	6,164	6,164	6,307	6,307	5,465	5,465	5,573	5,567
PHS field employees ¹	388	26	281	32	298	17	129	28	2	2
Other.....	3,544	3,235	5,743	5,519	6,081	6,037	7,894	7,730	7,710	7,194
Reimbursable, total.....	730	520	796	622	808	747	503	401	2,803	1,825
Foreign seamen.....	41	10	140	25	62	15	124	58	60	20
Immigration and naturalization.....			3	3	5	5			6	6
Emergency.....									2	2
Other.....	689	510	653	594	741	727	379	343	2,735	1,797

¹ Public Law 90-174 effective Dec. 5, 1967, removed PHSFE from eligibility.

Source: Monthly report on outpatients and adjunct services, form PHS-T408.

TABLE II.—USPHS OUTPATIENT CLINIC, SAN PEDRO, CALIF. VISITS TO OUTPATIENT SERVICES

Service	Total visits, Fiscal Year—					Service	Total visits, Fiscal Year—				
	1965	1966	1967	1968	1969		1965	1966	1967	1968	1969
Allergy.....		978	2,591	3,178		Orthopedics.....	359	377	410	669	577
Dermatology.....	784	769	731	641	868	Otolaryngology.....	730	1,167	1,006	929	847
General.....	38,464	44,638	50,705	47,370	51,537	Pediatrics.....		253	702	491	
Leprosy.....		1,315	935	905	929	Psychiatry.....	177	147	165	165	129
Medicine.....					2,822	Pulmonary.....			64	396	486
Ophthalmology.....	1,159	1,110	1,060	1,250	1,243	Dentistry.....	7,592	7,239	7,617	8,170	7,473

ADJUNCT SERVICES AND SELECTED PROCEDURES

Services and procedures	Total number, fiscal year—					Services and procedures	Total number, fiscal year—				
	1965	1966	1967	1968	1969		1965	1966	1967	1968	1969
Physical medicine, total visits physical therapy (with qualified therapist).....	10,187	11,699	13,508	14,445	13,352	Social service:					
New and reopened cases.....						Case work interviews.....	2,620	2,644	2,958	2,946	* 851
X-ray examination, total visits.....	9,963	12,645	10,275	9,633	8,123	Cases closed.....	5,193	5,234	6,110	6,076	2,775
X-ray films taken.....	16,256	21,153	21,008	21,688	18,747	Average monthly caseload per social worker.....	2,601	2,633	2,999	3,047	* 703
Pharmacy:						Operations in operating room.....	(4)	(4)	(4)	(4)	46
Prescriptions and requisitions.....	31,563	35,925	45,954	50,705	52,184	BMR tests.....	2,165	2,085	2,163	2,060	1,898
Total issues.....	6,892	7,439	5,960	7,329	5,869	Electrocardiograms.....	2	1	1	1	1,692
Bulk compounded items.....	168	183	96	370	214						
Prepackaged items.....	16,701	20,243	23,222	32,870	30,089						

¹ Data are for 6 months; began operating January 1966.

² Data are for 4 months.

³ Data are for 10 months; social worker attended conference and was on leave during August and September. Decline is due to method of counting caseload.

⁴ Not available; caseload is not reported on same basis as other stations.

¹ Tests reported on clinical laboratory table as part of miscellaneous category.

Sources: Monthly Report on Outpatients and Adjunct Services, Form PHS-T408, Pharmacy Operations; Quarterly Report, Form HSM-169-1; Social Service Monthly Statistical Report, Form HSM-38 and Monthly Report of Dental Operations and Administration, Form HSM-136-3.

TABLE III.—U.S. PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE OUTPATIENT CLINIC, SAN PEDRO, CALIF.: LABORATORY WORKLOADS, FISCAL YEARS 1967-69

Department, fiscal year	Unweighted test, out-patient	Weighted test, out-patient	Department, fiscal year	
			Unweighted test, out-patient	Weighted test, out-patient
Total:				
1967.....	35,924	75,385		
1968.....	34,666	68,817		
1969.....	34,850	71,533		
Chemistry:				
1967.....	4,768	13,882		
1968.....	4,788	13,467		
1969.....	6,186	17,600		
Urinalysis:				
1967.....	6,962	13,351		
1968.....	6,764	13,086		
1969.....	5,881	11,321		
Radioisotope:				
1967.....				
1968.....				
1969.....	4	8		
Hematology:				
1967.....	13,000	19,446		
1968.....	13,035	18,796		
1969.....	13,051	18,605		
Microbiology:				
1967.....	651	1,702		
1968.....	975	2,563		
1969.....	807	2,145		
Parasitology:				
1967.....	370	1,114		
1968.....	225	729		
1969.....	250	777		
Virology:				
1967.....			1	3
Serology:				
1967.....	6,257	6,875		
1968.....	5,916	5,918		
1969.....	5,545	5,842		
Blood bank:				
1967.....	985	2,955		
1968.....	644	1,932		
1969.....	652	1,956		
Histopathology:				
1967.....	763	3,052		
1968.....	794	3,176		
1969.....	781	3,124		
Miscellaneous:				
1967.....	2,168	13,008		
1968.....	1,525	9,150		
1969.....	1,692	10,152		

Source: Interagency Clinical Laboratory Workload Reporting System, HSM-164-1-164-10.

I would also like to submit for the record, at this point, a letter from Mr. John J. Royal, secretary-treasurer, Fisherman & Allied Workers' Union, Local 33, ILWU. Mr. Royal states that his "organization vehemently opposes such a move" and explains in this letter some of the advantages of maintaining and expanding the PHS hospitals and clinics.

The letter follows:

FISHERMEN & ALLIED WORKERS' UNION, LOCAL 33 ILWU., San Pedro, Calif., January 8, 1971.

HON. GLENN ANDERSON, House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESS ANDERSON: We compliment you for taking the initiative in opposing President Nixon's proposal to close down the United States Public Health Outpatient Clinic in San Pedro, California.

Our organization vehemently opposes such a move, and we would appreciate your continued support on this matter.

As you know, this San Pedro U.S. Public Health Outpatient medical facility is the only one available to our seamen and commercial fishermen in the Los Angeles area. It provides irreplaceable and incomparable health services in the form of preventive medicine besides its normal health care; it provides dental and eye care also which are both available to our fishermen. It is, moreover, centrally located in the area of the Port of Los Angeles, and is conveniently placed among the homes and residences of our men who ply the high seas all year long.

U.S. Public Health care for the seafarer is a matter of simple social justice in the light of the unique relation he holds to his vessel, which is one of personal indenture; the dispensation or the distribution of health care to the seafarer by its "ward," the Federal Government, is based upon the historical tenets of necessity in order to protect him from being overreached by masters and shipowners. We do not want to lose this principle of "wardship."

The beneficent attitude of our country and its people toward our seafarers was ably put by Justice Story when he set forth the underlying principles impelling the nation to that attitude. These were: (1) The protection of seamen who, as a class, are considered improvident from the hazards of illness and abandonment while ill; (2) The inducement to masters and owners to protect health and safety of seamen while in the merchant service; (3) The maintenance of a merchant marine and a fishing fleet for the furtherance of foreign trade in time of peace and as an arm of defense in time of war; and (4) By inducing seamen to accept employment in an arduous and perilous service. Every maritime nation has underwritten the health and welfare of its seafarers in this humanitarian and protective spirit. In fact, our nation from its earliest period of national existence has faithfully recognized the value of its men of the sea and their calling in this social context.

The U.S. Public Health Outpatient Clinic in the Port of Los Angeles, San Pedro, California has made in the past, and is still making a benevolent, humane and vital contribution to the health and welfare of our seafarers and fishermen in the whole Los Angeles complex. We hope that it will be allowed to continue. It makes seafaring and fishing not only a socially useful calling but also a safe one!

May we, therefore, respectfully urge you to continue to fight, in your forthright fashion, for this vital and meaningful social service.

Respectfully yours,

JOHN J. ROYAL,
Secretary-Treasurer.

I have mentioned the need to expand our PHS facilities. Congress overwhelmingly passed the Emergency Health Personnel Act of 1971, which was signed into law by the President last New Year's Eve. Under this act, the role of the Public Health Service is expanded beyond its present beneficiary group to help meet health needs in urban and rural poverty areas that are presently underserved. Why would the administration approve a law to expand services and, then, with the other hand, advocate the closing of the hospitals and clinics?

To rely on the Veterans' Administration hospitals to take over the PHS caseload, as suggested by Secretary Richardson, appears not to be properly accounting for the already overburdened condition of these facilities. The VA cannot handle USPHS beneficiaries in addition to the VA's own patients.

Mr. Speaker, as a supporter and cosponsor of the House concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress to continue these hospitals and clinics, as a member of the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee which has conducted hearings on this matter; as a person concerned with the escalating costs for doctors, drugs, and hospital care that now cost Americans some \$70 billion a year—a 16-percent rise last year, far greater than our general inflationary trend in the United States; as an American concerned about the poor state of the Nation's health, despite the fact that we have in our highly industrialized and technological society the ability to provide proper medical care for our people; I appeal to all concerned persons to help in our efforts to expand and modernize our existing health care facilities and not erode or eliminate the PHS.

I urge that all efforts be made toward building, and not destroying, the Public Health Service hospital system.

THE POLLUTION AND ECOLOGY ISSUE

HON. JOHN G. SCHMITZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 10, 1971

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, within the span of 2 short years, pollution and ecology have escalated from the particular concern of only a relative handful of people to a major national issue which polls report to be second only to the Vietnam war—sometimes even ahead of the war—as the primary concern of the public today.

Sometimes it seems that anything goes in the name of ecology. After the Liberty amendment, which I regularly introduced, had been defeated four times in the California State Legislature, it occurred to me that perhaps it could be passed if only I could present it as an antipollution measure.

But, seriously, we do need clear and specific guidelines to evaluate all proposed Government action against pollution and for protecting the environment. First, we should be at least reasonably sure that the alleged danger is real. Second, we should be sure that it is not already being effectively abated through the use of powers now available to Government, or through programs undertaken by the private corporations directly involved. Third, we should have good reason to believe that the danger actually threatens the life and health of our people, thereby making it a proper subject for governmental action, rather than—for instance—involving esthetic considerations only.

If these guidelines are not rigorously applied, we can be sure that the "ecology" issue will be used to bring about the needless and harmful extension of Government controls over the conduct of private business and the use of privately owned land, and to hamper technological developments vital to our national de-

fense which present no real environmental hazard.

All three of the criteria I have mentioned are met by air pollution resulting from factory and powerplant emissions and automobile exhaust, and by water pollution resulting from industrial wastes and untreated sewage. These forms of pollution clearly threaten life and health, cross State lines—making them a legitimate subject for Federal legislation—and by most indications are not being effectively checked by present legislation and control programs. Therefore I have actively supported, and will continue to support actively, much stronger legislation such as the recently passed Clean Air Act to remove these threats to life and health.

On the other hand, the environmental case against the supersonic transport—whose fate Congress is scheduled to decide this month—meets none of the three criteria. There is no convincing evidence that this aircraft will significantly endanger life and health. Much of the opposition to it, in the name of ecology, appears actually to arise from hostility to the military-industrial complex involved in the research and development and construction of this aircraft.

Therefore, I will vote for the appropriations necessary to complete the present development of two prototype models, so as not to lose the benefit of the work already done. But construction and development costs for any commercial fleet of supersonic aircraft should be met by the aircraft industry, without Federal subsidy.

Another example of how the pollution and ecology issue can be misused was pointed out recently by my colleague from California, Congressman CRAIG HOSMER. He said that nuclear power, actually the "cleanest" of all ways now known of producing electric power, was being given a "bum rap" by the "ecophiles." Taking advantage of popular fears of anything to do with nuclear energy, the development of this new "clean" power source is being hampered at precisely the time when existing and needed powerplants are a major contributor to air pollution.

A YOUNG OFFICER'S LETTER ON OUR INVOLVEMENT IN INDO- CHINA

HON. ANDREW JACOBS, JR.

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 10, 1971

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, recently I received a letter from a friend and constituent, a Green Beret and first lieutenant in the U.S. Army, who has served in Vietnam for the past several months as an adviser to an ARVN unit. I commend the reading of this statement to all who would inform themselves of the realities of our tragic involvement and recent adventures in Indochina—the "official" Pentagon versions notwithstanding.

Part of this young officer's letter reads:

A SLAUGHTER OF INNOCENTS

(By Tom Wicker)

As for the continuing nightmare of Vietnam, I guess all I can say is that it's still continuing and it's still a nightmare. My personal feelings on the subject have steadily gone downhill, and I guess, at this point, you could say I've just about had it. There's no way to describe in words how the situation has deteriorated in the past couple of months, but, believe me, getting every American out of Vietnam tomorrow wouldn't be too soon.

And what's surprising is that N.C.O.'s with 15-to-20 years in the service and wearing red, white, and blue underwear have reached the same conclusion—and are expressing it! What has been at best an unpopular war is now becoming totally futile—even in the eyes of its staunchest supporters.

For us, as advisers, the problem lies within the nature of the Vietnamese people. They have the training they need; they have the equipment they need; but the things we can't give them are the intangibles like concern and initiative—i.e., our values and presumptions. They just . . . don't give a damn—so why should we? The result here in Binh Dinh province has been that they're getting the ——— kicked out of them—and personally, I don't want to be around for the finish.

Then I read in *Time* magazine that there is very little enemy activity nowadays and that Abrams says 70% of the Vietnamese forces are as effective as U.S. troops, and I get sick. Sometimes I'd just like to get up on a huge platform right in the middle of the U.S. and yell at the top of my lungs, Bull ———! You American people don't know half of what's really going on in Vietnam! But since that's not Standard Operating Procedure for 1st lieutenants nowadays and since I want to get out as soon as possible—preferably "honorably"—I'll refrain from building my platform. But when they ask you to stop thinking, that's a little too much. And I'm afraid that's exactly what our "Commanders" have done. That's the only excuse I can think of for going into Laos and Cambodia. These exercises in futility are only delaying the inevitable withdrawal of all U.S. troops from Southeast Asia, and this delay is definitely proving to be much more costly than people realize.

A SLAUGHTER OF INNOCENTS

HON. MICHAEL J. HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 10, 1971

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, President Nixon's policy in Indochina is not one of steady withdrawal as is maintained, rather it is a bloody program of escalating American air bombardments sheltering increased South Vietnamese aggressions.

Instead of deescalation, the war has been carried by means of increased air and invasion into two more countries, victims of American withdrawal.

We did not believe that it was possible for this war to grow more cruel. Now the President through his policy of indiscriminate aerial warfare, has demonstrated that no sacrifice is too great to insure American victory; provided the bill is paid by a slaughter of civilians and not American casualties.

Tom Wicker's column, "A Slaughter of Innocents," exposes this policy for the fraud it is. I trust my colleagues will read the article and consider its implications.

The article follows:

WASHINGTON.—President Nixon's news conference of Feb. 17 made clear what skeptics have long believed. His Vietnam policy is by no means one of steadily withdrawing Americans from South Vietnam, then letting the people of Indochina work out or fight out their own affairs. It is instead a policy of escalation by American air power and South Vietnamese manpower, with the aim of military victory.

"I am not going to place any limitations upon the use of air power," Mr. Nixon said, excepting only the use of nuclear weapons. And if South Vietnam invades North Vietnam across the demilitarized zone—"to defend their national security," in the President's Orwellian lingo—Mr. Nixon openly left standing the possibility of sending American air power to support the invasion.

Mr. Nixon was careful at every turn to lay down, as a basis for an unlimited air war, the doctrine that he would be acting only to protect the lives of American ground troops. This blatant deception was used to justify the Cambodian invasion and is being used to justify the current extension of the ground war into the Laotian panhandle. But it was exposed as a fraud by Mr. Nixon himself, who claimed that the fighting in Cambodia had cut one North Vietnamese "lifeline" and then said of the march into Laos:

"This action would either cut or seriously disrupt the other pipeline or lifeline . . . the Ho Chi Minh Trail into the north half of South Vietnam. Therefore, we expected the North Vietnamese to fight here. They have to fight here or give up the struggle to conquer South Vietnam, Cambodia, and their influence extending through other parts of Southeast Asia."

Those are the words of a man seeking a showdown. The clear threat to turn loose the South Vietnamese to invade North Vietnam, under a protective umbrella of American planes and behind a destructive barrage of American bombs, may be in part psychological warfare. But if the President cannot get his victory in Laos, as he could not get it in South Vietnam or in Cambodia, there is only one other place to seek it, and every reason to believe that Mr. Nixon will do just that.

It should be noted well that this President, who was elected promising to end—not win—the war, has effectively jettisoned the Paris negotiations. Not only did he say that American representatives would continue to participate only in hopes of making an arrangement concerning prisoners of war—not the war itself—but he also said flatly that "we are not going to make any more concessions."

Not content with this demolition, Mr. Nixon went further and reiterated the fact that he has also abrogated the only fruitful results of those talks—the October, 1968 "understanding" by which the bombing of North Vietnam was ended.

That understanding was entered in good faith by the previous Administration and by Hanoi. Now Mr. Nixon has asserted without convincing supporting evidence that attacks on American reconnaissance planes over Hanoi constitute a North Vietnamese violation of the understanding that releases him from it; further, Mr. Nixon insists that he will bomb North Vietnam any time he decides anything happening in that country threatens American lives.

So the talks are dead, interred by a President who charges the other side with making no concessions despite having made none himself on any point that matters; and the important understanding those talks produced is also dead, broken by the second American President who failed to honor an arrangement with Hanoi; and the war has been carried by air and invasion to two more countries, with the threat poised of

the invasion and aerial devastation of a third.

This is a policy calculated to bludgeon North Vietnam to its knees, without appalling American casualty lists; it is also a policy that risks retaliation elsewhere—in northern Laos or in Thailand—and might bring Chinese entry into the war. But above all, every American, every citizen who loves his country, every man who honors humanity should understand the cost of this policy in life and suffering.

It is a policy of indiscriminate aerial warfare and blind firepower on the ground that means death and destruction wholesale, not just body counts of enemy dead, but a slaughter of innocents—women and children and old people—villages destroyed, the earth ravaged, refugees in their miserable thousands wandering homeless and hungry. For the people of Indochina, it is a wanton lie that this Administration is "winding down" the war; it is spreading the war like a holocaust.

In a forthcoming article in *The New York Review of Books*, Daniel Ellsberg cites Senate reports showing that more than a million Cambodian refugees have been "generated" in the last nine months; that in Mr. Nixon's first year in office about 50,000 civilians were killed, and in his second, more than 70,000. No one knows how many there will be in his third, or what number of innocents will die in Laos, or how many more will be made refugees.

But they will be many, and every one an ineradicable stain upon the once-proud name of the United States of America.

A LEGACY OF EXCELLENCE

HON. WILMER MIZELL

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 10, 1971

Mr. MIZELL. Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to ask my distinguished colleagues to join with me for a moment in honoring the memory of Mr. Carl Abram Webster, who passed away recently after serving for the past 10 years as Yadkin County field supervisor for the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service.

He leaves a legacy of excellence in finding ways to cope with the problems and realize the potentials of agriculture, and he will be greatly missed and fondly remembered by his many friends and associates in Yadkin County, N.C.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I insert in the RECORD the text of the February 19, 1971, newsletter of the Yadkin County ASCS, which deals exclusively with the work of Carl Abram Webster.

I recommend it to my colleagues' attention:

CARL ABRAM WEBSTER

Tuesday night, February 16, Yadkin County farmers and Yadkin County ASCS lost a true friend and a dedicated worker in the passing of Carl Webster.

Carl first became associated with ASCS in 1955 when he was selected by his neighbors to the Deep Creek Community Committee. He has been re-elected to that committee every year for the past 16 years. In 1956 Carl was employed as a reporter for the county office measuring land. He worked as a reporter until 1960. In June of 1960 he was promoted to Assistant Field Supervisor. In 1961 he was put in charge of all field work for the county office. He served in this position until his death this week.

In the nine years that I have been manager of the Yadkin office I, nor the county committee, have never had to correct or change any job that Carl performed. Spotchecks of his work by our state office never revealed any errors on his part.

He was truly devoted to his work, being satisfied with only one thing: doing a good job and treating all the farmers of Yadkin County with respect and fairness. This, we believe, he did without question.

He will be missed by us who knew him and we will long remember his smiling face, wit, and warm friendship.

THE CASE FOR REIES LOPEZ TIJERINA

HON. AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 10, 1971

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, I have been reading with concerned interest and frequent dismay for many months about the case of the Mexican American leader, Reies Lopez Tijerina, who is currently being held in prison by the Government of the United States at the Springfield, Mo., Federal Medical Center. He was charged and convicted of aiding and abetting an assault on forest rangers in the Carson National Forest in October 1966.

The Carson National Forest is part of land that Mr. Tijerina and many of his followers in the Spanish American land grant organization, the Alianza Federal de Pueblos Libres—Federal Alliance of Free Communities—contend belonged as common municipal land to the descendants of the original Spanish American settlers under the Treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo, 1848, which terminated the Mexican-American war and which involved the cession of the southwestern United States to this Nation.

Though some may think Mr. Tijerina's claims and those of his followers to be absurd and irrational, too much history, too many documents, and too much reason say otherwise. This is not to say, however, that I necessarily support or agree with those claims, but I do consider them very serious and substantial.

Many persons concerned with the civil rights and liberties of our citizens have sought through the courts and otherwise to obtain justice for Mr. Tijerina. Foremost among them has been Mr. William J. Higgs, a noted civil rights attorney, who has written to the Justices of the U.S. Supreme Court, petitioning for the redress of grievances. His letter presents a brief but concise delineation of the background and facts surrounding the conviction of Mr. Tijerina, and as such should be of most particular interest and enlightenment to my colleagues.

The letter follows:

ALBUQUERQUE, N. MEX.,

February 21, 1971.

Mr. Chief Justice BURGER, Mr. Justice BLACK, Mr. Justice DOUGLAS, Mr. Justice BRENNAN, Mr. Justice STEWART, Mr. Justice HARLAN, Mr. Justice WHITE, Mr. Justice MARSHALL, Mr. Justice BLACKMUN, U.S. Supreme Court, Washington, D.C.

GENTLEMEN: I am writing this letter somewhat in the nature of a petition for the

redress of grievances, somewhat in the nature of a letter of deeply felt and needed expression.

Since I am trained in the law, as such is known in this country (Harvard Law School, LL.B., 1958), I realize that this communication will probably have no meaning, no effect. Nevertheless, I have always given in to the urge to express myself when I felt something was deeply wrong. And this time is no exception.

I shall try to be brief; you have enough to read as it is.

In 1896 the Court gave its opinion in the case of *Plessy v. Ferguson*, 163 U.S. 537. That opinion became the cornerstone of legalized racism in this country. One year later in 1897, the Court handed down its decision in the cases of *U.S. v. Rio Arriba Land and Cattle Co.* (187 U.S. 298) and *U.S. v. Sandoval* (187 U.S. 276). These opinions, together with *U.S. v. Santa Fe*, 165 U.S. 675 (1897), now stand as the bulwark against the property rights of the impoverished Indo-Hispano (Chicano) of the Southwest. These cases grew out of the Treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo (final ratification by Mexico on May 30, 1848) closing out the war between the United States and Mexico, which many people believe was the most sordid chapter in our history. This Treaty stated that the property (as well as civil and political) rights of the Indo-Hispano would be faithfully protected by the United States. In essence these decisions of the Supreme Court held that the common lands of the pueblos (settlements) of the Indo-Hispano people of the Southwest belonged not to these people but to the U.S. government. (It goes without saying that the Court never considered protecting the inalienable character of the common lands of the pueblos in the Indo-Hispano people.) The Supreme Court wrote down reasoning to the effect that, since, under the laws of Spain and of the Indies (Spanish America), the King of Spain held and exercised absolute dominion and control over the common lands of the pueblos, the U.S. government as the successor to the King of Spain and to the government of Mexico was entitled to the common lands. In large part these Supreme Court decisions meant that up to 100,000,000 acres of land (about 1/3 of the entire area of the Southwest, Texas to California—according to *The Public Domain*, U.S. Public Land Commission (Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1884), p. 409, claims for 80,000,000 acres were evidently outstanding in New Mexico, Colorado and Arizona alone) was transferred effectively and successfully under the rubric of "legal process" from the Indo-Hispano people to the U.S. government, to shyster lawyers such as the Santa Fe Ring, and to other "Anglo" opportunists skilled in the art of legal intrigue.

In short, these decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court and the type of legal process that they fostered resulted in the loss of about 100,000,000 acres of land by the Chicano people to the U.S. government and Anglos—in direct violation of the guarantees of the Treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo.

Though I could not conceivably hold myself out as being anything but an average reader of Spanish, I have spent some time examining the various Spanish Codes, including the *Stete Partidas*, *Recopilación*, *Nóvísima Recopilación*, and others, as well as *La Recopilación de las Leyes de los Reynos de las Indias*. Also I have examined some treatises in Spanish on the subject. I am convinced that the Supreme Court of the *Rio Arriba*, *Sandoval*, and *Santa Fe* opinions was not correct when it accepted the position advocated by the U.S. government that the King of Spain held and exercised absolute dominion and control over the common lands of the pueblos.

Law 4, Title VIII, Book VII of the *Nóvísima Recopilación* states in part:

LEY IV.—Tiempo necesario para prescribir el Señorío de los pueblos, y su Jurisdicción

civil y criminal, á excepcion de la Suprema, y de los pechos y tributos pertenecientes al Rey.

LEY 2 tit. 27. del Ordenam. de Alcald. y D. Felipe II año de 1566.

Porque algunos en nuestros reynos tienen y posen algunas ciudades, villas y lugares, y Jurisdicciones civiles y criminales, sin tener para ello titulo nuestro, ni de los Reyes nuestros antecesores, y se ha dudado, si lo suso dicho se puede adquirir contra Nos y nuestra Corona por algun tiempo; ordenamos y mandamos: que la posesion inmemorial, probándose segun y como y con las calidades que la ley de Toro requiere, que es la ley, tit. 17. lib. 10., baste para adquirir contra Nos y nuestros sucesores qualquier ciudades, villas y lugares, y Jurisdicciones civiles y criminales, y qualquiera cosa y parte dello, con las cosas al Señorío y Jurisdiccion anexas y pertenecientes; . . .

Since the words "contra Nos y nuestra Corona" and "contra Nos y nuestros sucesores" are used L take this language to mean that the Pueblos at one time—at least until 1805, the date of the *Nóvísima*—held titles effective even as against the King, primarily because that is what it says.

Moreover, Law 8, Title XXI, Book VII, of the *Novísima Recopilación* declares—since 1515—that even the King of Spain could not grant to outsiders the common land within the terminos or boundaries of a pueblo.

Laws 1 and 2, Title I, Book II, of the *Laws of the Indies*, above, explicitly makes the laws of Spain applicable to the Indies when the *Laws of the Indies* do not cover the subject.

These laws I have mentioned above apparently were never seen by the U.S. Supreme Court of 1896, which contented itself with studying only some available English-language works and excerpts, much of which was incorrectly translated and contained serious omissions.

In addition, these cases before the Supreme Court invariably reflected only the interests of the U.S. government and the Santa Fe Ring as they struggled over who would get the spoils of the lands of the Indo-Hispano people.

Frankly, I do not feel that a legal brief is in order here. I just want to say that I am convinced that a reading of the Spanish Codes—in Spanish—will leave the reader certain that the Supreme Court of the United States incorrectly decided these cases that deprived the Indo-Hispano people of their land.

In view of the gravity of the continuing harm being done to the Chicano people of the Southwest, I would hope some day a Supreme Court would be big enough and just enough to rectify the wrong—just as Chief Justice Marshall did in *U.S. v. Percheman*, 32 U.S. 50 (1833) when he reversed the holding in *Foster v. Nelson*, 27 U.S. 164 (1829) and upheld a Spanish land grant upon the Court having subsequently called to its attention by means of a translation of the Spanish version the correct interpretation of the 1819 Treaty ceding the Spanish Floridas to the United States.

The consequences of this loss of land to the Indo-Hispano has been incalculable—in poverty, in suppression of culture, in denial of education, in encouraging of racial discrimination. And these effects are still continuing throughout the Southwest. One sees it here everywhere—in the facts and in the statistics.

And these are the consequences of this Court's decisions.

There is a man, Reies Lopez Tijerina, who—though having had only six months of formal education in his life and only learning English at 17—became interested in the plight of the Indo-Hispano, of his people, and in the role of the land in that plight. He traveled to Spain and to Mexico. He studied and purchased many books, including the *Laws of the Indies* and all of the old Spanish Codes. After years of laborious study

in lawbooks and talking the old people became convinced that the U.S. Supreme Court was wrong, that the pueblo common lands belonged to the people of the pueblos, not directly to the King of Spain. He sought in various ways to petition the U.S. government to correct its error, all in vain. In other contexts he has come to the extrajudicial attention of this Court, particularly that of Mr. Chief Justice Burger.

Mr. Tijerina was charged and convicted by the U.S. government of aiding and abetting an assault on forest rangers in the Carson National Forest in October, 1966, on land which Mr. Tijerina and the neighboring settlers claimed belonged to the common lands of the pueblo of San Joaquin del Rio de Chama (Canon de Chama). Since the rangers had only been led by the arm about ten yards, no one was hurt; but Mr. Tijerina received a two-year sentence, while the ones who actually touched the Rangers' arms were out of prison in two months. This Court refused to even hear the appeal in Mr. Tijerina's case, so Mr. Tijerina now (Jan. 17, 1971) has finished serving that sentence. He has just begun serving another sentence stemming from his wife's burning of two Forest Service signs designating the southern part of the San Joaquin pueblo as part of the Santa Fe National Forest, since he was convicted of aiding and abetting her. Mrs. Tijerina's sentence was suspended. Mr. Tijerina is now still in prison and has been there since June 11, 1969, when his bond on the "assault" case was revoked on the grounds that he was "dangerous to the community." At a new hearing after 18 months in prison, bond on the "sign-burning" conviction was denied for the same reason on January 19, 1971, in U.S. District Court in Albuquerque. Various petitions for vacation of sentence and habeas corpus have been summarily rejected or gone unanswered.

After relentless persecution by the state and local police in northern New Mexico because of his struggle for the common lands, Mr. Tijerina was involved on June 5, 1967, in a now-famous shoot-out in the Courthouse in Tierra Amarilla, New Mexico, the county seat of Rio Arriba County, a land of great size and beauty and of great poverty—for the Indo-Hispano. Mr. Tijerina was brought to the state bar of justice on about sixty counts, several capital (kidnapping). At a November, 1968, trial at which the state was forced to select any three charges on which to try Mr. Tijerina, he was acquitted by the jury of all three. Subsequently, in spite of Mr. Tijerina's stand on the double jeopardy clause of the U.S. Constitution, he was retried in November, 1969, and convicted on two of three of the numerous remaining charges. Mr. Tijerina was his own lawyer in both trials. The state had learned its lesson well: At the first trial he was physically free, during the second he was in prison and denied access to legal materials and witnesses necessary to his defense, in federal custody. At the first he had this writer as advisor sitting at his side, at the second I was ordered by the Court to sit with the audience. At the first he could introduce evidence about the pueblos and the common lands, at the second he could not. At the first he could have testimony from those directly involved such as the governor and the district attorney (the object of an attempted citizen's arrest that precipitated the shootout), at the second he could not.

Presently Mr. Tijerina's appeal from the sign-burning case is awaiting decision by the Tenth Circuit in Denver. He has been trying for parole or for bond ever since his June 11, 1969, arrest without success. He is now confined in the federal Medical Center in Springfield, Missouri, and has undergone several operations on his throat, accompanied by sharp loss of weight.

I have always considered that I have as much a direct stake in injustice as those who

suffer from it. I have been active in the civil rights movement both in Mississippi and in Washington, D.C., ever since my graduation from law school in 1958. Many household names and many forgotten persons of the movement have been my friends or acquaintances.

I believe Mr. Tijerina to be a very great man who passionately believes in justice. I believe that he is being made to suffer not for his transgressions against the law but for his convictions, the light of which the administrators of law and government cannot stand.

I believe the common lands—all 100,000,000 acres of them—in law and in justice belong to the Indo-Hispano people of the Southwest.

I would like to see the Court act in this cause and correct some errors, right some wrongs, and render justice. I do not believe that it will, but a petition at least has the salutary effect of making the petitioner feel better.

This letter is written with the greatest of respect to nine distinguished scholars and contributors of the law who have high dedication to justice as they perceive it—and I am not sure that one can ask for more.

Yours sincerely,

WILLIAM L. HIGGS.

WHAT ARE WE DOING ABOUT THE PROBLEM OF CUBA?

HON. JOHN ROUSSELOT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 10, 1971

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, we are hearing a great deal of discussion today, especially in the news media, about the importance of Congress assuming the responsibility to establish priorities. In the area of establishing priorities as they relate to our own Western Hemisphere, an important area of foreign affairs is, "What are we doing about the problem of Cuba?"

While a candidate for President in 1960, John Fitzgerald Kennedy stated that our American Government stood "helplessly by while the Russians established a new satellite only 90 miles from American shores." For a Nation that has always been such an intense believer in the concept of freedom, and has spent so much time talking about the "now generation," it is amazing that we have so neglected the freedom of the Cuban people who live so close to our own borders. "Freedom now" should really become the theme of the American people in their concern for the tyranny that has existed so long on the island of Cuba. David Lawrence has written a most appropriate editorial in the current issue of U.S. News & World Report, dated March 15, 1971, entitled, "Have the Russians Bought Cuba?" I submit it for the consideration of my colleagues whom I know are much concerned about our major priorities in the field of foreign affairs:

HAVE THE RUSSIANS BOUGHT CUBA?

(By David Lawrence)

Information about the extent to which the Soviet Union is aiding Cuba financially is gradually becoming known. When the Soviets and the Cubans signed their annual trade agreement a few days ago, the First Deputy Minister of Soviet Foreign Trade said that 1971 would see an increase of \$110

million in the value of Russian goods sent to Cuba.

Phil Newsom, a foreign news analyst of United Press International, says:

"Soviet aid has been keeping the Cuban economy afloat for the last ten years, and the Cubans now are estimated to owe the Russians more than \$3 billion exclusive of military aid. With the Cuban economy going deeper into the hole each year, the Russians can have but little hope of ever being repaid."

The big question is: What is motivating the Soviets in spending so much money on a small country in Latin America? Certainly in a nuclear war Cuba would not be of much importance. But, as Mr. Newsom points out, in peacetime or if there is a conventional war, the value appears to be "enormous." He writes:

"It gives the Russians a friendly port where no other exists.

"It can provide the Soviet Navy with food and facilities for shore leave and repairs.

"It could interfere with shipping through the Panama Canal and threaten the Canal itself.

"It also could pose a threat to shipping moving out of the mouth of the Mississippi River.

"Further, it has the prestige value of providing the Russians a haven in waters heretofore exclusively American."

What is surprising is that this situation has been slowly developing over the last few years without much protest from the people of the United States. It is true that, when President Kennedy seemingly persuaded the Soviet Union to abandon Cuba as a missile base, this won widespread approval. But the main source of possible difficulties with Russia over Cuba has by no means been removed.

Ever since President Monroe in a message to Congress in 1823 promulgated what has been known as the "Monroe Doctrine," the American people have felt that no European power should be permitted to get a military foothold in this hemisphere.

It is apparent, however, that the Soviets have been financing the Cuban Government and have been making arrangements to use the island as a base. In recent months there have been reports about the building of a base for nuclear submarines in a Cuban port, and the belief has prevailed that the Castro Government will bow to the wishes of Moscow in making available for Soviet warships whatever they may require when they are operating close to the United States.

This is a contingency which has caused a good deal of concern in Washington. The State Department has discussed the matter with the Soviet Government and has been assured that there is no intention of constructing a permanent base. But it is obvious that Cuba itself is a "permanent base" which is going to be accessible to Soviet naval vessels of all kinds.

The situation now is far different from what it was in 1962, when Russia installed in Cuba land-based rockets with a range of about 1,000 nautical miles. Today the Soviet missile-submarine force could annihilate a substantial part of the American population from coast to coast. The Soviets have developed Polaris-type ballistic missiles for submarines, and the United States defense against them—the "Safeguard" system—is not expected to be operational for another five years.

Meanwhile, how many of the Polaris-type submarines which Russia possesses—a total of at least 13—are kept in Cuban waters?

Since Cuba is only a few miles away from the United States, the presence of a hostile military unit in Cuba is clearly in conflict with American principles as set forth in the Monroe Doctrine.

The Cuban Government itself is weak and is plagued with unfavorable economic con-

ditions, which could bring on an internal revolution. There are many refugees from Cuba living on American territory today who would go back to their homeland if a new government were established.

As Russia moves in more and more to exercise a proprietorship over Cuba by furnishing huge sums of money to bolster the island's economy, the Soviets are believed to be maintaining also a headquarters for the training of agents who are in contact with Communist movements in other Latin-American countries.

The problem raised by what is happening in Cuba cannot be brushed aside. The American people have long supported the Monroe Doctrine and are opposed to any European country establishing a base in this hemisphere.

In time, the Cuban people themselves may solve the matter internally. But for the present the outlook for an independent Cuba is not bright. It has become one of the colonies of the Soviet Union, bought by Russian money.

THE NIXON REVENUE-SHARING PLAN: NO HELP TO OUR SCHOOLS

HON. WILLIAM D. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 10, 1971

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, an excellent article concerning revenue sharing and education written by Albert Shanker, president of the United Federation of Teachers, recently appeared in "The Detroit Teacher." Mr. Shanker points out that revenue sharing would merely create more problems for education, without solving the ones which presently exist.

In discussing new problems which would emerge under the President's proposal, Mr. Shanker underlines the most crucial one existing today, and notes that it will continue to exist if Mr. Nixon has his way. The most crucial problem today, of course, is money.

Perhaps the most cogent statement in this article is that, "Educational programs have failed because they have starved from their inception." No truer words about our educational programs have ever been spoken. Mr. Nixon proposes to do absolutely nothing about this with his revenue sharing plan. He does not propose to spend more money for education—he simply intends to rearrange existing funds.

Mr. Speaker, I am inserting this article in the RECORD, and I highly recommend it to any of my colleagues whose districts are presently experiencing financial problems with respect to education:

EDUCATION AND REVENUE SHARING

The school fiscal crisis deepens every day. In the New York area, New Rochelle has announced it may have to close schools. The district has run out of money and cannot raise taxes since the legal tax limit has been reached. New York City has imposed a job freeze, and the Board of Education is making cuts to head off a projected \$50 million deficit. Newark teachers are on strike, following a Board of Education demand that teachers sign a four-year pact providing no salary increases over the contract period.

It is because of the urgent need for more education dollars that initial public reaction to President Nixon's revenue-sharing proposal has been very favorable. Unfortunately, a closer look at the proposal leaves us with little reason for optimism.

A major obstacle to passage by Congress of revenue-sharing legislation is that it strips many Congressional committees of the power to approve legislation in their respective jurisdictions. A Congressional revolt on the issue of committee jurisdiction may give the President a good campaign issue against the Democrats in 1972, but it's not the best way to feed dollars to our starving schools.

But even if the proposal were adopted new problems emerge:

Without the appropriation of new moneys (which are not mandated in the President's program), revenue sharing will merely result in the destruction of present programs such as Title I.

Giving block grants to the states, rather than continuing the present earmarked categorical aid, reopens the thorny question of how much money goes to private and parochial schools as against public schools—a question that will have to be fought out and resolved on a state-by-state basis.

Moreover, enforcement of the provision that federal funds shall not be used to support racially segregated schools—a provision which the federal government itself has found "difficult" to enforce—would now be turned over completely to the very states guilty of discrimination.

Finally, in the proposal to give block grants to states there is no provision (as now exists in categorical aid) guaranteeing that the state will disburse the money to the cities in need. The states themselves will decide where the money goes, with the likelihood that these cities will be cheated in the process.

THE NIXON VERSION OF "POWER TO THE PEOPLE"

The President's use of the radical slogan, "power to the people," emerges as a conservative demand that Congress appropriate moneys without commitment to church-state separation, civil rights and aid to the cities. Congress should be reluctant to endorse such a program, in light of its historic obligation, when federal moneys are appropriated, to assure that these moneys are used to promote and advance national public policy, not to contradict or subvert it.

The administration's revenue-sharing plan must be placed in a yet broader context. At the recent White House Conference on Children, the administration worked day and night to undermine support for educational spending with such arguments as: "The schools are doing a poor job." . . . "Federal aid hasn't helped." . . . "Money is not the answer." Actually, money, as a remedy has never been given a fair trial. Educational programs have failed because they have been starved from their very inception.

Low financing means a choice of two makeshift procedures: Either the money is concentrated on meeting the needs of a very few schools, in complete neglect of the many, or it is spread so thin that no noticeable improvement can be expected anywhere.

The administration should stop saying that more money for the schools won't help until the remedy is tried—just once. If the President wants to help the schools, he need only enforce the legislation which is already on the books. The Elementary and Secondary School Education Act (ESEA), which contains the needed safeguards, is already on the books. Congress has authorized \$24 billion over three years, but the administration will spend only \$3.7 billion in the first year. New York City this year will get federal aid

to education in the amount of \$146 million. If the President were to fully apply the provisions of ESEA, and New York City were to get its full federal payment, the amount would be \$292 million. What is true of New York is true of the rest of the country. Every major city would receive double the amount now allocated to it.

The Nixon revenue-sharing plan for education only consolidates and re-arranges existing funds. It does not provide any additional money for education. The Cost of Education Index indicates that school costs are increasing 13% a year, and the President himself predicted an increase of 6% in the cost of living. Thus existing federally funded school programs face actual cuts ranging from 6% to at least 13%.

If the President continues to press for this new and controversial revenue-sharing plan while failing to provide much needed aid to children under existing legislation, there will be no escape from the conclusion that education is being sacrificed to presidential politics.

STRATEGY OF REALISTIC DETERRENCE

HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 10, 1971

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, Secretary of Defense Laird appeared before our Armed Services Committee today to present his annual report on our defense posture and plans.

Our whole defense program is keyed to deterring aggression. Our objective is not to make war but to deter it.

I am inserting in the RECORD, as a part of these remarks, section 1 of the Defense Report. It is entitled "Toward a Strategy of Realistic Deterrence," and it merits the thoughtful reading of all of us who serve in Congress and have the primary responsibility for our national security:

I include the material as follows:

SECTION I—TOWARD A STRATEGY OF REALISTIC DETERRENCE

I. STRATEGY OVERVIEW

In his first Report to Congress on Foreign Policy, on February 18, 1970, President Nixon enunciated a policy of peace and what is needed to achieve it. Based on the principles of partnership, strength, and a willingness to negotiate, this positive policy is designed to move our country and the rest of the world toward a generation of peace. This basic policy, reaffirmed in the President's second Report on Foreign Policy, on February 25, 1971, underlies and guides our new National Security Strategy of Realistic Deterrence.

The goal of peace and the need to maintain adequate combat capabilities are fully consistent. The President recognized this when he declared adequate strength to be one of the three pillars of his foreign policy; without adequate military power our nation could not attain or maintain peace.

From the President's Strategy for Peace, we derive this guideline for Defense planning:

Our goal is to prevent wars, to maintain a realistic and ready military force aimed at deterring aggression—adequate to handle aggression should deterrence fail. As Secretary of Defense, I believe that in terms of force levels and expenditures, we can make the transition from war to lasting peace and expanding freedom with an efficient and

modernized U. S. military force that, in peacetime, would require no more than seven percent of Gross National Product or less and be made up of no more than 2.5 million men and women who are volunteers. Combined with adequate strength, true partnership and constructive negotiations, such a force is designed to deter war.

The Department of Defense five-year program for FY 1972-FY 1976 is keyed to the goal of preventing war and securing peace.

A. SECURITY POLICY AND STRATEGY IN PERSPECTIVE

The security a nation enjoys at any given time is, in great part, the result of past efforts, particularly in the area of technology. The United States and other Free World nations clearly enjoy greater security today than they would if the tremendous efforts of the past twenty years had not been made.

In the past two decades we achieved first place in nuclear capability, became pre-eminent in space, and substantially strengthened our conventional capabilities. Our military power was an important factor in preventing aggression and safeguarding peace in many parts of the world, notably Europe. However, it did not prevent aggression in Indochina.

One problem was that national security policies during the past decade did not focus sufficiently on lowering the probability of all forms of war through deterrence of aggressors. The effect of these policies on military planning was to create forces that lowered the probability of nuclear war while stressing a growing U.S. military capability to engage and to fight in other types of conflict.

That this military capability proved not to be an effective deterrent was due to a second major problem in national security planning. This was the failure to correlate closely and fully military strategy, national security strategy, and foreign policy, which embrace all elements of effective deterrence—non-military as well as military.

This administration believes—and this is the foundation of President Nixon's Strategy for Peace—that our central national security objective is the prevention of war, and the movement toward a generation of peace. A realistic military strategy for the decade of the 1970's cannot be permitted to become an end in itself. It must be an inseparable part of a broader national strategy of deterrence, and meaningfully related to our pressing requirements in the domestic field.

In conceptual terms, U.S. national security strategy went through two distinct phases during the past two decades. Figures 1 and 2 in the Appendix illustratively summarize the basic strategy concepts, budget levels (in constant 1964 dollars), and major forces associated with the Eisenhower years and the Kennedy-Johnson years. These two phases were characterized by different emphases with regard to planning for military forces and military assistance. They can be summarized as follows:

EISENHOWER ADMINISTRATION

Strategy Concepts: Strategic superiority; limited general purpose forces deployed well forward with a potential tripwire function for possible nuclear response; strong regional and bilateral alliances with a dominant U.S. air, sea and ground role; allied ability to handle low intensity conflicts; and substantial economic and military aid. Eisenhower strategy and forces were deterrence-oriented with emphasis on nuclear umbrella.

Forces: Emphasis on development of new systems. Many nuclear systems deployed today were initially developed including IRBMs and ATLAS, TITAN, POLARIS and MINUTEMAN ICBM/SLBM systems. Work on ABM was also initiated. A notable decline in General Purpose Forces was evident from Korean War levels. Military manpower dropped by more than one million men. The number of

Army divisions and Navy warships declined. Tactical air squadrons increased.

Budgets: In constant FY 1964 dollars, the budget came down sharply from the Korean peak in the first two years and remained relatively stable thereafter. The post-Korean mean average was about \$46 billion.

Foreign and Military Assistance: The trend was down from post-World War II peaks but a rough balance was struck between military and economic assistance and the dollar levels remained relatively high.

Manpower: Emphasis was placed on Reserve call-ups for augmentation requirements.

KENNEDY-JOHNSON ADMINISTRATION

Strategy Concepts: Emphasis on "assured destruction" by strategic forces; "flexible response" for NATO strategy; a planning goal (never attained) to gain capability for fighting large Asian and European conflicts simultaneously; pursuit of a capability for fighting and training others to fight limited wars and insurgencies; and large but declining foreign and military assistance programs. Significant change in strategy was the shift in emphasis to greater orientation for U.S. toward bearing the principal Free World burden in non-nuclear conflict.

Forces: Strategic force buildup in early years until leveling off in the mid-1960's. Research and Development effort primarily emphasized refinements rather than conceptually new systems; notable exceptions: MIRV, battlefield sensors, F-111, C-5A. In general Purpose Forces, divisions, warships and tactical air squadrons, except fighter-interceptors, increased substantially. Manpower increased by over one million men, due largely to Vietnam. Special Forces were expanded.

Budgets: Trend up, with pre-Vietnam (1962-64) mean average \$50.7 billion in constant FY 1964 dollars. Significant planning innovation: initiation of the Planning-Programming-Budgeting System (PPBS).

Foreign and Military Assistance: Trend toward roughly stable and large economic aid with military assistance down significantly. With general aid levels going down, there was shift from military to economic aid.

Manpower: Heavy reliance on use of the draft for conflict, rather than available Reserve forces. When Reserves were called up, it was largely for crisis-management requirements.

B. THE CHANGING ENVIRONMENT—PRELUDE TO THE 1970'S

When the Nixon Administration assumed office in January 1969, it was clear that our complex national security problems demanded a basic rethinking of the existing policies in the light of changing world and domestic conditions. It was clear that new directions were needed. In my Defense Report to the Congress last February, I discussed the problems we found and the initial steps we instituted to cope with them.

At least seven factors, taken together, indicate that the economic, political, military, and manpower realities existing now are significantly different from the situation just five years ago. These factors are:

A growing Soviet military capability and technological momentum.

An expanding Soviet influence around the world, as evidenced by worldwide deployment of its growing naval forces.

An emerging Chinese Communist nuclear threat.

The reordering of national priorities, with a reduced percentage of Gross National Product for defense spending.

Sharply rising U.S. personnel costs and a start toward Zero-Draft and an All-Volunteer military force.

A changing world economic environment because of vigorous growth, particularly among Free World nations.

An increasing awareness among NATO members of the need for burden sharing and

among many of our Asian friends of the need for regional support.

Confronted with this changing environment, we concluded after careful analysis in the National Security Council that we must, whatever else, assure the following criteria in national security planning for the decade of the 1970's:

1. Preservation by the United States of a sufficient strategic nuclear capability as the cornerstone of the Free World's nuclear deterrent.

2. Development and/or continued maintenance of Free World forces that are effective, and minimize the likelihood of requiring the employment of strategic nuclear forces should deterrence fail.

3. An International Security Assistance Program that will enhance effective self-defense capabilities throughout the Free World, and, when coupled with diplomatic and other actions, will encourage regional security agreements among our friends and allies.

C. TRANSITION TO A NEW NATIONAL SECURITY STRATEGY

In my Defense Report last year, I characterized 1969 as largely a transition year in which we reviewed strategy, current capabilities, and possible major future programs. But I also stated that 1969 was a year of decision and that as a result of the review and decisions in 1969, the President had established the main directions of our foreign policy and national security strategy for the 1970's.

The changing international security environment was recognized and discussed by President Nixon in his first Foreign Policy Report to Congress in February 1970. The President's 1971 Foreign Policy Report amplifies these changes, and discusses some of the other major initiatives taken by this Administration; including the Middle East and Indochina peace initiatives, and a revised policy for Chemical Warfare and Biological Research.

The two major initiatives undertaken in 1969 which have a strong impact on our future defense planning were, of course, the Nixon Doctrine and the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks (SALT). The first emphasized our determination to instill a new basis for cooperation between us and our allies which takes into account their growing capabilities. The other demonstrated our commitment to serious and meaningful negotiations as the preferred path toward peace.

SALT is a crucial effort by the United States, in the field of negotiations, to seek agreement with the Soviet Union on strategic arms limitation. SALT represents an attempt (a) to reduce the likelihood of strategic nuclear war between the U.S. and the Soviet Union; and (b) to preserve U.S. strategic sufficiency through negotiations, rather than through competition in an arms race. SALT represents, among other things, an effort to avoid major increases in strategic force expenditures which will be necessary in the absence of an early successful agreement.

The application of the Nixon Doctrine can provide Free World strength and security as a realistic way to support peace initiatives through meaningful negotiations.

The institution of the Vietnamization program occurred almost simultaneously with the first public articulation of the Nixon Doctrine by the President in 1969 at Guam. Vietnamization, the first significant application of the Nixon Doctrine, was accorded top priority in our first two years of responsibility for national security affairs.

Both 1969 and 1970 were years of transition, during which new directions were set and major elements of our new strategy were structured.

We chose in 1970 to break the cycle of submitting a five-year defense plan to Congress in order to permit time for a safe and

orderly transition from the national security policies of the past decade to those more appropriate for the decade of the 1970's and beyond.

The FY 1971 transitional program and budget was designed essentially to preserve the basic capabilities the Nixon Administration inherited as final decisions were being made on the major elements of our new national security strategy.

Although both FY 1970 and 1971 were transitional with respect to program and budget levels, the FY 1971 plan contained many of the key elements of the President's Strategy for Peace. Among the elements distinguishing the FY 1971 plan from the previous strategy were:

A concept of strategic sufficiency which is based on specific criteria for the design of our strategic capabilities;

A strong conventional capability buttressed by increased burden sharing and improved defense capabilities of other Free World nations;

Adequate peacetime general purpose forces for simultaneously meeting a major Communist attack in either Europe or Asia, assisting allies against non-Chinese threats in Asia, and contending with a contingency elsewhere;

Smaller U.S. active forces, with great emphasis to be given to their readiness and effectiveness, including modernization;

A re-emphasis on maintaining and using our technological superiority;

Increased international security assistance for the defense needs and roles of other Free World nations; and

A new approach to U.S. military manpower, based on a goal of Zero Draft and an All-Volunteer active force, with increased reliance on National Guard and Reserve forces.

What has emerged from the review and decisions of the 1969-70 transition years is a new approach to national security planning concepts and a reformulation of older concepts. The new strategy is one of "Realistic Deterrence."

D. A STRATEGY OF REALISTIC DETERRENCE

As Secretary of Defense, my primary responsibility is to address those aspects of the President's Foreign Policy which bear directly on the defense programs and defense strategy of this nation.

Figure 3 in the Appendix schematically illustrates the essential components of the President's Foreign Policy and the interrelated nature of the three pillars of peace—strength, partnership and negotiation.

It demonstrates in their broadest aspects the close relationship between the President's policy objectives on the one hand, and the close correlation of foreign policy activities guided by the State Department and those aspects of national security strategy which are the primary responsibility of the Department of Defense.

The President's foreign policy objectives concentrate on long-term objectives and long-term policies. He noted in describing the Nixon Doctrine that it is neither practical, nor the most effective way to build a lasting structure of peace to rely solely upon the material and manpower resources of the United States to provide this capability. We have said, and I would repeat, that we do not intend to be the policeman of the world. Many of our allies are already prosperous; others are rapidly becoming so. Therefore, it is realistic and more effective that the burden of protecting peace and freedom should be shared more fully by our allies and friends.

We seek a structure of peace, in which free nations support each other against common threats according to their proportionate strengths and resources, while each bears the major responsibility for its own defense. The security of all is enhanced if each na-

tion increasingly is able to rely upon itself for its own defense, particularly its own defense manpower.

The Nixon Doctrine, by fostering and encouraging the capabilities of our allies, will enhance world stability. It is designed to foster development of a more effective deterrent—and through it a more stable world—thereby increasing the prospects for meaningful negotiation from a posture of strength around the world.

This approach in defense planning to national and international security—through the pillars of strength and partnership, each nation in a significant role and bearing its appropriate portion of the burden, each committed to working for peace from a strong internal security base—is a strategy of Realistic Deterrence. It forms the foundation for the third pillar—meaningful negotiation.

Turning to the defense posture and force aspects of this strategy for which I as Secretary of Defense am primarily responsible, I would point out that whatever the outcome of SALT, our strategic forces will remain the cornerstone of the Free World's deterrent against nuclear attack and must always be sufficient for this crucial role. While assuring an adequate deterrent at the strategic and tactical nuclear level, we and our allies also need to maintain strong conventional capabilities. Hence, for those levels in the deterrent spectrum below general nuclear war, the forces to deter Soviet and Chinese adventures clearly must have an adequate war-fighting capability, both in limited nuclear and conventional options. This has been reaffirmed during the past two years by a comprehensive reexamination, together with our allies, of our national and our multilateral deterrent capabilities, most especially NATO's historic review of Alliance Defense for the 70's (AD-70).

As we move toward the President's goal of peace in the decade of the 1970's, the deterrent to localized conflict apart from large-scale Soviet or Chinese attack, increasingly will to defend themselves. Local security themselves have a capability and national will to defend themselves. Local security would be further enhanced by regional defense arrangements which provide and take advantage of shared capabilities.

1. Regional Variations

Obviously, no single strategy can be applied in the same exact terms to situations which are sharply different. Therefore, we must fashion the elements of our strategy of Realistic Deterrence to match the various conditions we find in different regions. Let me cite several factors briefly, which I will discuss in later sections of this report:

In NATO/Europe, U.S. national security strategy for the 1970's must include the objective of maintaining a strong NATO deterrent in Western Europe, including its northern and southern flanks, against a wide range of possible Soviet and Pact initiatives, short of strategic nuclear exchanges. Such initiatives could span a continuum, from border incursions and military backed political threats to a full-scale conventional or tactical nuclear attack, including conflict at sea.

In Asia, our continuing nuclear superiority vis-a-vis the Chinese can contribute significantly to deterrence of Chinese nuclear attacks, or conventional attacks on our Asian allies, and would be strengthened further with an area ballistic missile defense effective against small attacks. However, there is a need for our Asian friends and allies to strengthen their conventional forces, both to defend themselves against non-Chinese attacks and, in regional conjunction, to build a defensive capability which would give Communist China increased pause before initiating hostilities. At the same time, we will maintain adequate forces to meet our commitments in Asia.

It is not realistic or efficient to expect

each country to develop an independent self-defense capability against all levels of non-Chinese and non-Soviet attack. The drain on allied manpower and on their economies would inhibit the achievement of economic growth, and therefore, the political stability which is essential to military security. At the same time, deep historical, social and political inhibitions to immediate and effective regional mutual security arrangements in some areas must be recognized. Thus, a careful balance must be achieved between independent capabilities and collective arrangements. One of the most important means available to the U.S. to stimulate and to help aid in the development of these capabilities and arrangements is the provision of appropriate security assistance to our allies.

In summary, as shown on Figure 4, the Strategy of Realistic Deterrence, emphasizing Free World strength and partnership, offers the most feasible approach toward our goal of achieving basic national and international security objectives. This strategy involves a shift in the direction U.S. foreign and security policy has taken over the past ten years. Successful application of the President's Strategy for Peace requires a coordinated application of all foreign policy resources—military power, diplomacy, military and economic assistance, and foreign trade—and most importantly, the understanding and strong support of Congress and the American people.

As the President said in his Foreign Policy Report last month:

"Gone for Americans is a foreign policy with the psychological simplicity of worrying primarily about what we want for others. In its place is a role that demands a new type of sustained effort with others."

INTRODUCTION OF THE SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY ACT OF 1971

HON. HAROLD RUNNELS

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 10, 1971

Mr. RUNNELS. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a bill to create a long needed Department of Science and Technology. The concept of such a department and efforts to establish it date back to 1884—87 years ago—when Congressman Theodore Lyman, who in addition to being a Member of the House of Representatives, was also a scientist of great renown and a member of the National Academy of Sciences. Since that time several attempts have been made to establish such a department. Among these were Clare Booth Luce—79th Congress, H.R. 5332; Congressman Brook of Louisiana in 1959, H.R. 8325; and Congressman TEAGUE of Texas in 1963, H.R. 4346. All previous efforts by our House colleagues failed to produce the necessary legislation to create a Department of Science and Technology. This has proved to be most unfortunate for the Nation as we now face a crisis in science and technology that could produce catastrophic effects on our future national and international economic status and our competitiveness in the world marketplaces. While we have failed to listen to the wisdom of our predecessors and contemporaries in the House on this matter in the past, I hope we have learned through the history of the past 87 years, and our experience in the past 25 years in particular—to now rationally reevaluate and

create the needed Department of Science and Technology.

In the operation of the Federal Government today we find the execution of science and technology programs spread throughout virtually every department, commission, and agency. Each of these governmental entities presents to the Congress annually their requirements for research, development, test and evaluation programs. Congress has in the past assumed that the practice of interdepartmental - interagencies - intercommission coordination for the planning, execution, completion, and final utilization of the new knowledge, products, and services of these programs were being systematically, conscientiously, and expertly accomplished. After 25 years and hundreds of billions of dollars, we find that this has not and still is not being done. The spread of authority and responsibility for the execution of the programs required to meet the operational needs of Government in science and technology has resulted in an uncoordinated, uncontrolled, and unresponsive national science plan.

We, in essence, do not have now, nor have we ever had, a national science policy backed by a national science plan properly prioritized to put "good order and sound judgment" into this most vital area of Government activity. This very fact is today appalling when we realize that we are a technologically based society and that the failures of our past management of science and technology in Government now threatens our national and international position and well-being.

Yet, the solution to all of these ills, that have been developing for 87 years, has been placed before us time and time again by our predecessors and contemporaries in this House of Representatives, as well as in the U.S. Senate. The solution—consolidate the authority and responsibility for the execution of the research, development, test and evaluation of the national science and technology programs as presented by all departments, agencies, and commissions to meet future operational needs and as evaluated, prioritized, approved and funded by the Congress in consort with the Secretary of Science and Technology and the President of the United States.

Almost a century of history has proven conclusively that no head of department, agency, commission, or administration can argue any longer, that science and technology is so integral a part of his function that it is impossible to separate it without seriously impairing the operation of that entity. Overlap of function, redundancy of effort, lack of coordination and cooperation in the execution of government, science, and technology programs have produced wasted resources of facilities and personnel, as well as valuable time in critical areas of endeavor.

We still find Government agencies competing for the Federal science and technology dollar instead of cooperatively exploiting the available resources to pursue solutions to the pressing problems of environment, transportation,

health delivery systems, housing, adequate defense posture, and food shortage. We will continue to suffer this loss of our resources in science and technology until we, the Congress, create a Department of Science and Technology, cause to be formulated a national science policy and plan, and systematically establish procedures for review and evaluation of these programs.

We must be capable of the assessment of new technology, both for the good it brings to mankind and the possible ill it may reap by its side effects. We must place the American people in a position so as to control their own destinies and not be made subservient to uncontrolled and randomly evolving technological systems. We can only accomplish this if we centralize the science and technology function and oversee its execution and control. Only from a central point can we get the overview that is now so vital to the future. In short, we must have a Department of Science and Technology.

During the past 25 years our accomplishments in science and technology have surpassed the fondest dreams of the early men of science. Magnificent as these accomplishments have been, we have still failed in many respects. The plague of famine and disease still takes a phenomenal toll on mankind every year of our existence. Even in this land of plenty many of our children suffer the pangs of hunger, inadequate shelter and clothing, and lost horizons of future human accomplishment because education will always be beyond their reach.

C. P. Snow, in his 1959 Rede lecture at Cambridge summed it up nicely when he said, "the majority of present day mankind are underfed and die before their time. That, in short, is the grim state of our society today." A decade later we still find the state of mankind essentially unchanged. But—we have added new threats to mankind's existence. The threat of nuclear war—even after 25 years and a trillion dollars for defense—still keeps mankind on the eternal "eve of destruction." Uncontrolled technology has polluted our air and water, our fish and wildlife, our agricultural animals. In short, we have lost our way—yet we have before us now a means to change our course of action, control our destiny, and put science and technology under centralized constructive control and direct it to solve the pressing problems that must be solved if we as a nation are to survive as well as all mankind.

We have been systematically disbanding and dismantling our scientific and engineering personnel and facilities for the past 2 years. As we shift our bulk priorities from space, defense, and atomic energy into domestic needs for science and technology, we failed to provide the organization vehicle in government to dynamically reprogram these valuable national resources of scientists, engineers, and facilities. The transition is producing chaos by virtue of massive unemployment in the scientific and engineering community, as well as the American industry where a sharp decline in the creation of new products, markets, and

services is being experienced. Also, corporate profits are declining and our balance of import-export is shrinking as the future availability of technologically intensive products for export, which has traditionally held the export level above the import, is now endangered.

A scientific and engineering work force and accompanying facilities which required billions of tax dollars to develop has already begun to dissipate. Our national enrollment in science and engineering in our universities is on a sharp decline. In short, we now stand to lose at least a decade of scientists and engineers and our current policy carried far enough could cost us a full generation of scientists and engineers.

It is ironic indeed that at the very moment in history when we need our technology to solve our social problems, revitalize our economy, and maintain our world position, we appear to be wantonly disbanding it. I refuse to believe that we have failed to learn one of the most important lessons from history, mainly, that a proven parallel has always existed between the rise of technology and democratic forms of government in the same time and the same place.

In conclusion, I would urge that each of us seriously consider the gravity of our current national situation in science and technology, how it is affecting us now and how it will affect us in the future. Men of wisdom having pointed the way past this present turbulent era as far back as 1884. We thus far have not heeded. We must reexamine our position on science and technology and we must take positive action now to establish the long needed Department of Science and Technology in the Federal Government. It is our only way to assure a reasonable transition through these troubled times, but also to assure the maximum in benefits to all our people in the future.

THE ADMINISTRATION'S HEALTH PROPOSALS

HON. JACK F. KEMP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 10, 1971

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, one of the most significant concepts in the administration's health proposals is a fairer distribution of the Nation's health personnel and health services. For a long time, we have been told inadequate health resources are characteristic, mainly, of our less affluent States and in the poorer regions of those States.

I submit there is no greater deprivation of health services and resources than exists in the poorer areas—the ghetto areas, if you will—of our large metropolitan centers. Crowded by millions of people, whose great common denominator is poverty, are vast numbers who have never seen a doctor and who exist from birth to death without any health care whatever. And, this is in the wealthiest Nation of the world.

The President's proposals offer promise of a remedy to this situation. The 92d Congress can make this promise a reality.

AMERICAN NATIONAL CATTLEMEN'S ASSOCIATION ALARMED OVER PRESIDENT'S REORGANIZATION PROPOSAL

HON. JOE SKUBITZ

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 10, 1971

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, the American National Cattlemen's Association adopted a resolution at their 74th annual convention objecting to the President's proposal to absorb the Department of Agriculture into a conglomerate departmental organization with no identity to its past history or its future purposes. I request the inclusion of a letter from C. W. McMillan, of the American National Cattlemen's Association together with the resolution adopted at the convention be printed in the RECORD.

The material follows:

AMERICAN NATIONAL
CATTLEMEN'S ASSOCIATION,
Denver, Colo., March 3, 1971.

HON. JOE SKUBITZ,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SKUBITZ: The President's State of the Union message on January 22, 1971, carried an alarming proposal which would split up the Department of Agriculture to be absorbed by at least three other departments that would evolve in the reorganization.

The message was delivered just prior to the 74th Annual Convention of the American National Cattlemen's Association. It received major consideration by our members in addition to being a topic of conversation throughout the meeting.

Enclosed is a copy of the resolution adopted at our convention urging the maintenance of full Cabinet status for the U.S. Department of Agriculture. We respectfully request your support of our position. Thank you.

Cordially,

C. W. McMILLAN.

RESOLUTION No. 1—(1971)

Whereas, agriculture has been and continues to be the foremost contributor to the economic well-being of the people of this nation; and

Whereas, American agriculture is the envy of the world because it has enabled the United States to meet the basic human needs of the American people by providing them with an abundant supply of food and fiber; and

Whereas, although executive reorganization to economize and to eliminate any duplication of effort by agencies of the federal government is highly desirable, the recommendation of the President to the Congress on January 22, 1971, failed to recognize agriculture's prominent role in preserving our natural resources and providing our communities with a diversified economic base, thus making major contributions to the strength and welfare of the American people; and

Whereas, although other nations give prime recognition to the importance of their agriculture, the President's recommendation to Congress de-emphasizes the importance of American agriculture even though ours is the world's most successful agricultural endeavor and contributes significantly to the

basic needs of the people throughout the world;

Now, therefore be it resolved, that the American National Cattlemen's Association, assembled at its 74th Annual Convention in Las Vegas, Nevada, this 28th day of January, 1971, strongly urges the Congress to continue to recognize agriculture's outstanding contributions to mankind by maintaining full Cabinet status of the United States Department of Agriculture; and

Be it further resolved, that a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States and to all members of Congress.

AUTOMATIC SPRINKLER SYSTEMS

HON. RICHARD G. SHOUP

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 10, 1971

Mr. SHOUP. Mr. Speaker, I am enclosing a copy of a joint resolution introduced in the senate and house of representatives in Montana. I thought that it would be of interest to my colleagues:

JOINT RESOLUTION

A Joint Resolution of the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Montana to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and to the Commissioner of Social Security Asking That the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare Forestall Enforcement of Regulations Promulgated by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare Requiring Automatic Sprinkling Systems in Certain Hospitals and Extended Care Facilities for a Period of 2 Years From January 31, 1971, and Further Urge the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare To Review, Reconsider, and Revise Said Regulations To Permit the Use of Alternative Fire Protection Devices

Whereas, the department of health, education and welfare has adopted regulations (Social Security Administration, 20 CFR Part 405) which provide that in order for extended care facilities and hospitals not accredited by the joint commission on accreditation of hospitals or the American osteopathic association to qualify for participation under the medicare program the standards in the national fire protection association life safety code shall be complied with; and

Whereas, it appears that the blanket adoption of the life safety code has not been properly evaluated with the application thereof to individual institutions in terms of optimum efficiency, cost and implementation; and

Whereas, it further appears that the regulations make mandatory the purchase and installation within affected institutions of automatic sprinkling systems before January 31, 1971, and that twenty-nine (29) Montana hospitals and thirteen (13) extended care facilities have been determined by the department of health, education and welfare, or may be determined, to be in violation of the automatic sprinkling system requirement as of January 31, 1971, and thereby no longer eligible for participation in the medicare program administered by the department of health, education and welfare; and

Whereas, there is definitive and authoritative opinion that automatic sprinkling systems do not provide maximum automatic fire protection and that there should be allowance for alternative arrangements that will secure as nearly equivalent safety to life from fire as may be practical; and

Whereas, there is further definitive and authoritative opinion that smoke detection systems provide alternative fire protection satisfactory to the guarantee of life from fire which are practical.

Now, therefore, be it resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Montana; That the legislative assembly of the state of Montana respectfully requests the secretary of health, education and welfare to forestall enforcement of said regulations of the department of health, education and welfare for a period of two (2) years, and further requests the secretary of health, education and welfare to review, reconsider and revise said regulations to permit the use of alternative fire protection devices that will provide equivalent safety to life from fire as may be practical.

Be it further resolved, that the secretary of state is instructed to send copies of this joint resolution to the secretary of health, education and welfare, to the commissioner of social security and to each member of the Montana congressional delegation.

NEED FOR IMMIGRATION REFORM

HON. HERMAN BADILLO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 10, 1971

Mr. BADILLO. Mr. Speaker, earlier this year our distinguished colleague from New York (Mr. RYAN), introduced legislation aimed at assisting Cuban refugees desiring to emigrate to the United States and at correcting gross inequities in the current immigration law regarding the treatment of Western Hemisphere aliens.

Although the 1965 Immigration Act corrected many of the inequities in our heretofore archaic and discriminatory immigration laws, the present law still contains loopholes and shortcomings which must be corrected without further delay. Congressman RYAN has been one of the primary leaders in this fight for immigration reform. He is to be commended for his dedication to this cause and I am very pleased to join in co-sponsoring and fully supporting his legislation.

Last month an editorial appeared in El Diario-La Prensa, highlighting the need for removing these discriminatory aspects of our immigration law and praising the efforts being made by Congressman RYAN. Because of the importance of this legislation to our country's Spanish-speaking citizens, particularly those with relatives and friends overseas, I am pleased to include this editorial in the RECORD:

CORRECTING IMMIGRATION INEQUITIES

Two bills deserving the backing of all the Spanish-speaking community have been reintroduced by Congressman William F. Ryan. One of them would grant parole status to Cuban refugees who have reached third countries on their journey to the United States. The other would allow Western Hemisphere aliens who had entered the United States with non-immigrant visas, to adjust their status to permanent resident without leaving the country.

Congress closed its ears last year on these two bills which mean so much to so many members of the Spanish speaking community in the U.S.

March 11, 1971

The proposed legislation on the Cuban refugees—HR 163—is co-sponsored by Congressman Herman Badillo, who is thus making good his promise of backing all proposals for the good of the Puerto Ricans and other Spanish speaking persons.

Because the airlift is limited to immediate relatives of U.S. citizens, and because there are thousands on the waiting list, many Cubans who are unable to find space on the airlift to Miami leave Cuba for Spain or Mexico.

The State Department reports that there are now some 8,000 Cubans in Spain and 3,000 in Mexico waiting for visas. All of them must take their places on the waiting list for Western Hemisphere immigrants, waiting a year or more for visas for which they must first establish priority dates.

Since the immigration laws of most countries forbid aliens with transit visas to work, relatives and friends in the U.S. must frequently take second and even third jobs in order to support their families here and other members of the family outside the U.S.

Referring to this bill, Congressman Ryan said: "With growing support from the public, I feel Congress should respond. I urge everyone supporting the bill to write his own congressman expressing his interest."

"The bill has been referred to the Subcommittee on Immigration and Nationality of the House Judiciary Committee, of which Congressman Peter Rodino (D-N.J.) is expected to be Chairman. The Chairman will be responsible for scheduling hearings on this bill, so I urge anyone interested in testifying at those hearings to write to Congressman Peter Rodino, Chairman, Subcommittee on Immigration and Nationality, House Judiciary Committee, 2137 Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20515."

We join Congressman Ryan in asking readers to support this legislation. The Cuban tragedy is already of enormous proportions, and the United States, following its traditional policy of granting asylum to the victims of political persecution, should open its doors to all those Cubans stranded abroad.

The other bill introduced by Congressman Ryan—HR 1646—would correct a serious inequity of the 1965 Immigration Act Amendment. Such Act openly discriminates against the Latin Americans. In fact, *El Diario-La Prensa* fought against it since its inception and we are glad that we now have a champion in Congressman Ryan.

Citizens from the Eastern Hemisphere and from India, Africa and practically all non-communist countries, can remain in the U.S. while changing their status to permanent resident from student, visitor, businessman, tourist, etc.

This legislation has also been referred to the Immigration and Nationality Subcommittee. Those interested in action on the bill should get in touch, both with their own Congressman and with Congressman Peter Rodino.

VETO OF FIREFIGHTER RETIREMENT BILL WAS ILL-ADVISED, BUT MISTAKE CAN BE RECTIFIED BY 92D CONGRESS

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 10, 1971

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, when President Nixon vetoed legislation to permit "hazardous duty" retirement for Federal firefighters, many Members of

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Congress were aware that a mistake had been made.

No one denies that the Federal firefighter is subjected to substantial risks, risks that should be borne by a young, vigorous corps of men. The most efficient way to obtain that vigorous firefighting force is to permit older firemen to retire at an earlier time than normal.

Since it is my firm belief that this is urgently needed legislation, I introduced, on the first legislative day of the 92d Congress, H.R. 227, a bill identical to the one I introduced in the last Congress. This bill must be passed if we are to assure a measure of equity to our firefighters who, at the risk of their limbs and even their lives, protect Federal installations and communities from conflagration.

A striking example of the frustration engendered by the President's veto of this bill is the letter sent to the President by one firefighter. Mr. LeRoy Ellis, fire chief at the Great Lakes Naval Station, has written eloquently of the need for an early retirement bill for Federal firefighters. I include the text of Mr. Ellis' letter at this point:

FEBRUARY 13, 1971.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: It is with grave concern that I have studied your veto message of Bill S-578, dated 4 January 1971. It is a most frightening thought that the awesome power of a Presidential veto could be used so indiscriminately. It is apparent that little, if any, evaluation of facts were made by you or your advisers as to the content contained in your veto message.

It is also obvious that you and your advisers have taken the advice of the "archaic thinking" and the misleading facts presented to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service hearings by Mr. Robert E. Hampton, Chairman of the U.S. Civil Service Commission and duplicated by Roger T. Kelley, Assistant Secretary of Defense. Your veto message can be found in their testimony on pages 2, 3, 4, and 37-56 of the record of hearings, Serial No. 91-29. It is also noteworthy that the testimony was found to be conflicting and unrealistic, notwithstanding the various committees, the House of Representatives and the U.S. Senate, passed the bill only to be vetoed by you because of misleading facts and opinions as shown below.

With specific regards to items mentioned in your veto message, I submit that your statement "Federal Fire Fighters already receive compensation for the hazards of their work in the form of higher levels of pay and higher retirement benefits", is absolutely untrue. The GS-4 fire fighter is classified as a GS-4 in the general schedule in the same manner as clerks, messengers, telephone operators, guards and other menial positions. The 25% premium pay is in accordance with Section 401(1) of 5 U.S.C. 901, which pertains to all overtime, night differential and holidays. In order to be eligible for the maximum 25%, a fire fighter is required to work 32 hours overtime per week or 64 hours overtime per pay period. In addition to this, he must work at least 41 Sundays per year. The premium pay law is actually a legal method of the Civil Service Commission to circumvent the time-and-a-half overtime pay for other employees. The total salary (base pay and premium pay) for a GS-4 Fire Fighter in the first step is \$7,752 per year for 3, 144 duty hours, while other Government employees work only 2080 hours per year. The hourly wage equates to \$2.44 per hour for the GS-4 fire fighter, while the

GS-4 female clerk receives \$2.89 per hour. It may also be appropriate to mention here that a janitress at Great Lakes receives \$2.69 per hour, or \$.25 more per hour than a GS-4 fire fighter. As you can see, the statement that, "Federal Fire Fighters are being paid hazardous duty pay", is completely false. In fact, the Federal Fire Fighter is being penalized for working an extra 32 hours each week.

Mr. Hampton's statement that, "Controlled environment and Federal Fire Fighters do not face the same degree of hazards as employees of Municipal Fire Departments", is even more absurd than the one mentioned above. To extinguish fires in sub-standard housing, barracks, recreation buildings, drill halls, schools, shop areas, ship manufacturing areas and hospitals, of which many are of World War II vintage and are constructed of highly combustible materials, without fire stops, inadequate exits, open stairwells, etc., requires the most efficient fire fighter that can be obtained, as the hazards of these fires are the same as those that arise in Municipal Areas.

Statistics from the State of Illinois clearly show that the Federal Fire Departments have nearly three times as many fire fighters being retired with disability as the average Municipal Department Fire Fighters. This is partially due to the respiratory and heart conditions that develop in the 45-60 year old Federal Fire Fighters.

It should be obvious that a man over 50 years of age is more prone to these conditions than younger men. The need for this bill is the first step in recruiting and retaining young men in the Federal Fire Fighter Service. Simple economics dictate that it would pay for itself in reduced B.E.C. claims and disability retirements. There is a 38% turnover of GS-3 and GS-4 fire fighters at Great Lakes, because of higher pay, less hours, and better retirement benefits in municipal fire departments. It is inexcusable to waste the taxpayer's money throughout the Federal Fire Service because of these inequities.

It is a fact that if young men could be attracted to the Federal Fire Service at 20, 21, and 22 years of age, could see a normal promotional pattern and be eligible to retire after 28, 29 or 30 years of service, it would considerably reduce the overall cost of fire protection to the Federal Government.

The concession in your message that, "Fire fighting is a hazardous occupation", coupled with the fact that the Federal Fire Fighters working 72 hours per week, will in fact, at the end of 30 years service worked 54 years as compared to the 30 years worked by other Federal employees, is in itself justification for this Bill. It is my contention, therefore that if there is an "inequitable practice of providing preferential treatment through retirement", it is the Federal Fire Fighter that is being discriminated against.

The "compelling reasons for divergence", that you mentioned in your message are many. In addition to those above, I believe the most compelling is to direct an unbiased committee, composed of personnel, both in and out of the Government, to review the entire plight of the Federal Fire Service to include personnel, wages, hours of work, classification, retirement, fire equipment (which is not comparable to Municipal Departments) and all other facets.

In the interim period, bills have again been introduced to include the Federal Fire Fighters in the hazardous duty retirement. It will be greatly appreciated if you will seek an early call-up and passage of Bill H.R. 227 recently introduced. It would restore the faith of thousands of fire fighters, their families, friends and colleagues throughout the U.S. and would prove that a mistake in our democratic way of life can be rectified.

Respectfully yours,

LEROY H. ELLIS,

INVASIONS AND INVASIONS

HON. JOHN G. SCHMITZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 10, 1971

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, there was a time when United States and allied forces taking the offensive and carrying the war to the enemy was a welcome occasion. The invasion of Normandy was one such example.

What follows are editorials from the New York Times concerning the allied invasion of Normandy in 1944. Compare these articles from the period when the New York Times was still a first-class paper to their editorials of today. In 1944, the first reports from the battlefront sound like an answer to the prayer that accompanied our troops. Smashed by allied bombers and by the guns of the united nations navies—sections of the vaunted German "Atlantic Wall" have crumbled, and our troops are established on beachheads. Today we "widen the war."

The editorials follow:

[June 6, 1944]

INVASION

At last the supreme moment has come. The months and years of waiting are over. Troops of the United States, the British Isles, the Dominions, contingents from occupied but unconquered countries in Europe are at this moment setting foot on the continental soil. The men who left Dunkerque nearly four years ago are returning. They left as a handful of shattered divisions, armed only with the splendor of an undying courage. They return as part of a great force supplied with every known means of beating down the enemy's resistance.

They are commanded by generals of proven worth, in whom there is universal confidence throughout the United Nations. The preparations have been thorough. Nazi resistance has been weakened by air attacks of unprecedented destructiveness. In equipment, in training, in courage and resolution these men are doubtless the equals of any soldiers who ever marched.

They are meeting and will meet terrible obstacles. The Nazis have had four years to prepare, and no doubt they are ready. They have had ample warning that the invasion was coming, though they did not know the time or the places. They will fight hard, for when they are beaten now they are beaten forever.

The next few hours and days will be critical in our history, and in all human history. We must wait in patience for news that may be slow in coming. We must be prepared for losses and for reverses at some points. The shape of the battle of Europe may be slow in emerging.

Today we can only pray, in our churches with other petitioners of the Almighty or alone and in our hearts.

We cannot pray that one we love be spared, if a stranger must fall in his place. But we can call upon the God of mercy and justice to strengthen each soldier in his hour of trial, to give victory with the least cost in life, in suffering and in sorrow; to grant each soldier faith in his cause and full knowledge that our love and our hope go with him.

We may pray, too, that we ourselves may be given the fortitude that these young men possess; that we may have strength to face the dreadful waiting; that we may have courage to bear the sorrow that must be the lot of so many.

We may humbly pray for untiring bodies and hearts to support all the soldiers of the United Nations who battle for victory and for the liberation of those who are in slavery.

Finally, we may pray for the knowledge and skill to create out of this slaughter a just and lasting peace.

These are our sons. God bless them.

[June 7, 1944]

LET US PRAY

The President's prayer last night was the nation's prayer. This nation was born in the only revolution in history made in the name of God. It was born of the conception that the rights of man are not conveyed to him by any accident of class or color, race or creed, are not conferred or withheld by any government, but are given him by God as the inalienable birthright of the human being. It is to defend this inherent right of the human being, the right of free will, against the most ambitious tyranny that ever shadowed the earth that we are today storming the beaches of Europe with the legions of all the people, conquered and marked for conquest, who would rather die fighting than live as slaves.

We have come to the hour for which we were born. We go forth to meet the supreme test of our arms and of our souls, the test of the maturity of our faith in ourselves and in mankind, and it is fitting that in this hour we at home, citizens of all confessions and no confessions, should follow the ways of our fathers and solemnly place the fate of our country, our cause and our sons, in the hands of God.

We pray for the boys we know and for millions of unknown boys who are equally a part of us. A year, two years ago, they were the grinning, careless youngsters we saw on the campuses and ball fields and streets of every American town. Now they are steeled and exalted into men; they are the heroes in the hardest and most crucial adventure in history. All too literally, their flesh and their spirit are our shield, the shield of the Republic. "Lead them straight and true, O Lord of Hosts; give strength to their arms, stoutness to their hearts, steadfastness to their faith."

We pray for our country, this country that is ourselves, as strong as we are strong, as great as we are determined to make and keep it great. In the eyes of our soldiers, looking back for one last look at home as they go forward into the unknown dangers before them, we see that "home" means to them all the world is fighting for. In this moment of pure light that burns away all trivial issues they see the war aims with perfect clearness, and so do we. Our prayer is to be worthy of their courage and their faith in us and the future and brave enough to keep on fighting for peace when they have won it for us.

The cause prays for itself, for it is the cause of the God who created men free and equal. Victory may be hard to win, but it is as certain as the eventual triumph of good over evil is always certain. In this searching hour we are humble as well as proud. We know that we are paying not only for the awful sins of those who willed war but for the sins of those who did not will peace hard enough to take responsibility to maintain it. We are paying also for our own sins. Let us pray for the grace to avoid committing them over again. On our knees let us seek the wisdom to turn the victory we will buy with a great price into a reign of justice.

THE INVASION

The first reports from the battlefront sound like an answer to the prayer that accompanied our troops. Smashed by allied bombers and by the guns of the United Nations navies, at least sections of the vaunted German "Atlantic Wall" have crumbled, and our

troops are established on beachheads along a front from Havre to Cherbourg, while Allied parachute and glider troops leaping beyond the "wall" are fighting in Caen, nine miles in the interior, and according to enemy reports even north of Rouen, forty-one miles from the coast.

Certainly in the first phases of the invasion Allied strategy has been brilliant. Instead of striking at the high cliffs opposite Dover, where the Germans expected the attack, and had therefore placed their heaviest fortifications, General Eisenhower struck at the low-lying sandy beaches of Normandy, using methods which had produced such excellent results in Sicily, at Salerno and at Anzio. And the location of the landings also indicates the further plan, which seems aimed at putting the whole Normandy peninsula into Allied hands as a base for a drive up the Seine Valley directly on to Paris. But the landings in Normandy are merely the first of a series which may now be expected to crash other beaches of France, both north and south, and possibly those of other countries as well.

Yet, though the enemy's "Atlantic Wall" has proved to be quite vulnerable in spots, the German Command has still mobile armies estimated at some fifty divisions in France, on which it has placed its main reliance to bring the Allied invasion to a halt. These armies will counter-attack and attempt to drive the Allies back into the sea. As General Eisenhower said, the landing is but the opening phase and great battles lie ahead. But the enemy armies can scarcely move until they are certain where the main blow is to come from, and they cannot be quite certain while other invasions are still pending. That is the advantage of the initiative, which is now firmly in Allied hands.

[June 8, 1944]

THE BATTLE IN NORMANDY

The eyes of the world remain riveted on the beaches of Normandy, where one of the decisive battles of history is now getting under way. Both sides agree that grim and bitter fighting is raging along a still intermittent and confused, but steadily expanding, front ranging for most of the 100-mile distance between the ports of Le Havre and Cherbourg, with the Caen-Bayeux area as the center of the struggle. It is still a fluctuating battle into which both sides are pouring reinforcements, and it is significant of the urgent needs of both sides that both of them are rushing troops to the critical scenes of action by air.

As was to be expected, the Germans, after recovering from the first stunning blow that breached their "Atlantic Wall," are putting out their usual claims of defensive successes, including claims of penetrations to some of the Allied landing beaches. But Allied Headquarters, while admitting that early yesterday developments were rather disappointing, announced later in the day that there was a decided improvement in the situation, that considerable progress had been attained, and that there was every reason for "sober satisfaction." That is all that can be expected at the present stage of the invasion.

But the mere fact that a battle is raging in Normandy has already dispelled at least two illusions held at one time by the rival sides. It has dispelled Hitler's illusion, exemplified by his boast after Dieppe that in the next invasion attempt the Allies "will be able to speak of good fortune if they are able to stay on firm land for a mere nine hours"—as at Dieppe. It has also dispelled the illusion widely spread in this country that, as a particularly clever trick, the Germans would "weave" us into France with only token resistance in order to drive a wedge between Russia and the western Allies and thereby gain a separate peace from one side or the other.

Hitler's illusion disappeared in the smoke

and thunder of the Allied assault which crashed through his "Atlantic Wall" with far less cost or difficulty than had been anticipated. Today the Allies stand on firm land in France, not for nine hours but for many times nine hours, and for as long as will be necessary to drive the Germans out of it. They have firmly established their beachheads; they have cleared them of the enemy; they have connected some of them; they have put most of them beyond enemy fire or interference. They control the sea lanes and supply routes. They control the skies. They have passed successfully and even brilliantly through the first critical stage of the invasion and are now driving into the interior. What is most important, they have repulsed the first determined enemy counter-attacks, and though the battle continues, their first successes are the promise of later ones to come.

For this is merely the first invasion of a series. The constant German reports about invasion fleets approaching various points along the French and Italian coasts are indicative of the problem confronting the enemy. As long as the Germans are uncertain where the next blows will fall they are unable to engage all their forces at any one point. And that should facilitate the Allies in attaining their first major objective, which is the capture of major ports as supply bases for the huge forces that are going into France. The Germans report that the Allies have already captured one port "suitable for large ships," but the development of the battle shows that the Allies are after Le Havre and Cherbourg. The fall of one or both of these ports will clinch their first victory.

The second illusion has faded before the reality of Teheran, of which the Germans are well aware. That reality is that Teheran cemented military uniting among all the Allies for the complete destruction of the German forces and likewise produced a concrete plan toward that end. It was a plan which called for a concentric attack on Hitler's fortress from east, west and south. The plan has now been put into effect. The attack from the west is now a fact. The attack from the south has been under way for some time and has passed beyond Rome. The attack from the east, expected at any time will complete the deadly vise in which Hitler will be crushed.

THE AIR-BORNE INFANTRY

A book might be written about a photograph published on the front page of this newspaper yesterday. The photograph showed the Supreme Commander of the Allied Expeditionary Forces talking to a paratrooper. Presumably this man, one of a group with blackened faces, their helmets grotesquely camouflaged, their shoulders bent under the loads they were about to carry on their journey into the enemy's country, was a private soldier. General Eisenhower's expression indicated unmistakably what his attitude toward this nameless trooper was. It was an attitude of friendliness, consideration and respect. That respect of the General for the private, which is of the very essence of democracy, must be shared today by every American.

One cannot pick special groups as heroes in this war. Those who do their full duty, on the beaches or on the machines and assembly lines at home, all have a share in this heroic adventure. Nevertheless one's heart beats faster at the thought of what the full duty of the paratroopers and the glider troops is, and with what fortitude and ardor the men of those services are now performing it. Air-borne operations may not require men without fear. They do require men who are not noticeably affected by fear. Even in practice their landings are dangerous, but in war their danger has only begun when they hit the ground. They find themselves immediately in a situation the old-fashioned soldier tried to avoid at any cost—they are surrounded by the enemy. Their only possible

safety is to hit with all their strength, with the great variety of light and heavy weapons they now carry, but above all with their naked valor.

At the best they are expendable. Their function is not to save themselves, but to ease the enemy pressure on their comrades—to block roads, destroy bridges, hold up troop movements. If they are finally captured, wounded or killed, they may still have succeeded in giving their Supreme Commander what he most needs—time. A four-star General dignifies himself when he salutes them. In the thoughts and prayers of all Americans they have a special place.

ON THE HOME FRONT

In a joint statement addressed to the American people Secretary of the Navy Forrestal and Under-Secretary of War Patterson emphasize the importance to the troops of our invasion armies of keeping the wheels of American industry turning at top speed. "Our behavior on the home front at this critical hour," their statement says, "will determine whether we can look those boys squarely in the eye when they come home again."

This warning is all the more timely because, on the very eve of the invasion, the already troublesome problem of manpower had begun to take a new and disturbing turn. This was the tendency of workers to drift away from war industries because they feared that "cut-backs"—not in the total volume of war production, but in specific types of weapons—would hit the particular industries in which they happened to be engaged and thereby throw them out of work. Fearing this result, they were beginning in large numbers to leave the war factories and seek "safe" work. Only three days before the invasion, Mr. McNutt, War Manpower Commissioner, spoke with concern of "the apparent attitude of some who think that it is time for employees in essential activity to seek a peacetime job." On the same day Mrs. Anna Rosenberg, regional WMC director in this city, declared that applicants for employment in war industries "are not interested unless we offer them job security." In a judgment based on recent experience she believes that "unjustified optimism and fear of cutbacks are turning people into less essential industries"—precisely at the moment when the war industries need them most.

It is evident that there is a problem here which is all the more insidiously dangerous because it threatened to grow worse if and as the news itself grows better. We have, in fact, a first clear warning of the very real risk that our industrial army will actually begin to melt away as the great test approaches. That has happened before, in the experience of volunteer armies. Shall we carelessly accept the risk that it will happen this time in our war industry? Or shall we protect ourselves against this risk by adopting a National War Service Act which makes certain that every man and woman who is needed for war work works and stays where he or she is needed? That would be one way of keeping faith with the young men who are fighting on the coasts of France. It would make it easier for us "to look those boys squarely in the eye when they come home again."

[June 9, 1944]

THE SECOND BATTLE PHASE

The battle in Normandy continues to grow in fury and extent, and the magnitude of the tasks still ahead begins to be seen in even clearer outlines than was possible before the great invasion. But it is also evident that the agonizing suspense and anxiety of the first few hours, when it was a question whether we could break through the German "Atlantic Wall" at all, is beginning to give way to a quiet confidence which no longer admits doubt in ultimate success.

General Eisenhower himself declares that his confidence in the ability of the Allies' forces has been justified. Even the Supreme Headquarters' communiqué, so reticent in making premature claims or tipping off the enemy, states flatly that the first phase of the assault, in which the Allies had to secure a foothold on the soil of France and defeat the local German reserves, has been successfully completed. It is still a narrow and disjointed foothold, but it stretches over considerable territory. And in that territory, the first French towns, ground under the Nazi heel for the last four years, are able to rejoice in their liberation.

Now begins the second and no less arduous phase, calling for the defeat of the enemy's tactical reserves. The battle with them is joined, and judging from the available reports the struggle is mainly for control of the Norman peninsula and the harbor of Cherbourg. Such a harbor is essential before the full force of the Allied armies can be deployed, for until they possess a real port the Allies must supply and reinforce their armies in France by air or by means of small landing craft able to reach the beaches. Both these methods are exposed to the vicissitudes of the treacherous Channel weather.

The Allies have captured the key communication center of Bayeux, cutting the direct Paris-Cherbourg railroad. They are now fanning out from it toward the southwest across the base of the Cherbourg peninsula. They are battling in the streets of Caen. They have landed troops on the eastern edge of the Cherbourg peninsula itself, twenty miles below the port, and enemy reports place another Allied force on the peninsula's western edge, only twenty miles away. They are hitting the onrushing German reinforcements and their communication lines from the air, and according to reports from both the enemy and from returning Allied fliers they have dropped parachute troops for the same purpose as far inland as the Falaise-Argentan regions and even Rouen, which is reported to be in flames.

But even if this battle has been won, the Allied armies must now face the full force of Field Marshal Rommel's strategic reserves, which are doubtless massing for counter-attack. These reserves contain some of the best and most battle-hardened divisions Germany possesses, and they will fight with desperation. Secretary Stimson has warned that the full weight of the German attacks is still to come, and Prime Minister Churchill summarized the whole situation when he said: "Great dangers lie behind us, enormous exertions lie before us."

However, if the tasks confronting the Allies are great, the demands made on the Germans by the present situation are also great. For the concentric attacks on Hitler's fortress planned at Teheran, are now getting under way. In Italy, the German armies have been routed and the Allies are advancing with steadily increasing speed. In the east, the Russian front is stirring into action and Berlin reports a powerful Russian offensive into Rumania which is merely the fore-runner of greater assaults to come. Even in France, the Germans will be scarcely able to throw all their available power against one point without denuding other points for further Allied landings.

Hitler, as well as the German Command know what the Allies forgot in the beginning, namely, that wars can be won only by offense and not by a mere defense. And the fact that the German armies have been thrown on the defensive by their own maxims, the symbol of their ultimate defeat.

[June 10, 1944]

THE GRAND OFFENSIVE

Our beachheads in France are widening, deepening, merging, strengthening. Despite bad weather which held our air fleets back,

we have cut the main highway and rail line leading into Cherbourg. The progress in these first few days is greater than most of us had dared to hope. With every day, with every hour that passes, the footholds that we retain become stronger and the reinforcements by sea and by air greater. But hours and minutes are still precious; at a score of points our footholds are still insecure, and the fate of the invasion still hangs in doubt.

We should remember all this when we look back upon the past. The present mighty invasion was made possible only by two overwhelming superiorities—mastery of the sea and mastery of the sky. The figures are awe-inspiring: a fleet of 4,000 vessels, ranging from landing craft to the heaviest battle-ships, by far the greatest armada ever assembled in history, supported by 11,000 airplanes. These ships and planes were able to sweep from the sea the few vessels that opposed them, and from the sky the few planes that ventured to attack them.

Our progress so far has been made possible, above all, by our mastery of the air. By it we were able to rain destruction upon rocket-gun emplacements and shore batteries months before a ship left the British ports. By it we were able to penetrate deep into Germany and destroy the factories and communications supplying the Atlantic defenses. By it we were able to whittle down the enemy's air force both in the sky and on the ground. By it we were able to keep hourly watch on the enemy's movements and preparations. All this was done in advance. At the moment of invasion itself we were able to blanket the sky, throw a protective umbrella over our ships, rake gun emplacements, disrupt communications, fight ground troops, and transport thousands of men by air itself, to vault over the "Atlantic Wall" and drop them behind it.

It is this achievement which gives so much ground for confidence now, even though tremendous tasks lie ahead. For the existence of any substantial Luftwaffe "reserves," so much feared before D-Day, now becomes extremely doubtful. The time of all times to use that reserve, if it existed, was on the first day, and certainly in the first few days of the invasion. No target is more profitable for an airplane than a ship. If it is hit the ship goes down and carries all its concentrated cargo of equipment and men with it. Once the ship reaches shore the cargo is never again so much concentrated, and even if hit, much of it can be saved. But the Luftwaffe today is spread thinner than ever; it is too small for the east; it is far overmatched in Italy; it is overmatched at the Atlantic Wall; and the strategic bombing of Munich yesterday is a reminder to the Nazis that even now they must keep a good deal locked up in the interior of Germany.

The Allies at last have the enormous advantage of the initiative. The Nazis at last are on the defensive on all fronts, forced to try to guess where we are going to attack next, forced to disperse their dwindling air force and their land power. But it does not follow that we could have taken the offensive just as well, say, two years ago. In the spring of 1942 critics of our military policy were pointing out, correctly, that "Defense will not win the war." But what was wrong with us two years ago was something far deeper than defective strategic concepts. We were not prepared. In any struggle the weaker side is almost necessarily forced on the defensive. The offensive is the prerogative of the stronger. In 1942 we did not even realize how enormous our preparations for an invasion would have to be. Today we know: they had to be greater than anything ever achieved before in history. And they were. That is why we can feel the confidence we do in the final outcome.

DO NOT ASK, JUST LISTEN

HON. MICHAEL J. HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 10, 1971

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, it has become apparent that the administration, its protestations notwithstanding, is further entangling us in Southeast Asia. The escalation of the Vietnam war through its extension into Cambodia and Laos was accomplished through political subterfuge cloaked in legal technicalities. Now a new and frightening tactic, first introduced during the invasion of Laos, has been added to the administration's repertoire of deception; the limitation, if not the prohibition of meaningful news coverage. This, Mr. Speaker, is not merely a problem for television or the newspapers but it presents a serious threat to all Americans. Denied accurate information, we are potential victims of the administration's propaganda. We have for too long lived amidst the illusions perpetrated by one administration or another. The perpetuation of those illusions as well as increasingly stringent news limitations are the subject of the following columns by James Reston. I hope my colleagues will take the opportunity to study them:

DON'T ASK, JUST LISTEN

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, February 11.—Even when you get the facts on what is happening in Indochina, it's not easy to reconcile the gains with the sacrifices, but we are now coming into a new phase of the war in Laos where it is going to be more difficult even to get at the facts.

In the first place, American correspondents, who have always been able to follow the battle with our own Army, Navy and Air Force in Vietnam and Cambodia, are now not permitted to fly with our aircraft in Laos.

They are allowed to fly with the South Vietnamese, but the Saigon forces have comparatively few aircraft, and this is a dangerous business, as the loss of four of our best battle photographers indicates this week.

Second, since no U.S. ground troops are engaged in the fighting, U.S. correspondents again must travel with the Saigon troops under the regulation of the South Vietnamese command, whose enthusiasm for reporting the truth is not unlimited.

This is not a newspaper or television but a public problem. The reporters will take their chances and do the best they can. Twenty-six of them have been killed in this bloody war since 1965, which indicates that your chances of surviving as a fighter are better than your chances of surviving as a reporter. Also, thirty reporters and photographers have simply disappeared in Cambodia since last April, so the reporters left will go where they can.

The problem is to find out what's going on. The Pentagon has shown us maps, which are clearer than the truth. The Ho Chi Minh Trail looks in the Pentagon map-room like the Jersey turnpike or an umbilical cord: cut it and the baby dies. If only it were true! The White House briefings reassure us that all will be well, that invading, bombing and expanding the war will bring the boys back home, reduce the casualties, and produce a generation of peace.

Maybe it is all so. The President, the Sec-

retary of State and Henry Kissinger, spending the weekend together at Key Biscayne, undoubtedly believe they are doing the right thing, but they cannot quite ignore the fact that many other equally serious men think they are doing the wrong thing, that they are still betting on a military resolution of the problem, still betting that Moscow and Peking will let Hanoi go down—in sum, betting on assumptions under challenge not only in Moscow and Peking but in Washington, even within the Republican party.

Faced with this conflict between what is right and what is wrong, at least it ought to be possible to agree on getting the facts, and here the Administration's record is a disgrace. The President is a very perceptive man. He knows he is in the White House today because Lyndon Johnson lost the confidence of the people and withdrew. Mr. Nixon came into office promising an "open" administration, and has been talking ever since about "open doors," but that is not the way things are going now in Indochina, or even in the White House.

The President has sent his air force into Laos, without a single personal word of explanation. His Communications Director, Herbert Klein, a genial honest man who lost his way and stumbled into political advertising, has the impertinence to circulate Joe Alsop's unspeakable suggestion that opponents of the Nixon war policy want to see the nation defeated in order to justify their opposition.

And on top of all this, they proclaim the virtue of their bombing in Laos, assume that Moscow and Peking will stand aside, assert that they are merely providing "air cover" for the South Vietnamese, and tell the reporters of their own country to go catch a ride with the South Vietnamese if they have any doubts.

We have to ask why? Why if they are bombing a path for the South Vietnamese in order to bring the boys back home sooner, why not let the reporters go along as before to record the facts as best they can?

It is very hard to answer these questions, particularly because in Laos the President and General Abrams actually seem to be doing no more than they say they are doing. The difference is not in their cant but in their cruelty. They are bombing almost at the level of the European war in a miserable, pacifist country, occupied by a cunning enemy. But rooting the enemy out of there is a ghastly business, and they don't want the facts recorded any more than they can help. No reporters allowed with us, they say. Go to the South Vietnamese, which is what the four battle photographers did before they flew over an enemy anti-aircraft battery and disappeared.

THE ENDURING ILLUSIONS

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, February 27.—Deep down underneath all the surface arguments about what we are doing in Indochina something in the American spirit keeps the nation from facing the facts in that tragic peninsula.

The truth is too unsettling to our romantic view of ourselves and our history. To set a date certain for withdrawing all the way would not, in my view, threaten our honor, or our security, or the strategic balance in the world—though this is clearly in dispute—but it would threaten our illusions, our slogans and our myths.

We are still clinging to the dreams of our youth. Everything must have a happy ending. We are bigger and better. Money talks. The machine is power and magic—an irresistible god, partner to the "Bitch Goddess Success." All this is in our fables and every minute in our advertising, and all this has been challenged in Vietnam.

Anybody who ever raised a child or planted

a garden knows that life does not support these assumptions, but they are dying hard. Woodrow Wilson said it took only half as long to train an American army, because you only had to teach it to go one way. G. K. Chesterton rejected Stephen Decatur's slogan "My Country, Right or Wrong" because he thought it was like saying "My Mother, Drunk or Sober," but Decatur's dogma still has a large following.

President Nixon is counting on it. He is not facing the facts of geography. He is not dispelling but perpetuating the nation's illusions, and he can undoubtedly do so for a while. But China will never be satisfied until it gets rid of a non-Communist military base close to its borders any more than the United States will ever be satisfied until it gets rid of a potential Communist base in Cuba.

In many ways, the Administration is now following in Indochina the techniques of American commerce. It has mounted a vast advertising campaign to persuade the American people that what it is doing is right, moderate and effective, and in fairness, the men at the top no doubt believe that they are right, and that advertising pays, particularly if you limit objective reporting of the results.

Also, as in commerce, the Administration is now fighting a "discount" war, minimizing the price and passing on part of the cost to the South Vietnamese and the mountain mercenaries. But in some ways it is going beyond these commercial techniques.

Even Henry Kissinger, who has kept out of the public propaganda campaign in the past, went on C.B.S. the other day and argued that even if the Administration was wrong in Indochina, it had to stick with its decision.

"All the tough decisions, the sort of decisions that come to the President," he said, "are very close, and you make your decision on the basis of maybe a 55-45 balance. . . . Once you've made the decision, you are committed to it or you are stuck with it 100 per cent. . . ."

But why? If the Soviet Union had stuck with its decision to put nuclear missiles into Cuba we could easily have had a nuclear war between the giants. And even Henry Ford, who is supposed to have "better ideas," scrapped the Edsel when he discovered it was a "lemon."

Still, even this attitude of Kissinger's is part of the American mythology. "Don't Give Up the Ship." . . . "Damn the Torpedoes: Full Speed Ahead." . . . "We're No 1." . . . "We Try Harder." Who wants to be a "helpless, pitiful giant"? Well, advertising does pay: It has confused a large part of the electorate over Indochina for a very long time, and in the short run and in political terms it may very well serve the President's interests, if not the nation's. No doubt he can hold the line through 1972 in Indochina and even keep a reasonably secure base in South Vietnam with American air power after that if he sticks. But that, he says, is not his policy. His policy is to get out and bet on the South Vietnamese to hold the fort against Hanoi and Peking.

And if he is wrong in this bet, who will explain the sacrifices of the men who die between now and then?

Still, the point of all this is not that he is perpetuating American illusions to serve his personal political interests—though it could have that result—but that he actually believes in the happy ending, that we are bigger and better, that money talks, that machines are irresistible even in the jungle, that China will tolerate on its border what he himself would not tolerate on ours, and that his purpose is virtuous and his ends justify his means.

Well, illusions have their purposes. Eugene O'Neill wrote a whole cycle of plays to prove that they were indispensable and that life was intolerable without them. But

in Indochina after ten years? After the heaviest bombing in the history of human conflict? After Lieutenant Calley?

Mr. Lincoln had a better idea: His clear and simple goal was to preserve the Union. "Military glory," he said, "is the attractive rainbow that rises in showers of blood."

AUTO INSURANCE

HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 10, 1971

Mr. ROBISON of New York. Mr. Speaker, even though most automobile insurance problems are handled by State departments of insurance, I have been receiving an increasing amount of mail in recent months about the cost and administration of these policies. I suspect that other Members are also hearing from angry constituents who for the most part, are left cold with suggestions that it is a State matter and demand that Congress take remedial action anyway.

With this in mind, I was pleased with the excellent editorial in the Sunday Star of March 7, 1971. The editorial cataloged—in highly readable fashion—some of the more common complaints consumers are making; and also warns that there will not be any quick, easy answers to the dilemmas such complaints reflect.

I hope that my colleagues will take a moment to read the editorial and I include its full text for their information:

THE PAINFUL DILEMMA OF AUTO INSURANCE

In none of his expensive activities is the American consumer unhappier than in buying automobile insurance. In his subsequent dealings with the people who insured him, his unhappiness frequently escalates into anguish. Controversy has swirled around this segment of the insurance industry for years, and hard battles over what to do will be fought out this year in statehouses across the country and in Congress.

The grounds for complaint about car insurance are familiar in a country of more than 100 million motorists. Rates have gone up sharply—by 90 percent since 1957-59—and there's no sign of a change in this trend. Companies cancel some policies and refuse to renew others, sometimes with evident reason and sometimes without. Millions of car owners are regarded as poor risks, and hence as customers to be avoided or to be charged extra-high premiums. The disfavored motorists, whether or not their own driving records are bad, include the young, the single and the divorced, and the members of occupations ranging incredibly from pool-hall employees to clergymen.

A lot of dissatisfaction and political heat comes from disparities of rates. Every family faces a financial beating when Junior gets his driver's license. With rates set according to the risks associated with geographical areas, inner-city residents get the worst deal and the companies incur charges of racial discrimination. Unwanted customers are shunted into high-cost assigned-risk pools, and 70 percent of the assigned risks in New York City are from Negro and Puerto Rican ghettos.

When it comes to claims against insurance policies, many companies are faulted as being too slow and too cheap. If a lawsuit is pressed for damages, a settlement or judgment may take years because of exhaustive

legal procedures and clogged courts. In the end, a lawyer gets 25 to 50 percent of the claimant's award.

The particular problems of Washington area residents, with respect to both automobile and homeowners' insurance, are the subject of a series of articles by Miriam Ottenberg starting in today's Star.

In the automobile field the reasons for the mess, across the country, are many. Arbitrary, high-handed and inhumane practices by some insurance companies undoubtedly are involved. Individual companies—some more notorious than others—and the industry as a whole are taking deserved lumps in many a public forum. The pressure is great for them to improve their operations, and the threat for their failure to do so is government-enforced reform of the industry and a heavier regulatory hand.

But more powerful forces than censurable business practices also are responsible for the current car-insurance crisis. The all-encompassing villain is the mindlessness with which Americans as a whole have converted their country into an automotive hell. Those 100 million motorists, gunning their fragile and overpowered vehicles over mostly unsafe roads, include every degree of skill, of sobriety and of good or bad intentions. There has been no denying the American passion for private transportation no matter what the cost in pollution, urban deterioration or safety.

The cost has been high. The appalling price in traffic deaths was 56,400 in 1969, according to the Insurance Information Institute. The number of injured was 5 million, and the economic toll of accidents was \$16.5 billion. All of these figures represented dramatic increases from previous years.

That is among the reasons for soaring car-insurance rates. Others are the equally steep climb of medical costs, and of the expense of fixing those easily wrinkled cars. Add the growing popularity of auto theft as a juvenile pastime and the insurance companies' defense of their rate increases gains plausibility. The companies, while being criticized for inefficient use of premium income and for not counting investment income in the equation, do lose money on their underwriting of auto insurance. And the time-honored business answer to that problem is to raise prices and seek cost reductions.

In attempting to assure that all qualified drivers can buy insurance to protect themselves adequately from the perils of the highway, legislative attention has focused naturally on the practices of the insurance companies. The industry faces more regulation of cancellation practices. The District City Council has taken steps to prevent the geographic discrimination that plagues otherwise qualified inner-city residents.

The focus of much official interest is the 55-year-old no-fault concept of insurance coverage, aimed at eliminating in whole or in part the lawsuit method of collecting damages from the insurance carrier of the driver deemed to be at fault in an accident. Under no-fault, a claimant collects for actual losses (not pain and suffering) from his own insurance company no matter who was at fault. Proponents say this method would speed payments to victims and, by eliminating much costly litigation, permit lower premiums. Opponents of no-fault say it would shift responsibility for accidents from the guilty to the innocent and would remove a deterrent to irresponsible driving.

A judgment of the efficacy of no-fault insurance must await the results of experience with the system, and it won't be long before there are such findings. As of the first of the year, Massachusetts was the first state to put no-fault into practice. The Massachusetts system is a limited one under which only the first \$2,000 of a victim's personal-injury costs are covered on a no-fault basis, with compulsory liability coverage for

larger damages. Massachusetts residents have yet to enjoy lower rates, since an attempt to legislate a 15 percent reduction was ruled out in court.

There are substantial doubts that no-fault is the panacea for rising car-insurance costs, given the grim economics of our rising traffic-accident toll. The Department of Transportation found that auto insurance covered only about a fifth of the compensable losses from car accidents in 1967. A system that improves on this record is liable to cost policyholders more, not less.

The problem still could yield to attack on a variety of other fronts, some thrusting to the heart of the way Americans use their automotive wealth. The highways should be made, really and truly, off-limits to drinking drivers, the biggest single cause of fatal accidents—accounting for a reported 40 percent in the District. Other forms of offensive driving, attested to by the arrest and accident records of many who daily ply our streets, need to be dealt with more effectively by our public institutions.

More crash-resistant cars, and autos designed so as to be repaired more easily and cheaply, could cut drastically into the toll of property damage. The American Mutual Insurance Alliance recently called runaway car-repair bills the biggest single factor in rising insurance rates, citing an 111 percent increase in the average repair claim since 1960.

As dated as is Ralph Nader's original campaign on car safety, much still can be done to build injury-reducing features into cars. Roads can be made safer, as witness the current effort to eliminate hazards on the George Washington Memorial Parkway. Cost-savings are possible in the delivery of insurance services (group policies hold out promise here) and in more efficient medical treatment and legal services.

The insurance companies should be brought into line where their practices diverge from the public interest. But the problem of rising insurance costs won't be solved until Americans have civilized their highways.

A MAN CANNOT PICK THE WAR HE WANTS

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 10, 1971

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, an editorial appearing in today's Chicago Tribune discusses the recent Supreme Court decision which, in effect, states that a man who is eligible in all respects for the draft cannot be exempted as a conscientious objector merely, because he objects to this particular war. I thought the decision was a sound one and hope that the Court will now move on to consideration of the case involving Muhammad Ali, or Cassius Clay, as he is referred to by the heavyweight champion of the world, Mr. Joe Frazier.

I include the editorial in the RECORD at this point:

A MAN CANNOT PICK THE WAR HE WANTS
The United States Supreme Court, in a draft case decision involving the individual conscience, has dealt a body blow to those who would set aside the Viet Nam war as an immoral conflict in which men of good will need not serve.

Without ruling on the legality of the war, the court, in an 8 to 1 opinion, held that

draftees opposed to the Viet Nam war—but not all wars—could not be exempt from military service as conscientious objectors. The C.O. exemption, whose base was broadened last term by the court, can be applied only to those "who oppose participation in all war—participation in war in any form," said the majority opinion, written by Justice Thurgood Marshall.

Thus the court disposed of the argument that would permit an individual to evaluate ethically the kind of war he is required to serve in. This "just war" doctrine had been raised by two draftees, Guy Gillette, of New York City and Louis Negre of Bakersfield, Cal. They refused to serve in Viet Nam but admitted that under other circumstances they would bear arms in defense of the United States.

"The nature of conscription, much less war itself," wrote Justice Marshall, "requires the personal desires and perhaps the dissenting views of those who must serve to be subordinated in some degree to the pursuit of public purposes." He also agreed with the government that if young men were allowed to pick their own war this would place too great a burden on draft boards trying to decide whose claims are just.

Only Justice William O. Douglas dissented. He held that the majority opinion had done violence to the free exercise and establishment of religion clauses of the 1st Amendment. Negre and Gillette had argued that many religions adhere to the "just war" doctrine.

A Justice Department source said that the court's opinion now gives the government the green light to seek indictments against many draft evaders who raised similar arguments. The "just war" doctrine has been a popular gambit among the antiwar crowd, many of whose leaders have been urged it as a legitimate reason for their young followers to escape the draft.

Ironically, the court's landmark decision in this case was handed down the same day that the nation's most notorious draft dodger, Muhammad Ali (nee Cassius Clay), picked up \$2.5 million for fighting Joe Frazier, the world heavyweight champion.

The high court has yet to rule on Ali's case. He is free on an appeal bond, having been sentenced in 1967 to five years in prison by Federal District Court in Texas for refusing to serve in the Army. Ali claimed exemption on the ground of being a Black Muslim minister. Previously he sought exemption on the ground of being psychologically and physically unsuited for the Army; the sole support of his mother; unable to make alimony payments on a soldier's pay; and a conscientious objector. All of the claims were rejected.

A TRIBUTE TO THE GIRL SCOUTS OF THE U.S.A.

HON. ELLA T. GRASSO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 10, 1971

Mrs. GRASSO. Mr. Speaker, throughout this week we mark the 59th anniversary of the Girl Scouts of the U.S.A. and I wish to pay tribute to the young women of this remarkable organization, and those adults who guide and direct their worthwhile activities.

In the first decade of this century, Lord Baden-Powell, the founder of Boy Scouting, his sister, Miss Agnes Baden-Powell, and others, launched the Girl Guide movement in England. It was a

program based on Scouting ideals, but developed especially for girls.

During the years in which the Boy Scout movement developed in England, Mrs. Juliette Gordon Low, of Savannah, Ga., was living in England, and became acquainted with the Girl Guide movement. From England, Juliette Low carried Girl Guiding to the United States, where she adapted the program and organization to meet the needs of American girls. On March 12, 1912, she established the first troop of Girl Scouts of the United States. In June 1913, the first national headquarters of the Girl Scouts was opened. In June 1915, the Girl Scout organization was incorporated.

I am proud to say that there are two active councils in my district with a combined membership of 10,000 Girl Scouts and 1,600 adults. These councils are chartered as the Connecticut Yankee and the Northwestern Girl Scout Council Inc., and are led by Mrs. Philip S. Brezina of Bristol, Conn., and Mrs. Joseph Bergman of Litchfield, Conn. These women have volunteered their services to encourage their children to engage in the meaningful Girl Scout activities.

Besides the 700 acres of campsite lands which are owned by the Girl Scouts and used for camping and other outdoor activities for members, there have been for the past two summers, activity programs for non-Scouts in New Britain and Meriden.

The story of Girl Scouting is an exciting one. No one could foresee in 1912 what would be the future of the little movement started in Savannah. However, those who realized its potential sought to provide each young girl tools to become an efficient, happy, healthy, and resourceful citizen. As an example of the rewarding opportunities offered Scouts, Sandra King of Southington has been chosen to participate in the "Aboard the Queen Mary" project to promote interest in oceanography. Lectures and a study course will be given this summer in Long Beach, Calif., where some 160 Girl Scouts from around the country will meet for a 2 week period.

The art of living together with other human beings is everyone's job, and one that the Girl Scouts do not take lightly; Scouting is an experience in living together, and every Girl Scout troop is a living human-relations laboratory.

The right to differ with others is a precious American heritage, but before we can grasp the concept of difference, we must first understand how people are alike. It is the intent of the Girl Scout program to provide experiences rich and meaningful for every Scout, giving her a sense of greater emotional security within herself, and to help her develop a sense of oneness and unity with a group. The importance of living together with respect and understanding is an important goal in the Scouting program. However, these goals are never emphasized at the expense of the individual.

It is indeed encouraging to know that the program of the Girl Scouts of the U.S.A. is successfully and creatively contributing to the sound development of our young people. Girl Scouting offers youths a chance to live a fourfold life,

in which love and play and work and worship are equally developed.

It is a pleasure to salute the Girl Scouts of America, in tribute to their grand record of accomplishment over 59 years of devoted service to American youth.

PROPHET OF ECONOMIC GLOOM

HON. WILLIAM L. SPRINGER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 10, 1971

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following. Many of my colleagues have during the past several years been wondering whether or not Cuba has made progress or has gone bankrupt economically. James R. Whelan, staff writer for Scripps-Howard newspapers has written an excellent brief article based on a recently published book by Rene Dumont, a leftist French writer and frequent adviser and admirer of Castro. Mr. Whelan has tried to condense into two columns the principle points made in Rene Dumont's book, "Cuba: Est Il Socialiste?" It is an article that is excellently written and I am sure that many of my colleagues would want to read it in order to have an understanding of why the economic situation in Cuba has deteriorated so greatly in the last few years. The article has appeared in all South American newspapers.

The article follows:

[From the San Juan (Puerto Rico) Star, Jan. 15, 1971]

PROPHET OF ECONOMIC GLOOM

(By James R. Whelan)

WASHINGTON.—Like a legion of avenging angels, the follies and failures of 12 years appear to be closing in on an increasingly brooding, moody Fidel Castro.

Out of a welter of statements and sources, the evidence is unmistakable of deepening and accelerating crisis in Cuba's economy. Castro himself—now 43, paunchy and captive of his own egomania—has emerged over the past six months as the foremost prophet of this economic gloom.

Evidence is also mounting that the Russians, tired of bank rolling Castro's economic misadventures, are tightening their grip of Cuba's internal affairs.

Neither Castro nor his regime is in danger of overthrow. The apparatus of repression in Communist Cuba, one of the world's authentic police states, is too formidable.

For the average Cuban—who Castro himself now concedes neither wanted nor liked his brand of revolution—life is a worsening cycle of privations, hardships, and postponed promises. Castro calls it the hard road, paved with good intentions, to the promised land of socialism.

Rene Dumont, a leftist French writer, frequent adviser and self-proclaimed admirer of Castro, put it somewhat differently in a recently published book ("Cuba: Est Il Socialiste?") Which was recently excerpted in the leftist U.S. magazine Dissent.

"As difficulties accumulate," Dumont wrote, "Castro asks his fellow citizens not to linger over the present but to turn their eyes toward a more and more distant horizon—1980 for example. And he draws an ever more idyllic picture of that future—on condition that his people accept a program of work that becomes more and more extravagant..."

"However," Dumont added in another passage of the book, "sacrifices that have been prolonged since 1961 have become unbearable for the people today."

In his July 26, 1970, speech on the 17th anniversary of the battle launching his revolution, Castro gave an amazingly itemized inventory of the revolution's failures. It was the first of a series by Castro in the same tenor in which the buoyant optimism of the past has given way to tortured apologies for errors, coupled with forecasts of bleaker times ahead.

The dam of optimism broke with the dismal failure of the Cubans to achieve a 10-million-ton sugar harvest last year, a goal on which Castro had staked the honor of the revolution. What he had planned as a monument to the superiority of socialist planning became instead an incinerator consuming both hopes and precious economic resources.

Stubbornly pursuing a 10-million-ton goal, Castro doubled the length of the harvest, diverted tens of thousands of workers from other jobs, students from their classrooms. Scarce fuel and supplies were siphoned off from other purposes.

The harvest finally reached 8.5 million tons, an all-time Cuban record. But it cost twice the time, and twice the manpower, and left deep political, psychological and economic scars. And it was the first time since Castro came to power on Jan. 1, 1959, that he managed to surpass the pre-revolution record of a 7.2-million-ton harvest.

One of the new breed of "Cuba watchers," professionals sifting information coming from Cuba, believes the effect of that failure has plunged Castro into "the longest period of doldrums" since the revolution. How much of that gloom stems from possible other factors, such as apparent Russian pressures, is not known.

The Cuban reality is, however, much gloomier than even Castro admits. And his promises do not seem to fire new hopes.

"When he begins 'to promise the moon,'" wrote Dumont "many Cuban listeners flick off their radios; they no longer believe."

Part of the reason Dumont believes is that "It is now more than 10 years that Cuba has been making mistakes and not very many lessons have been learned from them..."

Even Castro is promising less—except hardship. In his New Year's Eve speech, Castro said 1971 would be a year of increased production, but he offered no hope of a better life for ordinary citizens.

What is that life now like?

Since 1962, Cubans have watched shortages spread, until last year practically everything they used or consumed was rationed—even sugar, in the world's second sugar producing country (Russia is first), and cigars, in a country which made them famous.

In 1968, Castro nationalized 58,000 businesses then still in private hands, down to the "ma and pa"-type corner grocery store. About the only industry not nationalized is the taxi business, a collection of rickety relics, using cannibalized spare parts and coping with chronic shortages of fuel.

Except for taxi drivers and a handful of private farmers, practically everyone works for the state.

Because of rationing and shortages of goods, per capita consumption of goods and services in Cuba declined by 25 per cent between 1957 and 1969. The average worker now can buy everything rationing entitles him to for a month with the equivalent of three weeks' work. This disincentive to work has fostered the absenteeism that Castro frequently deplores in speeches.

In the early days of the revolution, Castro promised free housing for city dwellers, and free land for peasants. He recently reported that 268,089 families in Cuba's urban centers—where 60 per cent of the country's 8.5 million people live—were given use of houses

and apartments. And 100,000 former rent-paying peasants got free use of state-owned land, but not title to the land.

Illiteracy, 30 per cent on the eve of revolution, has been eradicated. School enrollment went up from 936,723 in 1958 to 2,289,464 last year. But 1,560,193 were in grammar schools, which still show high drop-out rates in the early grades. Castro recently referred to 400,000 children between the ages of 6 and 16 neither working nor in school.

Other reports back up the statistics: Dumont contrasts the "radiant" look of the town of Bayamo in early 1960 with the "empty shops and haggard passersby" of July 1969: "Children are sometimes dressed in odds and ends of old sacks, and young girls are ashamed of their rags..."

In Havana, "you queue up for the films, queue up to make a cab drive around Holguin, queue up to sit on the terrace of a cafe, which sells neither coffee nor beer, but lemonade and fruit juices that are more sugared than fruited. You queue up for the too infrequent bus..."

The list goes on. It took Castro nearly half an hour of his July 26 speech just to list the major shortages and shortfalls in production goals. He spoke of seeing workers in one plant "in tattered clothes and worn-out shoes..."

"Granma," organ of the revolution and only surviving newspaper in Cuba, publishes a daily notice of areas to be browned out that night because of energy shortages.

"The road is difficult," Castro said. "It is more difficult than what we expected... it is a lot easier to win 20 wars than to win the development battle..."

Only army officers, higher-ups in Cuba's 400,000-member Communist party, government bigwigs, and visiting foreigners live splendidly.

Cuba's economy actually is going backwards. Gross national product is up 10 per cent since 1961, but the population—even with the declining birth rate revealed in a new census—increased 17 per cent in that period.

Cuba's transportation system is a shambles. Inefficiency, incompetence and incredibly inept planning hobble efforts to industrialize. Agricultural output, other than sugar, is declining.

Cuba owes \$400 million to non-Communist Western trading partners, suppliers of food, machinery and other goods essential for Cuba's survival. There are signs that Cuba's lines of credit with these nations are nearing their limit.

According to Dumont, Communist-country diplomats in Cuba believe "the Cuban economy is moving toward imminent catastrophe."

How does Castro meet these problems? In one of his speeches, Castro recounted how a shortage of containers paralyzed a brewery's production of beer. He solved the problem by ordering a fleet of refrigerated tank trucks to be made available. Beer then flowed, but what of the other needs to which those trucks had been assigned?

Such improvisation, coupled with a strong reliance on intuition and scorn for statistics, seem typical of Castro's administration.

"This," Dumont commented, "would be quite acceptable in a chief of state if he did not insist on directing everything himself"—an interesting observation, since in one of his speeches, Castro noted the "impossibility" of "directing and coordinating all this apparatus..."

"He is no longer content with his military and political claims to glory," Dumont wrote, "or his unquestionable human value. It is essential to him that he also be recognized as first in scientific research and in agricultural education. He is the one who knows everything..."

THE NONPROFIT PRACTICE OF
LAW—A THREAT TO THE AMER-
ICAN JUDICIAL SYSTEM

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 10, 1971

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, we are accustomed to the cry for controls and regulations over a segments of society because the group as a whole has failed or refused to police itself. The latest shenanigans come out of Washington, D.C., where the local bar association has ruled that nonprofit law firms may advertise for specialty clients in newspapers and on radio and television.

The organization in question goes under the name of the Stern Community Law Firm, a supposedly nonprofit public interest law firm, which has sought special concessions and does not believe in conforming to the code of ethics of the legal profession.

Client soliciting, this new revolution in law practice—heretofore a clear violation of legal ethics—can be expected to usher in a new era of encouraged litigation from so-called poor people, class action by groups, and idealists in the areas of consumerism and ecology, etc. The courts already loaded with heavy dockets can expect a windfall of new litigation.

If the legal profession does not police itself and take responsible action to prohibit such barratry, society can shortly be expected to demand unprecedented action by legislating controls, including ethics, over the legal profession.

The Stern law firm which operates as "non-profit"—which means only that its wealthy benefactors can deduct their gifts as tax free—is financed by the Stern family foundation, one of the largest tax-free accumulations of wealth in the Nation.

Of interest to Americans is the connection between Stern, the radical Institute for Policy Studies, a transparent attempt to whitewash the notorious J. Robert Oppenheimer, and the financing of Seymour Hersh to promote the Mylai massacre hoax.

Although the source of Stern's wealth is usually given as his inheritance from his grandfather, Julius Rosenwald, and usually mentions the charitable activities of selected members of his family, never is any mention made of his relationship to the Stern who fled New York—just as a grand jury returned an espionage indictment—and found a haven in Moscow.

The local Stern has a relation in my State and both are consistent in throwing big money around supposedly to help the poor and spread the wealth so long as it is someone else's money or it is tax deductible. The Louisiana relative, Mrs. Edith Rosenwald Stern, has just been successful through litigation in reversing an Internal Revenue Service deficiency judgment of \$35,908 by proving that campaign money she had given for "reform" politicians in my State was nontaxable as a gift. Apparently the Sterns are sincere in their belief that only Americans who work for their money are expected to pay taxes. And

those who live off the workingman are not to be required to pay their fair share of the cost of government.

Another nonprofit law firm which calls itself the Environmental Defense Fund can be expected to "go to town" under the present bar association ruling. Here again it hides behind poor people's credentials; yet its late general counsel, Victor J. Yannacoe, Jr., was paid a \$5,000 a month retainer while maintaining his own private law practice. Sixty thousand dollars lawyers' fees may indicate why the nonprofit law firms have been so successful in recruiting highly intelligent and energetic young attorneys from private practice, industry, and government. Business can be expected to pick up as long as the Ford Foundation, the Rockefeller and the taxpayers' money hold out.

It was for this reason that I had reintroduced in this session H.R. 425, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to provide that tax-exempt organizations, which voluntarily engage in litigation for the benefit of third parties, or commit other prohibited actions, shall lose their exemption in tax.

Likewise, this is one of the principal reasons I had reintroduced H.R. 405, to amend the Internal Revenue Code to require each tax-exempt organization to file an annual information return showing each source—including governmental sources—of its income and other receipts, and to provide for a loss of tax exemption in the case of willful failure to file, or fraudulent statements made in connection with such returns.

These two bills will go a good way in helping the attorneys restore confidence and ethics to our profession.

I insert several newsclippings and H.R. 425 and 405:

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 10, 1971]

NONPROFIT LAW FIRMS MAY ADVERTISE
(By William L. Claiborne)

The D.C. Bar Association has ruled that nonprofit law firms may advertise for clients in newspapers and on radio and television.

The decision, the first of its kind in the nation, is expected to bring into the courts citizens who have grievances against government and businesses but may be unaware of free legal services offered by "public interest law firms."

The ethics and grievance committee of the bar association, in an opinion upheld by the board of directors, ruled against complaints by a number of Washington lawyers who had accused the Stern Community Law Firm of violating the longstanding code of professional responsibility by advertising its services in publications and on radio and television.

The ruling, a bar association spokesman emphasized, applies only to nonprofit, "public interest law firms" whose lawyers do not receive fees from clients.

These law offices include such nonprofit firms as Stern, which is supported largely by private contributions and foundations, and government-supported agencies like the Neighborhood Legal Services Program for the poor.

The departure from the canons of ethics is expected to have far-reaching effects for these lawyers who have sought to offer legal assistance to individuals and in the "class actions" on behalf of groups, such as the poor, minorities, consumers and environmental organizations.

Raymond Garrity, executive-director of the D.C. Bar Association, said it is the first time in the country that law firms have been permitted to advertise their services.

"It's perfectly logical that it would happen first in Washington, with the seat of government here. There are lots of groups here representing people against the government and I'm sure this decision will have a larger scope as time passes," Garrity said.

The ruling came on an advertisement labeled a "public service legal opinion" that the Stern Community Law Firm had published in local newspapers last fall, calling attention to the plight of children in orphanages here and offering free legal services to prospective adoptive and foster parents.

Later, the law firm published an advertisement on an effort to force the Food and Drug Administration to ban the sale of certain hazardous toys that could "kill and maim" children. The advertisement also solicited new clients.

Monroe Freedman, director of the Stern firm, noted that the bar association committee had stipulated that the advertisements be clearly labeled "opinions" and that the names of individual lawyers not be used.

"We can easily live with the two limitations," said Freedman in hailing the committee's ruling. "We are living in times when too many people are seeking redress of grievances through rioting, burning and bombing. The new public interest lawyers want to get controversies out of the streets and into the courts..."

Garrity said the ruling will apply not only to the Stern firm, which is financed by a family foundation, but to other nonprofit firms, such as consumer advocate Ralph Nader's Committee for Responsive Law, and to government-financed law groups such as the Neighborhood Legal Services Program and the Urban Law Institute, which receive funds from the Office of Economic Opportunity.

The bar association board of directors disagreed with the ethics and grievances committee on one point. It ruled that the word "law" should not be used in the Stern firm's identification in the advertisements.

However, Freedman said the board's ruling on that point was labeled an "interim position" and that the Stern firm's ads would continue to use the full name.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Feb. 10, 1971]

GIFT-TAX CASE

Good government can merit an investment, a court says in a gift-tax case.

A decade ago, Mrs. Edith Rosenwald Stern, a wealthy Louisiana resident, gave \$60,850 to support reform slates in New Orleans and statewide elections. She and her fellow contributors said they were disturbed by the state's lagging economy and considered the state's politics responsible. The money went for campaign literature and advertising. The IRS claimed the sums were gifts, however, and dunned her for \$35,908 in taxes and interest.

Mrs. Stern contended she got full value for her money because she had a stake in better government. The tax law presumes that a transfer in the ordinary course of business is made for adequate consideration (and thus isn't a gift) if it's bona fide, at arm's length and free from donative intent. That's fine, the IRS said, but it denied the transfer was made in the course of "an actual business carried on by Mrs. Stern."

The Fifth Circuit appeals court said the IRS construed the law too narrowly. "The transfers were permeated with commercial and economic factors," it said. "In a very real sense, Mrs. Stern was making an economic investment."

[From the Washington (D.C.) Star Sunday magazine, Feb. 1, 1970]

THE HAPPY PHILANTHROPIST

(By Barbara Stubbs Cohen)

(NOTE.—Philip Stern, an heir to the Sears Roebuck fortune, is "having a ball out of life" granting money to worthwhile Wash-

ington projects and, on the side, dabbling in art-collecting, silk-screening and flying airplanes, among other things.)

"Being rich," says Philip Stern, "is really not very different from having a cleft palate or green hair."

Stern, who has neither, knows what he's talking about. The heir to a Sears Roebuck fortune, fattened over two generations. Stern has shunned further money-making and resorted to giving his wealth away. But even as a philanthropist, the man who has funded such iconoclastic projects as the first research on My Lai and a home for runaway hippies can hardly be classed as normal.

Not that Stern is unhappy about this. At 43, after one unremunerative career in politics and another in newspapering and in the midst of a modestly successful one as a crusading author, Stern exudes an air of satisfaction. "I'm having a ball out of life. I just learned to fly an airplane in the last four years, learned to play the recorder and read music, learned to silk-screen." All these activities are shared with his wife, Leni, and five children aged 7 to 18, who spill out of a 20-room house in Kalorama equipped with swimming pool, tennis court, trampoline, tree house and art studio.

Though they could hire just about anything done for them, the Sterns take pride in their do-it-yourself projects. Leni, who says she has never allowed a decorator across the threshold, is responsible for decorating the house with bright splashes of color on the walls—"which are likely to change at any moment"—and good modern furniture, including a gigantic swing in the middle of the living room. They get engrossed in silk-screening their own Christmas cards or studying Spanish for a trip to Mexico. And the art collection of modern masters has been carefully chosen by the Sterns, not an agent.

But the Philip M. Stern Family Fund is Stern's farthest-reaching plunge into the do-it-yourself realm. His grants, which are his way of effecting change in education, community service and culture, go to people who want to help themselves. Though small by Ford or Carnegie standards, with its endowment of \$832,000, the Stern Fund is behind almost every innovative and controversial project in Washington.

Col. Hassan Jeru-Ahmed, who operates three centers for the free distribution of methadone, a heroin substitute, and who estimates he is returning 450 to 600 addicts to normal life, got his first grant from the Stern Fund.

The Rev. Tom Murphy of Dupont Circle's Church of the Pilgrims has used Stern money to finance Runaway House, Switchboard (a "bulletin board" via telephone), and the Georgetown Free Medical Clinic, all catering to Washington's hippie community.

Students at Eastern High, calling themselves the Modern Strivers, got a Stern grant to start their own classes in black history and other subjects not taught in the school.

Joel Denker has set up, with Stern help, the New Educational Project, to make education relevant for white kids from the suburbs.

Julius Hobson's Washington Institute for Quality Education got a Stern grant for its study of D.C. schools.

And the Washington Theater Club, which received its first Stern grant four years ago, has grown in membership from 40 season subscribers to 9,200 and moved into a new theater.

In fiscal 1968, the most recent year for which figures are available, Stern's foundation made 78 grants totaling \$174,847. It may not have been the most, but it was the most unorthodox in Washington. Some of that comes naturally to Stern, the third generation in a line of philanthropic mavericks.

Stern inherited his fortune and a tradition of giving from his grandfather, Julius Rosenwald, the Sears Roebuck magnate whose fund built 5,000 schools for Negroes in the South, and from his father, Edgar, whose foundation Stern now heads. Under their father's direction, the Stern children served an apprenticeship on that board, then were given a lump sum to start their own. Stern's brother runs the Six Foundation in New Orleans and his sister manages the Longview Foundation in New York.

None of Stern's careers was undertaken to make new family fortunes. In his favorite role as author, to which he devotes about four times as much time as to philanthropy he has recently published *The Case of Robert Oppenheimer*, which has been praised by reviewers around the country. He wrote the book, he says, because "it seemed to me it would be useful to lay out the way government power was used, or really abused, to get a guy. It became a book about The System and what I think are the malign effects of that system—the loyalty and security system—on the country." The crusading note runs through his first book, *The Great Treasury Raid*, about tax loopholes; *Oh Say Can You See: A Bifocal Tour of Washington*, a picture book done with his wife juxtaposing Washington's monuments and slums; and *The Shame of the Nation*, photos and essays on poverty.

Politics, though, was Stern's first love. He came to Washington under a now-defunct Rockefeller internship program to give young men a look at the workings of the Hill. He stayed on as a congressional aide to Sen. Henry M. Jackson, when he was a congressman, and to Sen. Paul Douglas before he joined Adlai Stevenson's presidential campaign in 1952. After the campaign he was made research director for the Democratic party. He left that post in 1958 to start the *Northern Virginia Sun* with Clayton Fritchey, George Ball and Arnold Sagalyn. But, except for contributions to the Democratic party, he has given up politics—permanently, he says. "I always thought that I ought to take advantage of the financial means with which I was blessed," he explains, "and one of the main ways is to be independent—genuinely independent—and to say what I believe without being afraid of the consequences. I don't want to be irresponsible in what I say, but I don't want to have to worry about the consequences."

After 13 years of giving money away, Stern has developed a set of criteria for the kind of project he favors. The decision to grant money is not, however, his alone. He is restricted, first of all, to aiding Washington projects, because his foundation is chartered here. He is also restricted to projects approved by the foundation's six-member board, and a group less inclined to rubber-stampism hardly could be found.

The board members, who serve without pay and are selected by Stern and approved by the others on the board, are, besides Stern and his wife, Father Gino Baroni, an activist in civil rights and poverty causes; Patrick Hayes, Washington's Sol Hurok; Mrs. Willie Hardy, a black community leader; and Richard Scammon, head of Elections Research Center. "We chose people," Stern says, "that we thought would add to our intelligence in the fields we were interested in, and whose experience would add judgment as to the merits of the proposal and the people. A board member either knows the person who is bringing in the proposal or he's in a position to look into it in a way that I couldn't."

If there should be a difference among the board members about a request, the matter is decided simply and democratically with a vote. And to make things even less arbitrary, Stern and his assistant, Mrs. George Allen, who cull the preliminary requests,

list the applications they have turned down so that members have an opportunity to take a second look at a project.

Stern is fond of saying that the chief thing he tries to accomplish in his giving is "bridge-building," not "dock-building." "I like to find out if we are building a dock out into the middle of a pond so that when they get to the end of our grant they'll be in essentially the same fix they're in now, or if we have a chance of helping them build a bridge from one piece of dry land to another piece, so that at the end of the grant they have some prospects of either being self-supporting or getting some other source of funds." It is the long-run future of the organization which is under consideration. "We found," Stern says, "that we were the object of what I call 'oxygen-tent' requests—that is, organizations that were about to go under and were coming to us to be rescued from bankruptcy—in effect, death."

This does not mean that the Stern Fund backs only sure bets. Stern says, "We tend to look with the most favor on people or projects who don't have any other philanthropic constituency. For example, something like the Red Cross has an enormous constituency, if it gets money from all over and we wouldn't even consider the Red Cross for that reason. When the kids at Eastern High School who wanted a new school came in, that attracted our attention right away, partly because they didn't know where to go." Since that initial grant to youngsters who didn't know where to turn, the Modern Strivers have been featured in national magazines, praised by educators and given other grants by larger foundations.

Stern grants are more limited than those by the big foundations. Most are \$5,000 to \$10,000, with \$20,000 being huge, by Stern standards. For that reason, the foundation tries to spend its money where it will have the biggest impact. "We ask how big their total need is. If somebody's got a budget of a million dollars, they're not likely to get any money from us," Stern says, "because even if we gave them a huge grant—on our terms—it would be a spit in the ocean, and it wouldn't make a critical difference whether that project goes or doesn't go. I'd much rather give to something where we can make a critical difference as to whether something exists or not."

The potential success of the projects he finances matters to Stern. "One of the criteria you use when you make the grant is to ask what it is you'd like to see when you stand a year hence and look back. Is what we hope to accomplish (a) realizable and (b) important?"

But he is not frightened of failure, and in the end, the decision to back a project depends on the person proposing it. "A final criterion," Stern says, "is betting on people. When you get a hot person, someone who is clearly gifted, that's when you say we don't know whether it's going to work or not. That's when you begin to take your longest shots."

Neither is Stern embarrassed by failure. He tells of one young heroin addict who had kicked his habit and was going to District schools evangelizing against drugs. When he came to Stern for help he was put in touch with the Psychiatric Institute Foundation so that he could get money and training.

But, says Stern, "That was a long shot that didn't pay off. He fell off. But the way I feel is if you don't make some mistakes and have some failures, you're not really doing your job. That's the main rationale for foundations—to be the real risk-takers. The government can't do it politically, and corporations won't do it, so that's what foundations are all about."

Grants from the "senior fund" as Stern has nicknamed the national foundation set up by his father, often find their way into

the Washington area also. The Washington Gallery of Modern Art got help from that foundation, thanks to the interest of Stern's wife, Leni, who with her husband has selected paintings by Frank Stella, Franz Kline, Joseph Albers and Sam Gilliam for their living room walls, is an artist in her own right. She served as chairman of the Gallery of Modern Art board through its merger with the Corcoran and transformation into the Dupont Center of that museum. Another Washington recipient of senior Stern funds is the radical research center, the Institute for Policy Studies, who founders include Arthur Waskow and Marcus Raskin. Phillip Stern serves as chairman of the trustees of that institution.

The Stern grant that made the biggest splash of 1969 was money given Seymour Hersh to research reports of a massacre of Vietnamese civilians by soldiers at My Lai. Hersh's research, aided by a special fund to promote investigative reporting, led to stories that shocked the nation and the world.

Despite his gratitude to his parents for philanthropy instructions, Stern hesitates at involving his own children. So far they have not expressed much interest themselves in becoming philanthropists. "It's very difficult," Stern says, "for someone to grow up with a lot of money, and they're feeling that now and they're not at all sure that they want to be involved in that."

If they do, their father has some advice for them. "If they're going to do it seriously—and I must say I wouldn't recommend it to them if they weren't—they have to prepare to be bombarded by a lot of people who want things. They have to be comfortable about saying no. And it's not easy to come by, believe me. It took me a long, long time to be comfortable about saying no to people, and particularly to friends. They will have to be prepared to spend a portion of their lives working at this. And that's not everybody's bag."

[From the Science, Dec. 26, 1969]

ENVIRONMENTAL DEFENSE FUND: YANNAONE OUT AS RINGMASTER

The Environmental Defense Fund (EDF), a unique conservation organization that has done much to stimulate interest in environmental law among scientists and others, has been known especially through the activities of its ebulliently aggressive ringmaster and general counsel, Victor J. Yannacone, Jr. Now, however, it appears that Yannacone either will be merely one member of a team of EDF attorneys or will have no role whatever with EDF, which is adopting a broader legal strategy and a quieter demeanor than it has had in the past.

Last winter, Charles F. Wurster, Jr., one of EDF's founders and chairman of its Scientists Advisory Committee, spoke warmly of Yannacone. "Vic really thinks he can save the world," Wurster said. "He's a brilliant guy. If you aim him in the right direction, he'll raise hell." Recently, however, EDF concluded that it could no longer guide Yannacone in the manner desired and decided to replace him as its general counsel, although Yannacone may continue to represent EDF in certain litigation, such as EDF's air pollution suit in Missoula, Montana.

EDF was established in the fall of 1967 as the outgrowth of an anti-DDT suit in a Suffolk County (Long Island) court. The prime movers were Yannacone, a 31-year-old Patchogue, Long Island, attorney, and Wurster, an assistant professor of biology at the State University of New York at Stony Brook (Science, 22 December 1967). There were other conservation law groups already in existence, but EDF was something new—a scientific organization dedicated to use of the courts for environmental protection.

Its Scientists Advisory Committee, on which Wurster now says more than 200

scientists have accepted membership, was set up in order that EDF might draw on the best talent in the scientific community. EDF soon became widely known, especially for its suits and petitions in the Midwest against use of hard pesticides, and it began receiving numerous appeals from around the nation to intervene in environmental controversies. EDF has received much of its financial support from funds raised by local groups, such as the Citizens Natural Resources Association of Wisconsin, which a year ago petitioned the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources to ban use of DDT. The Ford Foundation also has supported the Wisconsin action, although it has chosen to do so indirectly, through the National Audubon Society's Rachel Carson Fund.

Yannacone is a bustling, flamboyant lawyer with a brash style ("sue the bastards" has been his slogan), a love of rhetoric and the center stage, a confessed distaste for preparing briefs, a quick grasp of scientific information, and a gift for examining (and cross-examining) scientific witnesses. Over the last 2 years few if any young attorneys have received more publicity than Yannacone. He generally has scorned the usual legal approaches (such as the bringing of conventional nuisance suits against polluters) and has sought to have the courts declare that citizens have a constitutional right to protection from pollution and other environmental insults.

Now, the board of trustees and staff of EDF feel that, while the effort to establish constitutional safeguards should not be abandoned, other available legal strategies also should be pursued. EDF is acting accordingly—for example, with its October petition to the Secretary of Agriculture, stating that the law requires him to ban all use of DDT. Earlier, EDF had rejected as unpromising Yannacone's proposal to bring a \$30-billion damage suit against DDT manufacturers as a "class action" on behalf of all citizens of the United States; Yannacone finally filed this action with his wife as plaintiff.

The Long Island Press recently quoted Yannacone as attributing his problems with EDF partly to this suit, which he said some trustees regarded as an embarrassment to EDF in its efforts to obtain a grant from the Ford Foundation. However, according to Reginald C. Smith, an attorney EDF hired several months ago to represent it in its dealings with its general counsel, the suit had nothing to do with the "strained relations" between EDF and Yannacone. The trouble, he said, grew out of Yannacone's "evident lack of respect [for] the EDF trustees" and his failure to take direction.

Roderick A. Cameron of Stony Brook, an attorney and executive director of EDF, told Science that EDF was getting a "bad deal" and that Yannacone, who, besides representing EDF, has carried on a private law practice of his own, had not been doing enough work for EDF to earn his \$5,000-a-month retainer. Yannacone's written agreement with EDF included the provision that any time his work took him more than 100 miles from home for more than 3 days at a time, he was entitled to take his wife and son with him, and that accommodations for travel, meals, and lodging were "to be first class at all times."

EDF's new general counsel is Lee Rogers, a 37-year-old Oregonian who has been a tax attorney for the U.S. Department of Justice. EDF has set up a legal advisory committee and is establishing a network of attorneys around the country which it can call on for advice and courtroom work. For his part, Yannacone, whatever his future relations with EDF, plans to continue his practice of environmental law. He is presently one of the attorneys in a suit in Colorado raising allegations of environmental hazards against the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission and its Project Rulison, in which a 40-kiloton nu-

clear device was detonated 8000 feet underground in September to allow recovery of natural gas from a rock formation.—L.J.C.

H.R. 405

A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to require each tax-exempt organization to file an annual information return showing each source (including governmental sources) of its income and other receipts, and to provide for a loss of tax exemption in the case of willful failure to file, or fraudulent statements made in connection with, such return.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 6033 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to returns by exempt organizations) is amended as follows:

(1) (A) The first sentence of subsection (a) of such section is amended by inserting "the source of each item of gross income and receipts (including governmental sources)," immediately after "disbursements,".

(B) The second sentence of such subsection is repealed.

(2) Subsection (b) of such section is amended—

(A) by amending clause (1) to read as follows:

"(1) the amount and source (including governmental sources) of its gross income for the year," and

(B) by amending clause (8) to read as follows:

"(8) the total and the source (including governmental sources) of the contributions and gifts received by it during the year."

(3) Such section is amended by redesignating subsection (c) as subsection (d) and by adding after subsection (b) the following new subsection:

"(c) WILLFUL FAILURE TO FILE RETURN; FRAUDULENT RETURN.—Any organization which willfully fails to file the return required by subsection (a), or to furnish the information required by subsection (b), shall not be exempted from taxation for the period for which the return was required to be filed. If any person is convicted under section 7206 or 7207 with respect to a return filed or information furnished by an organization under such subsections, such organization shall not be exempted from taxation for the period for which such return or information was filed or furnished."

Sec. 2. Section 6104(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to inspection of annual information returns) is amended by striking out "6033(b)" and inserting "6033".

Sec. 3. The amendments made by this Act shall apply only with respect to the annual periods ending after the date of the enactment of this Act for which exempt organizations are required to file information returns.

H.R. 425

A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that tax-exempt organizations which voluntarily engage in litigation for the benefit of third parties, or commit other prohibited acts, shall lose their exemption from tax.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That subsection (a) (1) (A) of section 503 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to loss of exemption from taxation) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "or if it has engaged in barratry, maintenance, or champerty, voluntarily provided legal assistance to, or participated or sought to participate by intervention, as amicus curiae, or otherwise, for the benefit of any person or class other than itself, in any judicial proceeding after the date of enactment of this Act."

THE OUTLOOK FOR URBAN INDIANS

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 10, 1971

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, in a recent editorial, the Minneapolis Tribune commented on the condition of urban Indians in my district. The Tribune reported that the Indian population of Minneapolis has increased by 100 percent since 1960 but that too little has been done during this 10 year period to ease the transition between reservation and urban life.

The outlook is improving, however, now that Federal funding is expected for the construction of an Indian center and the operation of a new social services program. The Bureau of Indian Affairs could do much, I am sure, to complement these new programs if its services were made available to urban Indians. Currently, the Bureau's employment assistance and education programs, for example, are restricted to Indians living on or near reservations.

At this point, I include the Tribune editorial with my remarks:

THE OUTLOOK FOR URBAN INDIANS

The 1970 census verifies previous estimates on the increase of Indian people in Minneapolis in the past 10 years. The city's more than 7,000 Indians, a 100-percent increase since 1960, make up by far the largest concentration of Indians in the state.

The migration of Indians to the city to find jobs and a better life is not confined to Minneapolis. A recent report by the University of Minnesota Training Center for Community Programs notes a similar movement by Eskimos in Alaska and describes many of the same problems. When the Eskimos migrate from small villages to larger communities, they lose control over their personal destiny, lack adequate income to match rising expectations, find tension with whites and experience deep-seated resentments and feelings of personal inadequacy.

The growth of the Indian community in Minneapolis has not been matched by programs to ease the rural-urban transition and meet the needs of the newcomers. Sporadic attempts to provide special centers usually have failed for lack of money and commitment. But the outlook is improving. The expected federal funding of a neighborhood facility in the Model City area and a model urban Indian social-services center should assure the permanence that has been missing in past efforts. The proposed housing project in south Minneapolis also should help to alleviate that serious problem.

Although these programs are encouraging, they will provide minimal benefit if not accompanied by similar gains education and employment opportunities. The report on Alaskan Eskimos is instructive in this regard. Eskimos in the village of Kaktovik made the transition from a meager hunting and fishing economy to a nearly full employment economy—thanks to jobs in new defense installations. They did so without sacrificing their cultural values, local autonomy and social structure. The Eskimos in that case had the advantage of remaining in their native village. But the migrating urban Indians are developing self-determination and reemphasizing cultural values. They, too, can make the transition if provided the opportunities.

RESOLUTION BY LITHUANIAN-AMERICANS OF ARIZONA

HON. SAM STEIGER

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 11, 1971

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution adopted by the Lithuanian-Americans of Arizona:

RESOLUTION

We, the Lithuanian-Americans of Arizona State, assembled this 14th day of February, 1971, at UAYA Hall—730 W. Elm Street, Phoenix, to commemorate the restoration of Lithuania's independence, do hereby state as follows:

Whereas, the 16th of February, 1971, marks the 53rd Anniversary of the restoration of independence to the more than 700 year old Lithuanian State, and

Whereas, on June 15, 1940, the Soviet Union forcibly occupied and illegally annexed the independent Republic of Lithuania, which fact had been officially confirmed by the findings of the Select Committee on Communist Aggression of the House of Representatives, 83rd Congress of the United States, and

Whereas, the subjection of people to alien subjugation, domination and exploitation constitutes a denial of fundamental human rights, is contrary to the Charter of the United Nations, and is an impediment to the promotion of world peace and cooperation, and

Whereas, the Soviet Union, through a program of deportations and resettlements of peoples, continue in its efforts to change the ethnic character of the population of Lithuania and the other Baltic States, thereby committing the offense of genocide, and

Whereas, the Soviet invaders are unable to suppress the aspirations of the Lithuanian people for freedom and the exercise of their human rights, as demonstrated by 1941 uprising, 1944-1952 partisan war and as most recently by the dramatic hijacking of Soviet aircraft to Turkey by Pranas and Algirdas Brazinskas, the heroic attempt of defection by Simas Kudirka and the unsuccessful attempt of escape to Sweden by Vytautas Simokaitis and his wife, now, therefore be it

Resolved, That we again demand that the Soviet Union shall withdraw its armed forces, administrative apparatus, and the imported Russian colonists from Lithuania, thus permitting the Lithuanian people to freely exercise their sovereign rights,

That we again express our gratitude to the United States Government for the firm and unwavering position of non-recognition of the Soviet occupation and annexation of Lithuania,

That we respectfully request President Nixon to direct the attention of world opinion at the United Nations and at the other appropriate international forums on behalf of the restoration of sovereign rights to the Baltic people, which policy was recommended to the President of the United States by the House Concurrent Resolution 416 of the 89th Congress,

That, we urgently request our Government to make all possible efforts to have Simas Kudirka returned to the country with his family, if he is still alive, and

That the copies of this Resolution be mailed to President Richard M. Nixon, Secretary of State William P. Rogers, to both Senators and all the Members of Congress from our State, and to the Press.

This resolution was adopted on February 14, 1971.

WHY EXPLORE SPACE? AN EXPERT'S EXCELLENT ANSWER

HON. BOB CASEY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 11, 1971

Mr. CASEY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, many Americans, indeed some of our colleagues have questioned the wisdom of our program of exploring space when so much remains to be done here on earth.

Those who pose the question are seldom answered in a complete and factual manner. As one who has strongly supported our space program during the years I have been privileged to serve in Congress, I have been disturbed and indeed, concerned over the "soft sell" approach which the administration has taken in recent years in explaining the benefits America and the world have received from this program. Since the Manned Space Center is within the district I am privileged to represent, and since I formerly sat on the House Science and Astronautics Committee, perhaps I have a keener insight of the program than some of my colleagues and the average citizen.

Recently, a friend sent to me a reprint in which one of our outstanding space scientists answered the question "Why Explore Space?" It is the reply sent by Dr. Ernst Stuhlinger, associate director of science at the Marshall Space Flight Center, Huntsville, to the letter he received from Sister Jucunda, O.P. Sister Jucunda works among starving natives in Africa. Because I think Dr. Stuhlinger's reply is of broad general interest to my colleagues and to the American people, I include it at this point in the RECORD:

WHY EXPLORE SPACE?

Your letter was one of many which are reaching me everyday, but it has touched me more deeply than all the others because it came so much from the depth of a searching mind and a compassionate heart.

I will try to answer your question as best as I possibly can.

First, however, I would like to say what great admiration I have for you, and for all your many brave sisters, because you are dedicating your lives to the noblest cause of man: help for his fellow men who are in need.

You asked in your letter how I can suggest the expenditures of billions of dollars for a voyage to Mars, at a time when many children on this earth are starving to death.

I know that you do not expect an answer such as "Oh, I did not know that there are children dying from hunger, but from now on I will desist from any kind of space research until mankind has solved that problem!"

In fact, I have known of famined children long before I knew that a voyage to the planet Mars is technically feasible.

However, I believe, like many of my friends, that traveling to the moon and eventually to Mars and to other planets is a venture which we should undertake now. I even believe that this project, in the long run, will contribute more to the solution of these grave problems we are facing here on earth than many other potential projects of help which are debated and discussed year after year, and which are so extremely slow in yielding tangible results.

Before trying to describe in more detail how our space program is contributing to the solution of our earthy problems, I would like to relate briefly a true story which may help support the argument.

About 400 years ago, there lived a count in a small town in Germany. He was one of the benign counts and he gave a large part of his income to the poor in his town. This was much appreciated because poverty was abundant during medieval times and there were epidemics of the plague which ravaged the country frequently.

One day, the count met a strange man. He had a workbench and little laboratory in his house, and he labored hard during the daytime so that he could afford a few hours every evening to work in his laboratory.

He ground small lenses from pieces of glass; he mounted the lenses in tubes and he used these gadgets to look at very small objects. The count was particularly fascinated by the tiny creatures that could be observed with the strong magnification and which nobody had ever seen before.

He invited the man to move with his laboratory to the castle, to become a member of the count's household and to devote henceforth all his time to the development and perfection of his optical gadgets as a special employee of the count.

The townspeople, however, became angry when they realized that the count was wasting his money, as they thought, on a stunt without purpose. "We are suffering from this plague," they said, "while he is paying that man for a useless hobby!"

But the count remained firm. "I give you as much as I can afford," he said, "but I will also support this man and his work, because I know that someday something will come out of it."

Indeed, something very good came out of this work, and also out of similar work done by others at other places: the microscope. It is well known that the microscope has contributed more than any other invention to the progress of medicine and that the elimination of the plague and many other contagious diseases from most parts of the world is largely a result of studies which the microscope made possible.

The count, by retaining some of his spending money for research and discovery, contributed far more to the relief of human suffering than he could have contributed by giving all he could possibly spare to his plague-ridden community.

The situation which we are facing today is similar in many respects. The President of the United States is spending about \$200 billion in his yearly budget. This money goes to health, education, welfare, urban renewal, highways, transportation, foreign aid, defense, conservation, science, agriculture and many installations inside and outside the country.

About 1.6 per cent of this national budget was allocated to space exploration this year. The space program includes Project Apollo, and many other smaller projects in space physics, space astronomy, space biology, planetary projects, earth resources projects and space engineering.

To make this expenditure for the space program possible, the average American taxpayer with \$10,000 income per year is paying about \$30 for space.

The rest of his income, \$9,970, remains for his subsistence, his recreation, his savings, his taxes and all his other expenditures.

You will probably ask now: "Why don't you take 5 or 3 or 1 dollar out of the 30 space dollars which the average American taxpayer is paying and send these dollars to the hungry children?"

To answer this question, I have to explain briefly how the economy of this country works. The situation is very similar in other countries.

The government consists of a number of

departments (Interior; Justice; Health; Education; Welfare; Transportation; Defense; and others), and of bureaus (National Science Foundation; National Aeronautics and Space Administration and others).

All of them prepare their yearly budgets according to their assigned missions and each of them must defend its budget against extremely severe screening by congressional committees and against heavy pressure for economy from the Bureau of the Budget and the President. When the funds are finally appropriated by Congress, they can be spent only for the line items specified and approved in the budget.

The budget of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, naturally, can contain only items directly related to aeronautics and space. If this budget were not approved by Congress, the funds proposed for it would not be available for something else. They would simply not be levied from the taxpayer, unless one of the other budgets had obtained approval for a specific increase which would then absorb the funds not spent for space.

You may realize from this brief discourse that support for hungry children, or rather a support in addition to what the United States is already contributing to this very worthy cause in the form of foreign aid, can be obtained only if the appropriate department submits a budget line item for this purpose and if this line item is then approved by Congress.

You may ask now whether I personally would be in favor of such a move by our government. My answer is an emphatic yes. Indeed, I would not mind it at all if my annual taxes were increased by a number of dollars for the purpose of feeding hungry children wherever they may live. I know that all of my friends feel the same way.

However, we could not bring such a program to life merely by desisting from making plans for voyages to Mars. On the contrary, I even believe that by working for the space program I can make some contribution to the relief and eventual solution of such grave problems as poverty and hunger on earth.

Basic to the hunger problem are two functions: the production of food and the distribution of food. Food production by agriculture, cattle ranching, ocean fishing and other large scale operations is efficient in some parts of the world, but drastically deficient in many others.

For example, large areas of land could be utilized far better if efficient methods of watershed control, fertilizer use, weather forecasting, fertility assessment, plantation programming, field selection, planting habits, timing of cultivation, crop survey and harvest planning were applied.

The best tool for the improvement of all these functions, undoubtedly, is the artificial earth satellite. Circling the globe at a high altitude, it can screen wide areas of land within a short time, it can observe and measure a large variety of factors indicating the status and conditions of crops, soil, droughts, rainfall, snow cover, etc., and it can radio this information to ground stations for appropriate use.

It has been estimated that even a modest system of earth satellites equipped with earth resources sensors, working within a program for worldwide agricultural improvement, will increase the yearly crops by an equivalent of many billions of dollars.

The distribution of the food to the needy is a completely different problem. The question is not so much one of shipping volume, it is one of international cooperation.

The ruler of a small nation may feel very uneasy about the prospects of having large quantities of food shipped into his country by a large nation, simply because he fears that along with the food there may also be an import of influence and foreign power.

Efficient relief from hunger, I am afraid,

will not come before the boundaries between nations have become less dividing than they are today.

I do not believe that space flight will accomplish this miracle overnight. However, the space program is certainly among the most promising and powerful agents working in this direction.

Let me only remind you of the recent near-tragedy of Apollo 13. When the time of the crucial reentry of the astronauts approached, the Soviet Union discontinued all Russian radio transmission in the frequency bands used by the Apollo Project in order to avoid any possible interference, and the Russian ships stationed themselves in the Pacific and the Atlantic oceans in case an emergency rescue would become necessary.

Had the astronauts' capsule touched down near a Russian ship, the Russians would undoubtedly have expended as much care and effort in their rescue as if Russian cosmonauts had returned from a space trip.

If Russian space travelers should ever be in a similar emergency situation, Americans would do the same without any doubt.

Higher food production through survey and assessment from orbit, and better food distribution through improved international relations are only two examples of how profoundly the space program will impact life on earth.

I would like to quote two other examples: stimulation of technological development and generation of scientific knowledge.

The requirements for high precision and for extreme reliability which must be imposed upon the components of a moon-traveling spacecraft are entirely unprecedented in the history of engineering.

The development of systems which meet these severe requirements has provided us a unique opportunity to find new materials and methods, to invent better technical systems, to improve manufacturing procedures, to lengthen the lifetimes of instruments and even to discover new laws of nature.

All this newly acquired technical knowledge is also available for applications to earthbound technologies. Every year, about a thousand technical innovations generated in the space program find their ways into our earthly technology where they lead to better kitchen appliances and farm equipment, better sewing machines and radios, better ships and airplanes, better weather forecasting and storm warning, better communications, better medical instruments, better utensils and tools for everyday life.

Presumably, you will ask now why we must develop first a life support system for our moon-traveling astronauts, before we can build a remote-reading sensor system for heart patients.

The answer is simply: significant progress in the solution of technical problems is frequently made not by a direct approach, but by first setting a goal of high challenge which offers a strong motivation for innovative work, which fires the imagination and spurs men to expend their best efforts, and which acts as a catalyst by including chains of other reactions.

Space flight, without any doubt, is playing exactly this role. The voyage to Mars will certainly not be a direct source of food for the hunger. However, it will lead to so many new technologies and capabilities that the spinoffs from this project alone will be worth many times the cost of its implementation.

Besides the need for new technologies, there is a continuing great need for new basic knowledge in the sciences if we wish to improve the conditions of human life on earth.

We need more knowledge in physics and chemistry, in biology and physiology, and very particularly in medicine to cope with all these problems which threaten man's life: hunger, disease, contamination of food and water, pollution of the environment.

We need more young men and women who choose science as a career, and we need better support for those scientists who have the talent and the determination to engage in fruitful research work.

Challenging research objectives must be available, and sufficient support for research projects must be provided. Again, the space program with its wonderful opportunities to engage in truly magnificent research studies of moon and planets, of physics and astronomy, of biology and medicine is almost ideal catalyst which induces the reaction between the motivation for scientific work, opportunities to observe exciting phenomena of nature, and material support needed to carry out the research effort.

Among all the activities which are directed, controlled and funded by the American government, the space program is certainly the most visible, and probably the most debated activity, although it consumes only 1.6 per cent of the total national budget and 3 per mill of the gross national product.

As a stimulant and catalyst for the development of new technologies, and for research in the basic sciences, it is unparalleled by any other activity. In this respect, we may even say that the space program is taking over a function which for three or four thousand years has been the sad prerogative of wars.

How much human suffering can be avoided if nations instead of competing with their bomb-dropping fleets of airplanes and rockets, compete with their moon-traveling space ships! This competition is full of promise for brilliant victories, but it leaves no room for the bitter fate of the vanquished which breeds nothing but revenge and new wars.

Although our space program seems to lead us away from our earth and out toward the moon, the sun, the planets and the stars, I believe that none of these celestial objects will find as much attention and study by space scientists as our earth.

It will become a better earth, not only because of all the new technological and scientific knowledge which we will apply to the betterment of life, but also because we are developing a far deeper appreciation of our earth, of life, and of man.

The photograph which I enclose with this letter shows a view of our earth as seen from Apollo 8 when it orbited the moon at Christmas, 1968.

Of all the many wonderful results of the space program so far, this picture may be the most important one.

It opened our eyes to the fact that our earth is a beautiful and most precious island in an unlimited void, and that there is no other place for us to live but the thin surface layer of our planet, bordered by the bleak nothingness of space.

Never before did so many people recognize how limited our earth really is, and how perilous it would be to tamper with its ecological balance.

Ever since this picture was first published, voices have become louder and louder warning of the grave problems that confront man in our times: pollution, hunger, poverty, urban living, food production, water control, overpopulation.

It is certainly not by incident that we begin to see the tremendous tasks waiting for us at a time when the young space age has provided us the first good look at our own planet.

Very fortunately, though, the space age not only holds out a mirror in which we can see ourselves, it also provides us with the technologies, the knowledge, the challenge, the motivation, and even with the optimism to attack these tasks with confidence.

What we learn in our space program, I believe, is fully supporting what Albert Schweitzer had in mind when he said:

"I am looking at the future with concern, but with good hope."

My very best wishes will always be with you—Ernst Stuhlinger.

POSTMASTER GENERAL BLOUNT REPORTS ON POSTAL SERVICE

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 11, 1971

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, today Postmaster General Winton M. Blount and his staff appeared before our Committee on Post Office and Civil Service to report on the developments of the past year and to answer questions of Members.

The Post Office Department, as a result of the Postal Reorganization Act enacted by Congress last summer, is now undergoing transition to the U.S. Postal Service. This transition is to be completed by July 1.

In his opening statement to the committee, General Blount reported on the progress of the transition to date and of the plans ahead for the operation and improvement of the postal service.

He announced several major decisions with regard to the handling of mail and the construction of new facilities.

Mr. Speaker, as part of my remarks I include the text of General Blount's opening statement, followed by explanatory statements on three specific matters: bulk mail network, postal building program, and the postal agreement with the Army Corps of Engineers.

TESTIMONY OF POSTMASTER GENERAL WINTON M. BLOUNT BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE

Mr. Chairman: I appreciate your invitation to bring the Committee up-to-date on some of the more significant developments in the United States Postal Service since the passage of the Postal Reorganization Act last August.

The job of guiding that bill through to enactment was an exceptionally difficult one, Mr. Chairman, and I should like to take this opportunity to give public recognition to the leadership that you and your Committee displayed in this regard.

Without the strong, bi-partisan support that this Committee gave to the principle of postal reform, I seriously question whether a meaningful reform bill could have been passed in the last Congress.

The cynics who told us in May of 1969 that the 91st Congress would never respond positively to the President's appeal for total reform of the postal system made the mistake, in my opinion, of seriously misjudging the willingness of this Committee to put principle ahead of politics.

ROLE OF THE CONGRESS

The Committee's statesmanlike approach to the question of postal reorganization was particularly commendable, I think, because the Committee recognized from the outset that passage of the Act would result in major changes in the Committee's own role *vis à vis* the postal establishment.

Now that the law is on the statute books, the Committee's primary responsibility with regard to postal matters, as I understand it, will be to keep generally informed on the major activities of the Postal Service, with a view to helping insure that the public interest remains paramount. I am keenly aware of the importance of this "oversight" function, and the Committee will have my complete cooperation in the work that lies ahead.

I intend to do all I can to encourage the kind of friendly relationship we have had in the past, for without such a relationship neither the Postal Service nor this Committee is likely to be able to do the kind of job the American people are expecting.

If I may, I would like now to introduce to the Committee Lawrence C. Gayle, who was appointed Assistant Postmaster General for Personnel on January 20, 1971. Mr. Gayle came to the Post Office Department from Delta Steamship Lines of New Orleans, where he was Vice President for Operations. Prior to that time, Mr. Gayle had served as Vice President and Director of Labor Relations for the New Orleans Steamship Association and as Director of Administration for the New York Shipping Association.

Mr. Gayle has the distinction of being the first Assistant Postmaster General appointed without Senate confirmation under the new Act.

SPOKESMAN ON BARGAINING

I should also like to present to the Committee Mr. James P. Blaisdell, our spokesman in the current collective bargaining negotiations. Mr. Blaisdell has participated in the negotiation and administration of collective bargaining agreements for a wide variety of employer associations, public utilities, and shipping, mining, manufacturing and agricultural interests.

He has been assisting us for some months as a sort of "minister without portfolio" in the labor relations area, and I think that all of us—including the employee organizations—believe that it is fortunate from the standpoint of every participant in the negotiations that we have a man like Jim Blaisdell on board during this critical period.

The unions have also retained a highly professional representative, Mr. Bernard Cushman. Mr. Cushman, an alumnus of the Harvard Law School, has a reputation as an extremely able negotiator, and he will, I am sure, do an outstanding job of seeing that the interests of the bargaining unit employees are well protected at the bargaining table.

THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS

As the Committee knows, the nine Governors of the Postal Service were nominated by the President last September. The nominees include Theodore W. Braun, who heads a company by that name in California; Charles H. Coddling, Jr., who owns and operates a ranch in Foraker, Oklahoma; Patrick W. Haggerty, the Chairman of the Board and Chief Executive Officer of Texas Instruments Company, in Dallas;

Dr. Andrew D. Holt, who recently retired as President of the University of Tennessee; George E. Johnson, of Chicago, the President and Chief Executive Officer of Johnson Products Company; Frederick R. Kappel, the former Chairman of the Board of American Telephone and Telegraph Company and the man who headed, with great distinction, the President's Commission on Postal Organization;

E. T. Klassen, the former Deputy Postmaster General and former President of American Can Company, who brings to his new position a lifetime of experience in the labor relations area, as well as a keen insight into the problems of the Postal Service;

Crocker Nevin, Chairman of the Board and Chief Executive Officer of Marine Midland Grace Trust Company in New York City; and M. A. Wright, Chairman of the Board and Chief Executive Officer of Humble Oil and Refining Company.

GIVEN RECESS APPOINTMENTS

Because the Senate was not able to act on these nominations before the 91st Congress adjourned, the President gave the Governors recess appointments in January of this year. Under the Constitution, these appointments will enable the Governors to serve until the expiration of the first session of the 92nd Congress.

The Board of Governors met for the first time on January 12, 1971, and promptly began the task of familiarizing itself with the financial situation of the Postal Service and with other aspects of the postal picture. There have been three further meetings of the full Board since January 12, and various

committees of the Board have also started to function.

The Board has selected a Postmaster General and Chairman for the new organization, and has decided that the Postal Service will commence operations as an independent establishment on July 1, 1971. At that time the Post Office Department will go out of existence and the Postmaster General will leave the President's Cabinet.

SOME PROVISIONS EFFECTIVE

In keeping with the expectations of the interested Congressional Committees, the Board has also adopted a resolution putting into effect provisions of the Act that will enable the Governors to make necessary adjustments in postage rates, after proceedings before the independent Postal Rate Commission, and will enable the Post Office Department to put temporary rate changes into effect if the Rate Commission should fail, for one reason or another, to give the Governors a recommended decision on rate changes within 90 days after the Department's request for such a decision.

The independent Rate Commission—composed of five exceptionally well qualified Commissioners—has been in office for several months. The Commission has recruited a staff, published its rules of practice, and, we understand, is ready for business.

We filed our request with the Rate Commission on February 1, and published a notice in the Federal Register advising the public of the specific rate changes being suggested by the Department. The notice also alerted the public to the temporary rate changes we expect to put into effect about the middle of May if the Rate Commission has not been able to complete its work by that time.

SOME SUBSIDY CONTINUES

Without going into the details of our rate proposal at this time, I can say that the new rates will substantially reduce the flow of taxpayers' dollars out of the Treasury of the United States.

Under the Postal Reorganization Act, the taxpayers will continue to subsidize the postal system for some years to come, but we can at least look forward to a time when the only continuing subsidies will be to non-profit organizations and the blind.

Our individual customer may not be overjoyed at the prospect of paying eight cents to mail a letter, but he will still be getting one of the best bargains available in today's economy.

As this Committee fully appreciates, the wage increases recently received by Postal employees have increased our costs of operation substantially.

In addition to the wage increases that Congress granted Postal employees in 1970—increases that totaled nearly 15% and that boosted our costs of operation by \$921 million per year—the Reorganization Act required the Post Office Department to establish a new wage schedule (through collective bargaining with the unions holding national exclusive recognition rights) reducing to not more than eight years the time required for bargaining unit employees to reach the top pay step in grade.

Agreement on the terms of such a wage schedule was reached last November, and the newly "compressed" wage schedule became effective for most rank and file employees as of November 14, 1970.

CONCERN FOR MANAGEMENT TEAM

From a management standpoint, it made no sense at all for our bargaining unit employees to receive more favorable treatment than our management team (including our postmasters and supervisors) and other non-bargaining unit employees.

Unfortunately, because we still did not have a Board of Governors last November, it was not legally possible to extend equitable

treatment to our management people at that time.

One of the first orders of business of the new Board, when it finally did take office, was to implement Section 1003 of the new Title 39, as contained in the Reorganization Act, thereby giving the Post Office Department legal authority to make appropriate adjustments in the pay schedules applicable to postmasters, supervisors, and other non-bargaining unit employees.

Under this authority, I issued "Postal Service Order No. 71-1" on February 1, 1971, establishing a new "PMS Schedule" that will enable most postmasters and supervisors to reach the top pay step in their respective grades after seven years of satisfactory service.

The order also provided for a "one-time equalization payment" designed to put our management people in as good a financial position as they would have been in if it had been possible to adopt the new PMS schedule on November 14.

APPOINTING OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES

The Board of Governors has also implemented 39 U.S.C. §1001, thereby enabling the Postal Service (or the Post Office Department, prior to July 1) to appoint officers and employees in the Postal Career Service.

This provision—which applies to the appointment of postmasters as well as other officers and employees—will enable us to modify the residence requirements that previously applied to candidates for appointment to postmaster positions.

Under regulations that will become effective on April 1, 1971, consideration will be given to postal employees, in accordance with the following guidelines, and without regard to residence:

First, for postmaster jobs at the PMS 16 level (\$19,589–\$25,469 per year), or above, any postal employee will be eligible for consideration regardless of where he is currently working;

Second, for lower grade postmaster jobs, any postal employee will be eligible for consideration provided that for the six months preceding his appointment he has worked in the postal region where the office is located, in the case of PMS 14 and 15 jobs; or in the state in which the office is located, in the case of PMS 9 through 13 jobs; or in the Postal Sectional Center where the office is located, in the case of PMS 6 through 8 jobs.

SELECTING POSTMASTERS

For postmaster jobs below the PMS 16 level (\$19,589–\$25,469), initial consideration will be given to employees in the post office where the vacancy occurs, in the case of first-, second-, or third-class post offices. The regulations will permit the area of consideration to be expanded when the Postmaster General finds that such an expansion is in the interest of the Postal Service.

Similarly, consideration may be given to individuals who are not postal employees, where the Postmaster General finds that this would be in the interest of the Postal Service, provided that such individuals have actually resided for six months within the work area applicable to employee candidates for the postmastership in question.

Postmasters at fourth-class offices will be selected from among people who have actually resided within the delivery area served by the post office, or the city or town where it is located, for at least six months.

The Committee may also be interested in a report on our progress to date in filling the substantial backlog of vacant postmasterships that has been building up over the past several years.

Under section 13 of the Reorganization Act, which empowered the Postmaster General to appoint postmasters at offices of all classes without Senate confirmation, a total of 1014

career postmasters have been appointed since last November.

4700 POSTMASTER VACANCIES

We still have approximately 4700 vacancies to fill, and I expect that this backlog will have been substantially disposed of by the time the Postal Service commences operations next July.

Turning now to our plans for the future, I have been concerned, as I know this Committee has been, about the fact that our antiquated physical plant and our outmoded organizational structure have made it increasingly difficult for us to provide the kind of service that our customers want, at prices that they can afford to pay.

The problems we face in this regard are monumental; obviously, it will take years to solve them. We are going to solve them, however, and I expect that our customers are going to enjoy very substantial long range benefits as a result of the planning now under way in the Postal Service.

One of our major problems in the past, as I need hardly tell the Committee, has been in our handling of packages. We have been trying for years to process "bulk mail"—i.e., parcels and sacks containing circulars, magazines, and the like—in the same facilities where we handle letter mail.

LETTER-PARCEL MIX CHAOTIC

In many areas, the result has been chaotic; the time within which both letters and packages are delivered has varied far more than it should, and, because of inadequate facilities, the damage rate for parcels has been simply appalling.

After intensive study, we have concluded that a major breakthrough can be achieved by constructing a network of separate facilities, specifically designed for efficient handling of parcels and sacks of non-preferential second and third class mail.

The construction of these bulk mail facilities will enable existing post offices to concentrate on important letter mail, and, when the system is fully operational, will permit us to handle parcels with far less breakage and with much greater dependability in terms of delivery time.

Attached to the copies of my prepared statement that you and the members of the Committee have before you, Mr. Chairman, are reproductions of the "National Bulk Mail System" briefing charts that Mr. Carlin will, with your permission, now help me review.

BULK MAIL NETWORK

As the chart shows, the separate bulk mail network will consist of 21 major facilities (the first of which is already under construction in the New York City area) and twelve satellite facilities. We expect to have the entire system—all 33 units—in full operation during fiscal year 1975.

Construction of this bulk mail network will, we believe, enable us to operate the postal system for about \$310 million a year less than it would cost us if we continued to do business the way we are today. In other words, on the basis of 1971 costs, we expect to save more than \$310 million a year once the system is in operation.

The volume of mail is steadily rising, of course, and some of our costs may rise too; I am not suggesting, therefore, that our total 1975 costs will be \$310 million less than our total 1971 costs; what I am saying is that our 1975 costs will be \$310 million less than they would be if we did not build the system.

The total investment required to construct and equip the network of bulk mail facilities, thereby permitting us to realize these savings, is estimated at less than one billion dollars—and this estimate takes into account the fact that construction costs may go up between now and the time when the last contract is awarded.

RETURN ON INVESTMENT

As the Committee can see, that's a pretty good investment; even if mail volume did not increase at all, the investment would produce a return of almost 25% per year, calculated on a 1971 cost base. There aren't many banks that pay their depositors that kind of interest!

The next chart shows the "product lines" that will be processed in the bulk mail facilities. These product lines include parcel post and other fourth class mail; sacks of third class mail, such as circulars, catalogs, and "small parcels and rolls"; and sacks or bundles of second class periodical publications that do not have the time value that newspapers or news magazines have.

Turning to the next chart, we see that the annual volume of second class mail handled in the bulk mail network will be about 50 million sacks—or more than six billion individual pieces each year.

More than 60 million sacks of third class mail will be handled, and more than one billion pieces of fourth class mail.

The next chart shows the locations of the 21 major bulk mail facilities together with the twelve service facilities.

PROPOSED BULK MAIL UNITS

As the Committee can see we expect to locate a BMF at Springfield, Massachusetts, with an auxiliary facility in Portland, Maine, New York and Pittsburgh will have BMF's, and there will be a service facility in Buffalo.

Following on down the chart, there will be BMF's in Philadelphia, Washington, Greensboro, Atlanta and Jacksonville, with a service facility in Miami. Memphis will have a BMF, and New Orleans a service facility. Cincinnati, Detroit and Minneapolis are to have BMF's, and there will be a satellite facility in Bismarck.

There will be a BMF in Chicago and a service facility in Milwaukee. BMF's will be located in St. Louis, Kansas City, Des Moines and Dallas, with service facilities at Houston and Oklahoma City. Denver will have a BMF, and Billings, Salt Lake City and Albuquerque will all have service facilities.

BMF's will be located in Los Angeles, San Francisco and Seattle, and there will be a service facility in Phoenix, Arizona.

The next chart shows the number of days within which the Post Office Department is now able to deliver designated percentages of fourth class parcels addressed to locations within the same local area in which they are mailed.

(The "intra SCF" in the caption refers to movements entirely within the area served by a single sectional center facility. There are 553 section centers throughout the United States.

PROPOSE 64 PERCENT ONE-DAY DELIVERY

While almost 64% of these local parcel movements are completed within one day after mailing, the curve flattens out very quickly thereafter.

Only 85% of the local parcels are delivered within three days after mailing, and when we get out to seven days, we find that only about 95% of local addressed parcels are delivered within a week.

The next chart shows what kind of job we are presently doing with respect to 95% of the parcels mailed between the representative cities named in the matrix. Starting with Springfield, Massachusetts, we find that we have to wait as long as six days before we can say that 95% of all the packages mailed in Springfield and addressed to people right in Springfield have been delivered.

We have to wait ten days, similarly before 95% of all packages mailed in Springfield and addressed to New York City have been delivered. Going down to the end of that column, it takes more than 16 days before

95% of the packages mailed in Springfield to Seattle, Washington, have been delivered.

Moving over to the opposite end of the chart, we find that it takes eleven days before we can say we have delivered 95% of the parcels mailed in San Francisco and addressed to people in that same city. In my book, that's pretty bad service.

IMPROVED SERVICE EXPECTED

As the next chart shows, we expect to be doing a little better by the time the bulk mail system is fully operational. Within the next four years, 95% of all parcels mailed in San Francisco to San Francisco addressees should be delivered within two days, rather than the present eleven days. 95% of all packages mailed in Springfield, Massachusetts, to Springfield addressees, similarly, will be delivered within two days, while 95% of all packages mailed from Springfield, Massachusetts, to Seattle, Washington, will be delivered within seven days, rather than the 16 or more days it takes now.

In addition to this rather dramatic improvement in our ability to deliver most parcels within a reasonable time frame—and to do so for substantially less money than it would cost us simply to maintain today's unacceptable service levels if the bulk mail network were not built—the modern materials-handling methods employed in the bulk mail system should result in a far lower incidence of damage to the parcels that the American people entrust to our care.

Trying to process bulk mail and letter mail in the same overcrowded facilities, as we have been doing for years, is like trying to manufacture tractors and sportscars on the same assembly line.

You can do it, but you can't do it very fast and you can't do it very well. It's time for a change—and the change I have described is going to make it possible for us to deliver a better product at a better price than we'd be charging for the old product if there were no change.

HANDLING LETTER MAIL

In addition to the bulk mail network, we expect to start work in fiscal year 1972 on 23 major postal facilities devoted to handling of letters and other preferential mail. Cost estimates for these 23 facilities are not yet complete.

For the Postal Service itself to build and equip all the projected new facilities would obviously require a dramatic expansion in our existing capabilities. As one who has some familiarity with the construction industry, I am convinced that this would be a wasteful and inefficient move.

Fortunately, the Corps of Engineers of the Department of the Army already has a large, experienced and extremely capable construction team in being, and after months of preparation we have worked out an arrangement whereby the Corps, acting under overall policy guidance from the Postal Service, will select and acquire the sites for the new buildings, furnish necessary architect and engineer services, award and supervise the construction and mechanization contracts, and deliver the completed facilities to the Postal Service on schedule.

I think I can promise the Committee that, despite the size of this construction program, it's no longer going to take us nine years to get our postal facilities off the drawing board and into production.

THE ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE

Just as important as the modernization of our physical plant is the modernization of our organizational structure. The Postal Reorganization Act provides the basic charter for a well-managed, non-political, service-oriented enterprise capable of doing the job that needs to be done in the years ahead.

Obviously, it is up to the Postal Service to take full advantage of the opportunity

thus presented, and to make the most productive use of its resources so as to best serve the interests of its customers. Intensive study is now being given to the question of how our organizational structure can be improved, so that we will be in a position to achieve that end.

I have every hope that whatever organizational changes these studies show to be desirable can, in large part, be implemented by next July, when the Postal Service takes over from the Post Office Department.

Our future prospects are truly exciting. Just over the horizon, for example, lie new techniques that will enable us to sort and distribute the growing volume of letter mail far more quickly than we are able to today, and at a far lower unit cost than that which would be incurred if we continued to use traditional sorting techniques.

Each and every person now employed in the Postal Service will, I believe, have a chance to help attain a goal that has not heretofore been attainable—the goal of providing America a truly excellent postal system. One of the things that makes America great, I think, is the traditional determination of its people to excel in whatever they do. We are more fortunate than we know in having the kind of people that we have in the American postal system; given the means, I am convinced that they will be able to make our postal system the envy of the world.

This completes my prepared statement, Mr. Chairman, and I should be happy to respond to any questions the Committee may have.

BULK MAIL NETWORK

The United States Postal Service is implementing a \$950 million nationwide Bulk Mail Network that will reduce operating costs by over \$300 million a year when it is fully operational. The network, scheduled for completion by the end of 1975, will consist of 21 highly mechanized Bulk Mail Centers (BMC's) and 12 Auxiliary Service Facilities (ASF's).

The system will centralize the handling of parcel post and some second- and third-class mail in separate facilities and will provide more efficient sorting of these mail categories. Additionally, space now being used to process such mail in existing postal facilities will become available for processing letter mail more expeditiously.

The first Bulk Mail Center, which will service New York City, is already under construction at Jersey City, New Jersey, and is scheduled for occupancy in 1973.

PROPOSED BULK MAIL UNITS

Funds have been allocated for construction of other Bulk Mail Centers in the following locations:

Fiscal Year 1971 Funds—Atlanta, Georgia; Chicago, Illinois; Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania; Los Angeles, California; Washington, D.C.; Dallas-Ft. Worth, Texas; Minneapolis-St. Paul, Minnesota.

Fiscal Year 1972 Funds—Jacksonville, Florida; Kansas City, Missouri; St. Louis, Missouri; Philadelphia, Pennsylvania; Seattle, Washington; Springfield, Massachusetts; Memphis, Tennessee.

Tentative plans call for similar facilities to be constructed in the following additional locations—Cincinnati, Ohio; Detroit, Michigan; San Francisco, California; Denver, Colorado; Greensboro, North Carolina; Omaha, Nebraska.

An estimated annual volume of over one billion pieces of parcel post and over 20 billion pieces of second- and third-class mail will be channeled through the new system. The typical Bulk Mail Center will operate for 16 hours a day and is designed to control the input of mail to eliminate volume peaks.

Processing capabilities of the facilities will be determined in accordance with the ex-

pected mail volume within the geographic area serviced by the given facility.

The Bulk Mail Centers will be high-volume, fully mechanized installations supported by low-volume auxiliary service facilities with less mechanized equipment.

ROLE OF AUXILIARY UNITS

Auxiliary facilities will sort originating parcels for their own service areas and to other volume mail centers. In general, existing postal installations will be modified to serve as these auxiliary facilities.

The Postal Service will apply specially developed service, operating and design criteria to significantly reduce the average time required to deliver long haul parcel post. The emphasis from a service standpoint will be consistent, reliable, damage-free service in a reasonable time period. In order to achieve these goals, it will be required that all parcel post be ZIP Coded by the customers.

Construction of the facilities and associated mechanization will be based on two or three standard designs. However, due to the anticipated volume and sortation requirements, specially designed facilities are being planned for New York and Chicago.

In general, the type to be used at a particular location will be determined by the area mail volume and distribution patterns.

STANDARDIZED SYSTEM

Such a standardized system concept will significantly reduce design and procurement time to allow faster implementation of the system. This will also permit production ordering of equipment which should result in significant cost reduction.

Equipment to be installed in the facilities will include high speed parcel sorters capable of sorting fourth-class parcels at the rate of 160 parcels per minute. The present sortation equipment is capable of operating at the acceptance rate of 45 to 60 parcels per minute.

Each sorter will be equipped with mechanized induction units which will automatically feed parcels onto the high speed sorters.

An automatic container unloading system, developed by the U.S. Postal System, will be utilized in each facility. This system automatically unloads parcels and sacks onto conveyor systems which transfer them without manual assistance to designated sorting areas.

Careful attention is being given to working conditions in these highly mechanized plants. The objective is to significantly improve environmental conditions for the Postal Service employees.

The new facilities will contain the best security provisions for the protection of the mails. New electronic surveillance systems as well as direct visual observation will be incorporated in the plant designs.

Great emphasis is being placed on reducing damage to mail to an insignificant level. The equipment designs are being critically reviewed to assure appropriate damage elimination design practices.

POSTAL BUILDING PROGRAM

The Postal Service intends to build 30 major postal buildings, including 23 preferential mail facilities and seven Bulk Mail Centers, under the fiscal 1972 budget.

The list of facilities is tentative because evolving mail-handling concepts and availability of existing buildings may necessitate changes in projects.

The 30 facilities, with their cost estimates where available, include:

Preferential Mail Facilities—Albany, New York (\$11,664,000); Amarillo, Texas (\$4,453,000); Billings, Montana (\$3,850,000); Brooklyn, New York (\$29,536,000); Columbus, Georgia (\$3,957,000); Hartford, Connecticut (\$7,347,000); Honolulu, Hawaii (\$9,736,000); Jackson, Michigan (cost estimate being developed); John F. Kennedy Airport Mail Facility, New York (\$28,633,000); Little Rock,

Arkansas (\$7,850,000); Madison, Wisconsin (\$6,875,000); Manchester, New Hampshire (\$4,181,000).

Missoula, Montana (cost estimate being developed); Montgomery, Alabama (\$4,718,000); Oshkosh, Wisconsin (cost estimate being developed); Rapid City, South Dakota (\$2,537,000); Reno, Nevada (\$3,488,000); Salem, Oregon (\$2,840,000); Shreveport, Louisiana (\$5,750,000); Syracuse, New York (\$9,337,000); Waterloo, Iowa (\$3,506,000); Wichita, Kansas (\$6,161,000); Youngstown, Ohio (\$4,117,000).

Bulk Mail Centers—Jacksonville, Florida (\$13,600,000); Kansas City, Missouri (cost estimate being developed); Philadelphia, Pennsylvania (cost estimate being developed); St. Louis, Missouri (cost estimate being developed); Seattle, Washington (\$8,160,000); Springfield, Massachusetts \$13,600,000; Memphis, Tennessee (cost estimate being developed).

OTHER FACILITIES PLANNED

The construction plan also calls for two other major facilities to be built by private capital and leased to the Postal Service: a new mail handling facility for the city of Louisville, Kentucky, to be located at the Louisville airport, and a new mail facility to be located on the Dallas and Fort Worth, Texas, regional airport.

Several hundred smaller postal facilities also will be built under the leased construction program in fiscal 1972. Regional officials will announce decisions on these projects throughout the budget year.

The Postal Service has developed a new concept for specialized handling of bulk mail (periodicals, advertising, circulars, parcel post) and preferential mail (first-class, some newspapers and magazines, air mail). This approach has several advantages:

First, a greater degree of mechanization is possible.

Second, sites in less crowded fringe areas can be selected for facilities.

Third, high grade, industrial type buildings can be erected, rather than structures that are more appropriate to business areas.

AREA MAIL PROCESSING

The building program reflects another new concept being used by the Postal Service called Area Mail Processing.

The principal idea behind Area Mail Processing is that larger facilities equipped with major mail-handling machines which could not be justified for small-volume post offices will process mail brought in from surrounding areas. Modern, high-speed equipment is costly, and its use is most efficient when a concentrated mail volume permits operation of the machinery for a larger part of the working day.

A highly mechanized experimental letter sorting project also is being conducted in Cincinnati, Ohio. The project relies on encoding, a system whereby a code is put on an envelope so that it can be read by machines.

The result of this and other test programs probably will require adjustments to the postal facility program, so that a particular area serves most efficiently in regional or national plans for moving the mail.

Some changes have already occurred since the President's 1972 budget submission. At that time, the postal public building program was estimated at \$217,800,000. This estimate was prepared for the construction of 26 postal facilities. Since the budget was released, the Postal Service has identified the need for seven additional facilities, deleted two of the proposed 26 and advanced one to the fiscal 1971 program.

Thus, current planning for the fiscal 1972 program includes 30 projects. Cost estimates have been developed for 23; estimates for four bulk and three preferential facilities will be developed when planning has been completed.

POSTAL AGREEMENT WITH ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS

The U.S. Postal Service plans to use the full capabilities of the Army Corps of Engineers in carrying forward a large-scale modernization of American post offices and mail facilities.

The arrangement was worked out between Postmaster General Winton M. Blount and Secretary of Defense Melvin R. Laird as an alternative to increasing Postal Service manpower to handle the large construction program.

Under the new joint agreement signed today by Secretary of the Army Stanley R. Resor, the Army engineers will select and acquire sites, design new facilities and supervise construction, inspection and acceptance of new buildings.

"One of the keys to improving the mail service is a more up-to-date postal plant built around sophisticated, high-speed mail handling equipment," Mr. Blount said. "Congress recently authorized the Postal Service to undertake a modernization program which would make this possible."

PROVIDE NEW EFFICIENCY

For the Postal Service alone to execute the program would require temporary addition to the staff of many types of personnel.

Use of the Corps is expected to bring a new degree of efficiency to the construction program of the Postal Service. Swifter completion of planned facilities will hold down costs and make possible earlier occupancies, thus improving mail service.

The Corps of Engineers in the past has rendered similar service to other executive agencies, most recently involving facilities for NASA's Manned Space Program.

The Corps already has become active in major postal projects by taking over supervision of construction of facilities at Kearney, New Jersey; Memphis, Tennessee; St. Louis, Missouri; Baltimore, Maryland; Jersey City, New Jersey, and assuming responsibility for design of Walkiki Station in Honolulu, Hawaii.

A TRIBUTE TO THE LATE HENRY ROGERS

HON. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 11, 1971

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, wide admiration of his high principled endeavors compels me to notify my colleagues in the Federal legislature and, through you, the American public of the untimely death on Tuesday, March 2, 1971, of Henry Rogers of Detroit, Mich.

Mr. Rogers, who died at the young age of 38, was a talented building architect and one of Detroit's most dedicated equal rights leaders. He was a tireless crusader for the participation of a rightful number of black workers in the construction trades. Moreover, as the chief planner for several neighborhood rehabilitation projects, he was devoted to making the city of Detroit a happier and healthier center of urban life.

Through the contributions of the late Henry Rogers, the people of Detroit have a clear blueprint from which to erect an environment of social and economic harmony. His deeds deserve not just to be

remembered, but to be engineered into complete realities for local and national good.

A WORKERS PLEA TO CONGRESS

HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 11, 1971

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, foreign imports of leather and vinyl footwear products continue to take their toll of American jobs. Last week, alone, in my State of New Hampshire, some 50 employees of a firm in Portsmouth were sent home from their work. The plant at which these workers had labored to earn a living has closed its doors "temporarily" in the hope that something will soon be done to stop the increasingly harmful importing of shoes and shoe products produced abroad under a wage system with which industry in this country just cannot compete.

In the last 2 years when imports have registered a virtual runaway percentage of the American market, New Hampshire has seen 12 major factories close and 13,150 American jobs lost. Every indication is that 1971 will be yet another year of lower shoe business for New England producers. This situation must stop.

Congress should act immediately on orderly marketing legislation—not to completely cut off imports—but to require a limitation of imports to a base period—1967-68—in which foreign sources had a considerable but not excessive share of the marketplace. Not so in 1970.

For the readers of the RECORD, I am including three articles which paint a bleak situation already in existence in New England in terms of jobs being exported. One is an article appearing in the March 3 issue of the Portsmouth, N.H., Herald entitled "Welpro, Inc. Still Hopes To Resume." Another is a March 6 article appearing in the State Edition of the Manchester, N.H., Union-Leader entitled "New Hampshire Shoe Outlook Worsens." And, the third is a statistical compilation, with explanation, published on March 5 by the New England Footwear Association located in Boston, Mass.:

[From the Portsmouth (N.H.) Herald, Mar. 3, 1971]

WELPRO, INC. STILL HOPES TO RESUME

The Portsmouth shoe firm Welpro, Inc., has closed the doors of its Lafayette Road plant, but one of the owners said today it's hoped the shutdown will be temporary.

The plant sent home its 50 employees, two-thirds of whom were women, Monday because of the sagging retail market aggravated by foreign imports and the business recession. Stanley Barr, president, said from the parent company in Seabrook today, "It's temporary, we hope, but because of the uncertainties in the shoe industry we're not sure what will happen."

"We'll leave the plant basically intact and hope something will develop. We should know within a couple of months."

The firm has employed up to 95 personnel during the period of just under five years it's been open.

Welpro started in May 1966, using machinery that uses a welding process, that virtually eliminates stitching in shoe manufacture.

[From the Manchester (N.H.) Union Leader, Mar. 6, 1971]

INDUSTRY EXPERT REPORTS NEW HAMPSHIRE SHOE OUTLOOK WORSENS

The shoe industry in New Hampshire faces further declines in employment and output in 1971 because of an alarming increase in imports of foreign footwear, reports Maxwell Field, executive vice president of the New England Footwear Association, in his annual review of conditions in the shoe industry in New England.

The foreign competition affects New Hampshire more so than most shoe states, Field said, "because women's shoes account for over 50 per cent of all shoes produced in New Hampshire."

Referring to Manchester, Field said:

"Manchester, as the leading shoe city in the state, with 4,300 shoeworkers employed last January, is also adversely affected by rising imports totals. For, it, too, has a large concentration of women's shoe operations."

Field states that the shoe manufacturing is the No. 1 industry in New Hampshire. Not only is it the largest employer of labor in the state, but it is the major industry in most of the 20-odd cities and towns where shoe plants are operating today.

He went on:

"In January, 1971, there were only 13,000 shoeworkers employed in the state and this represents a drop of 10 per cent from the 14,650 workers in January, 1970. These figures were prepared by the N.H. Department of Employment Security.

"Compare these figures with the totals for 1968 when 56 shoe factories were listed with total employment of 18,000 workers.

"The sharp decline in employment in New Hampshire's major industry—footwear—from 1968 through 1970 is accounted for in major part by the fact that 12 shoe factories ceased operations and 13,150 workers lost their jobs.

"ALARMING INCREASES

"New Hampshire's shoe industry, unfortunately, will witness lower operations and employment in 1971. This unfavorable situation is largely due to alarming increases in imports of foreign footwear. And it affects New Hampshire more so than most shoe states because women's shoes account for over 50 per cent of all shoes produced in New Hampshire.

"The rate of foreign shoes imported into this country has been steadily increasing at alarming rates every year during the Sixties and is continuing into the Seventies.

"It reached the highest level ever in 1970, to the astounding total of 235 million pairs of imports of leather and vinyl (non-rubber) footwear. This was equal to fully 42 per cent of U.S. shoe production of 560 million pairs produced last year and 30 per cent of the total U.S. market supply for footwear.

"For 1971, we forecast total U.S. footwear imports (non-rubber) will soar to 280 million pairs, equal to 50 per cent of domestic production.

"Only quota legislation limiting imports in future years to reasonable levels, as proposed consistently for over 10 years by leaders in our industry, can stave off further factory closings and loss of jobs in New Hampshire's leading industry. This requires positive action both by members of Congress and the administration.

"The year 1971 is the year of decision for such legislation."

His forecast for the other two New England shoe states, Massachusetts and Maine, are in a similar vein.

IMPORTS—JANUARY 1971

Imports of Leather and Vinyl footwear are off to a lightning start with a total of 28,925,000 pairs entering this country in January—a 30% increase over January 1970.

The f.o.b. value of this footwear was \$57,677,900, which registered a 36% increase over January 1970. It seems that imports are no longer as cheap as they used to be. Not only are the pairs pouring in, but they are pouring in at a greater expense. The year 1970 saw a 28% increase in value. Cheap vinyl footwear increased 38% in value from 1969 to 1970. Leather footwear, which totaled 120,000,000 pairs in 1970, increased 25% in value from 1969 to 1970.

Our estimate for 1971 imports is now placed at 282,000,000 pairs. The question now, in light of the January figures is: Could imports for 1971 go higher than that?

TOTAL IMPORTS OF OVER-THE-FOOT FOOTWEAR

[Thousand pairs; thousand dollars]

Type of footwear	January 1971			Average monthly, 1970		
	Pairs	Value	Average value per pair	Pairs	Value	Average value per pair
Leather and vinyl—total	28,094.7	\$56,952.2	\$2.03	18,619.8	\$44,303.6	\$2.38
Leather, exclusive slippers	14,203.3	44,446.3	3.13	9,970.0	35,628.0	3.57
Mens, youths, boys	3,521.3	14,703.4	4.18	2,788.6	12,624.5	4.53
Womens and misses	9,495.8	27,508.8	2.90	6,328.4	21,055.1	3.33
Childrens, infants	916.1	1,326.9	1.45	561.9	850.2	1.51
Moccasins	31.4	39.7	1.26	44.7	51.4	1.15
Other leather (includes work and athletic)	238.7	867.5	3.63	246.4	1,046.8	4.25
Slippers	6.7	21.8	3.25	26.1	67.4	2.58
Vinyl supported uppers	13,884.7	12,484.1	.90	8,623.7	8,608.3	1.00
Mens and boys	2,077.1	2,425.2	1.17	1,355.4	1,799.1	1.33
Womens and misses	10,570.2	9,080.5	.86	6,440.7	6,146.4	.95
Childrens and infants	1,111.0	869.5	.78	695.6	569.6	.82
Soft soles	126.4	108.9	.86	132.1	93.2	.71

TOTAL IMPORTS OF OVER-THE-FOOT FOOTWEAR—Continued

Type of footwear	January 1971			Average monthly, 1970		
	Pairs	Value	Average value per pair	Pairs	Value	Average value per pair
Other nonrubber types—Total.....	830.	\$725.7	\$.87	\$1,012.2	\$1,458.1	\$1.44
Wood.....	79.4	199.9	2.52	324.3	829.9	2.56
Fabric uppers.....	521.2	381.9	.73	504.6	506.1	.84
Other, not elsewhere specified.....	230.0	143.9	.63	83.2	122.1	1.47
Nonrubber footwear—Total.....	28,925.3	57,677.9	1.99	19,632.0	45,761.7	2.33
Rubber soled fabric upper.....	4,596.1	4,971.7	1.08	3,983.9	3,758.2	.94
Grand total—All types.....	33,521.4	62,649.6	1.87	23,615.9	49,519.9	2.10

Note: Details may not add up due to rounding. Figures do not include imports of waterproof rubber footwear, zories, and slipper socks. Rubber soled fabric upper footwear includes non-American selling price types.

MILITARY MANPOWER PROCUREMENT IN THE 19TH CENTURY

HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 11, 1971

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, not until the Civil War did our Nation choose to impose a system of national conscription. And the system proved to be selective, inequitable, and divisive. According to a study prepared for the Gates Commission by Mr. Jack Rafuse:

Both North and South had to suspend *habeas corpus* in connection with draft protests, so that the infringement of one liberty led directly to the removal of a legal right. Bounties and substitutes played a large part in recruiting. These monetary incentives seem to have played a considerably larger part than the draft in providing men. The great majority of troops throughout the war were volunteers; "draft pressure" matters little because of exemption, commutation and substitution (and only a relatively small number were hired substitutes). Only 2 percent of the Union Army was conscripted.

The Spanish American War, of course, was fought with an all-volunteer force. The historical tradition of voluntarism, and the disruptive impact of the draft, are important factors to consider in our present deliberation on the all-volunteer force. I commend this item to your attention:

UNITED STATES' EXPERIENCE WITH VOLUNTEER AND CONSCRIPT FORCES

PART THREE: THE CIVIL WAR AND THE SPANISH AMERICAN WAR

Civil War: Mass voluntarism and conscription

(By John L. Rafuse)

The next time the United States considered conscription it was enacted. After the end of the Mexican War, there was little change in the size of the Army and the United States was unprepared for war in 1861. At the outbreak of the Civil War the Regular (Union) Army totalled about 15,215 officers and men. The authorized strength of the Regular Army at that time was 16,400 officers and men. That small force was incapable of suppressing a rebellion of great magnitude. It was small, widely dispersed through the West, untrained for large scale operations, and commanded by old men.

The militia remained, in theory, but it had deteriorated over the years and by 1861 existed only on paper—some of the rosters had not been updated for 25 years. For all practical purposes, then, Union and Confederacy started even in military manpower in 1861.

When Sumter was fired upon, Lincoln tried the militia. He called for 75,000, 3-month volunteers to supplement the Union Army, but by the Battle of Bull Run (July 20), most of the enlistees were marching home, their obligation completed. Next the Regular Army was increased, and an army of volunteers called for. The government could not feed, clothe or outfit all the 700,000, 3-year volunteers who responded.¹ It was totally unprepared to re-

Footnotes at end of article.

act. A sudden swelling of the forces required the government to choose between sending men to go into battle unprepared, or holding them out of battle at the start of a war. The key to flexibility, then, is preparedness and force size relative to a threat. It has little or nothing to do with the method of recruitment, as demonstrated by the Civil War flood of volunteers.

Recruitment was suspended, then halted "permanently" (April 3, 1862). Two months later a new call for 300,000 volunteers was filled. By July 17, 1862, Congress passed a Militia Act enabling the President to levy militia quotas on the states. The quotas were to be filled through either voluntarism or draft of 18-45 year olds. Another act, approved the same day, reduced to one year the residence requirement for citizenship for aliens honorably discharged from the Union Army. At least 20 percent of the Union's enlisted men during the war were foreign-born.² These were men for whom the compensations of military service were relatively high, and who volunteer for that reason.

The Militia Act was not true national conscription; it was more reminiscent of the Revolution than of later wars. The system provided for substitutes and local bounties and ended volunteer recruitment. When it was greeted by widespread resistance and rioting, Lincoln suspended *habeas corpus* and 13,000 resisters were imprisoned. Militia draft bounties and substitutes pay ended other voluntarism and helped pave the way for the next step—the national conscription law.³

It is often stated that conscription was used during the Civil War because voluntarism had failed. The record does not support such a statement. Table 4 enumerates Union calls, quotas, and respondents during the Civil War.

TABLE 4.—NUMBER OF MEN CALLED FOR, PERIODS OF SERVICE, QUOTAS,¹ AND NUMBER FURNISHED UNDER EACH CALL DURING THE CIVIL WAR

Date of call or proclamation	Number called for	Periods of service	Quotas assigned	Number obtained	Date of call or proclamation	Number called for	Periods of service	Quotas assigned	Number obtained
Total ²	2,942,748		2,759,049	2,690,401	Aug. 4, 1862.....	300,000	9 months.....	334,835	87,588
Apr. 15, 1861.....	75,000	3 months.....	73,391	93,326	Total.....				1,342,110
May 3, 1861, volunteers.....	42,034	3 years.....	611,827	714,231	June 15, 1863.....	100,000	6 months.....	467,434	16,361
May 3, 1861, regulars.....	22,714	do.....			Oct. 17, 1863.....	300,000	3 years.....		374,807
May 3, 1861, seamen.....	18,000	do.....			Feb. 1, 1864.....	200,000	do.....		186,981
July 22 and 25, 1861.....	500,000	do.....			Mar. 14, 1864.....	200,000	3 years.....	85,000	100 days.....
May and June 1862.....		3 months.....		15,007	Apr. 23, 1864.....	85,000	1, 2, and 3 years.....	346,746	384,882
Total.....				822,564	July 18, 1864.....	500,000	do.....	290,000	204,568
July 2, 1862.....	300,000	3 years.....	334,835	431,958	Dec. 18, 1864.....	300,000	do.....		
					Totals.....	2,942,748		2,759,049	2,690,401

¹ Provost Marshal General, "Final Report Made to the Secretary of War" (Washington, 1866), app., pt. 1, p. 160.

² The totals derived from different official records vary appreciably even in the Report of the Provost Marshal General. As in other wars, short-term militiamen frequently reenlisted making accurate personnel accounting impossible. Based on this table, if all enlistments were reduced to a 3-year standard, the estimated total enrollment in the Union Army is approximately 2,325,000, but many of that number were reenlistments. The number of individuals who served was probably close to half the 2,700,000 shown. (Thomas L. Livermore, "Numbers and Losses in the Civil War in America: 1861-1865" sets the 3-year figure at 1,556,678 for the Union and 1,082,119 for the Confederacy.)

³ Includes 86,724 paid commutations, excluding 63,322 men furnished at various times for various periods of service.

⁴ Upton, op. cit., p. 257 states that "By Jan. 1, 1863, the Army attained a maximum of only 25,436, which was less than 3 percent of the total force then in the field." During the entire war he puts the percentage of regulars to total troops at 3 percent saying, "Give men a choice between regulars volunteers, and militia, and they will invariably select the organization whose laxity of discipline is greatest."

⁵ Includes 35,883 men raised and 52,288 paid commutations (July 1863 draft).

Through May and June, 1862 calls of 685,000 were easily met and exceeded, as 822,500 men enlisted, 714,000 of them for three years. These men were unaffected by draft pressure. Further, calls through August, 1862, brought a total of 1,334,210 enlistments, 1,146,189 of which were for three years. These numbers of long-term enlistments seem even larger when considered relative to the population base. Table 5 compares the total number of males in the 18-45 age group in 1861-62 with equivalent figures for 1960, 1970, and 1975 and show proportionate force levels based on Civil War voluntarism.

TABLE 5.—MALE POPULATION BY YEAR AND LONG-TERM VOLUNTEERS

Year	Population		Long-term volunteers	
	Ages, 18 to 45	Year	Ages, 18 to 45	Year
1861-62 (Union)	5,018,000	1861-62	714,231	1861-62
1960	31,736,000	1960	4,456,800	1960
1970	36,974,000	1970	5,313,450	1970
1975	37,633,000	1975	5,408,150	1975

On February 9, 1863, the Senate national conscription bill was introduced; on February 16 and 17 it was debated and passed; the House debated and passed it from February 23rd to 25th. On February 28th the final version was passed, and on March 3rd Lincoln signed the draft into law.

The 1863 Conscription Law closed many of the loopholes of the earlier Militia Act. A fee of \$300 purchased an exemption, and the army then paid a bounty of \$300 for a volunteer. Though like some 1814 proposals, the 1863 law was no graduated tax—it discriminated against the poor and favored the rich. The new draft was met by great violence and rioting, most spectacularly in New York, where 10,000 federal troops were required to restore order.

Fear of recurrent violence prompted cities and states to add to the federal bounty, so volunteer recruitment became active and competitive again. Only 10,000 draftees entered the army in 1863, and the number of volunteers was more than 12 times greater. Congress (1864) eliminated commutation, so substitutes became significantly more expensive.

In general, the draft law excluded the physically or mentally unfit and convicted felons and exempted:

1. Vice President, Federal judges, heads of Federal executive departments, and governors
2. Men with certain specified types of dependents

The law divided enrollees into two classes: Class I—all persons 20-35 and unmarried persons 35-45; Class II—all other enrollees. Class II enrollees would not be called until the Class I pool was exhausted.

There were over 2,000,000 enlistments and reenlistments in the Union Army during the War, though the actual strength at any time never reached half that figure. In addition to short terms of service, casualties were extremely heavy. Further, 16,365 men deserted from the Regular Army and 182,680 from volunteer units in the Union.⁵ The South had the same problem, which got worse with the years. According to Clement Eaton⁶ "the low pay and tremendous inflation contributed to the large-scale desertion of (Confederate) soldiers in the last two years of the war . . ." In terms of gold backing for the pay, the Confederate soldier's pay was worth \$0.90/month, as compared to the Union private's \$6.40/month in 1864.

In addition, the Union paid enlistment bounties to 1,722,690 men as shown in table 6.

TABLE 6.—Bounties paid upon Union Enlistees⁷

Recipients of \$100 federal bounties	\$1,156,868
Recipients of \$200 federal bounties	10,606
Recipients of \$300 federal bounties	496,709
Recipients of \$400 federal bounties	158,507
Total recipients of federal bounties	1,722,690
Total payment of federal bounties	300,223,500
Local bounties total (unknown distribution/person)	285,941,028

In this discussion of wages and monetary incentives for enlistment, one other point should be made. Prior to the Civil War, Negroes, free or not, were excluded from the Regular Army, though they had fought in militia or volunteer units in every other American war. The 17 July 1862 Act provided for the enlistment of Negroes, but paid them only \$10 per month, \$3 of which was kept to pay for their clothing. An Act of 24 February 1864 included Negroes in the draft at the lower pay rates. Finally, on 15 June 1864, a law was enacted which provided all Negro enlistees with the same pay and clothing as other troops and a bounty not to exceed \$100. The Act, retroactive to January 1864, covered "all persons of color who were free on the 19th April, 1861. . . ." Later in 1864 the new Attorney-General ruled that enlistees freed by the Emancipation Proclamation (1 January 1863) were entitled to the same pay and bounty as other volunteers. An Act of 3 March 1865 made all pay and allowances equal for all troops. More than 186,000 Negroes⁸ served in the Union forces segregated units.⁹

According to Army historians¹⁰ "the ultimate number of troops mobilized by the U.S. during the Civil War was a fine achievement in military manpower procurement, but the methods by which those men were procured clearly demonstrated how not to raise armies."

The Civil War is important in the history of the draft. It was fought largely to uphold the central government and for the first time a central (national) draft was enacted. Both North and South had to suspend *habeas corpus* in connection with draft protests, so that the infringement of one liberty led directly to the removal of a legal right. Bounties and substitutions played a large part in recruiting. These monetary incentives seem to have played a considerably larger part than the draft in providing men. The great majority of troops throughout the war were volunteers; "draft pressure" mattered little because of exemption, commutation and substitution (and only a relatively small number were hired substitutes). Only 2 percent of the Union Army was conscripted.

Spanish American War

There was no draft during the Spanish American War. The brevity and popularity of the war may be the main reasons, but military wages were also higher than an enlistee might get in civilian life. In addition, casualties were low.

Revolt against Spanish rule had flared in Cuba in 1896, but by October 1897, the tension between the United States and Spain eased as a result of Spanish concessions. Then, on 15 February, 1898, the United States battleship *Maine* blew up in Havana harbor. On 9 March Congress unanimously voted \$50,000,000 for national defense and on 11 April, President McKinley asked Congress for authority to intervene in Cuba.

The Regular Army was ordered to concentrate at New Orleans, Tampa, Mobile, and

Chickamauga, Tennessee for training. Congress passed a joint resolution which was tantamount to a declaration of war and McKinley signed it. On April 22nd the Congress passed "An Act to provide for temporarily increasing the military establishment of the United States in time of war." According to the act, the Army would be composed of the Regular Army and the Volunteer Army which would include the militia when in federal service. The President could call volunteers (18 to 45 years old) for 2 years service, and militia units volunteering as a body would be accepted as a unit into the Volunteer Army. Other units could be raised by states.

On April 24th a bill was introduced to raise the pay of enlisted men by 20 percent in time of war if no "special duty" pay were provided. The following day Congress declared that a state of war had existed between the United States and Spain since April 21, 1898, and on April 26,¹¹ the 20 percent wartime pay raise became law without question or debate in either House of Congress. The flood of legislative action is impressive, but the nation was again largely unprepared for war. The army was once again faced with the task of preparing and fighting at the same time.

By the end of May, 125,000 had answered the first call to arms, a second call (for 75,000) had been issued and an increase (to 65,000) in the Regular Army was authorized. Enlistees filled the quotas, but the great influx of volunteers was never properly outfitted—they wore winter blue uniforms in the semi-tropical battles, fired old rifles, and let the Rough Riders charge San Juan Hill without horses. Though fewer than 400 Americans died in battle, more than 4000 died from disease, accident, or other causes.

FOOTNOTES

- ¹ Upton, *op. cit.*, 225.
- ² Lonn, Ella, *Foreigners in the Union Army and Navy* (Baton Rouge, University of Louisiana Press, 1952) pp. 581-582. *Foreigners in the Confederacy* (Chapel Hill, University of North Carolina Press, 1940) by the same author shows the proportion as less clear, but much lower in the South.
- ³ The Presidential Proclamation, including calls for troops, suspension of *habeas corpus*, and others, are included in the *Provost Marshal General's Report*, Appendix Part II, pp. 205-275.
- ⁴ In the first call of 1863, 292,441 were called, 9,881 inducted, 28,002 furnished substitutes, and 52,288 paid the \$300 fee. *Provost Marshal General's Report*, Part II, p. 28.
- ⁵ *Ibid.*, Appendix Part I, 224f.
- ⁶ *A History of the Southern Confederacy*, p. 100.
- ⁷ *Provost Marshal General's Report*, Appendix Part I, pp. 213-223.
- ⁸ *Ibid.*, Part II, p. 69.
- ⁹ Eight years after the Civil War (3 March, 1873) an Act provided that:
All colored persons who enlisted during the late war and are now prohibited from receiving bounty and pensions on account of being borne on the rolls of their regiments as "Slaves," shall be placed on the same footing as to bounty and pensions as though they had not been slaves at the time of their enlistment.
- ¹⁰ The inequities in pay, bounties, clothing and allowances were finally removed by that Act as the Union recognized its obligation. This brief outline of the policies toward Negroes in the Civil War is from *A Compendium of the Pay of the Army from 1785 to 1888*. Washington, Government Printing Office, 1888, pp. 52-53.
- ¹¹ Kreidberg and Henry, *History of Military Mobilization* (Washington, 1946), p. 97.
- ¹² An Act for the Better Organization of the Line of the Army of the United States" (HR 9878). *United States Statutes at Large* 30 STAT 364-365.

NATIONAL VOTING AGE CHANGE
URGED

HON. BILL FRENZEL

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 11, 1971

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Speaker, the Minnesota Legislature in 1969 passed an amendment to the State constitution lowering the voting age to 19. I was proud to have been the author of this measure which was approved by the people of the State in the last election.

Congress will soon take final action on a proposed constitutional amendment to give the right to vote to all persons 18 years and older. We need to have this action taken as soon as possible so that the State legislatures can be given the opportunity to ratify the amendment in advance of the 1972 elections. The problems and costs of bilevel registration and eligibility are staggering.

Minnesota's Secretary of State, Arlen Erdahl, spoke to this point in a recent interview carried in the University of Minnesota Daily of March 4. Because this article points out the problems the States presently have, I am inserting the entire text in the RECORD at this point.

NATIONAL VOTING AGE CHANGE URGED
(By Bill Richardson)

The state's chief election official said yesterday that the most expedient method of standardizing voting ages would be an amendment to the U.S. Constitution.

Arlen Erdahl, secretary of state, also said in an interview that he also would seek legislative authorship of a resolution asking Congress to take the necessary steps to solve the dual-voting age problem.

Minnesota law allows voting for state and local officials at 19 years of age while federal law allows 18 year olds to vote for President and vice president.

The congressional amendment would be submitted to the state legislatures, most of which are now in session. Three quarters of the legislatures would have to concur for the amendment to be ratified.

Erdahl said other routes that could be taken to reduce the voting age would include a state constitutional amendment—the method used to reduce the state's 21-year-old voting law to 19 last fall.

"The problem with that," Erdahl said, "is that the amendment has to be on the ballot in a general election. That would make the next eligible election the fall of 1972 and the 18 year olds wouldn't be able to vote for state officers until 1974."

Erdahl, author of 19-year-old voting legislation while a state representative, admitted chances of quickly amending the Constitution are not good.

"I got a letter today from U.S. Sen. Birch Bayh (D-Ind.) chairman of the subcommittee on constitutional amendments of the U.S. Senate Judiciary Committee saying that most of the state legislatures are now in session or could be called into special session so that means if the Congress could act the states could conceivably approve the change. But legislatures just don't move that quickly."

Nine states now have voting ages under 21, but only three, Georgia, Hawaii and Kentucky, have reduced the voting age to 18.

Maine and Nebraska allow 20 year olds to vote while in Massachusetts, Minnesota and Montana 19 year olds may vote.

These nine states will be required to maintain two voting records—one for those who can vote for President and vice president, U.S. senator and representatives and one for those who can vote for governor down to county commissioner.

"While as a matter of constitutional law the Supreme Court's decision (to split the responsibility for setting voting ages between state and federal governments) may have been correct, the result is morally indefensible," the Bayh subcommittee reports.

"There is no basis whatsoever in policy or logic for denying these citizens (in Minnesota 18 year olds) the right to vote in state and local elections when by bearing the responsibilities they may vote in federal elections."

The Bayh subcommittee report states that the arguments in support of a reduced voting age are as valid for the states as the federal government.

"Moreover, many of the problems that most concern our younger citizens are largely matters of local and state policy: the quality of education at all levels; the state of the environment; planning and community development," the report says.

Erdahl and the subcommittee both expressed concern with the cost of the dual-age voting.

"The largest costs will stem from the need to purchase new voting equipment," the report says. "A majority of votes cast in America today are cast on voting machines. In the interest of the greatest accuracy, a separate machine should probably be provided in each polling place so that no administrative errors would allow an under 21 (under 19 in Minnesota) voter to vote in state or local elections."

Voting machines cost more than \$2,000 apiece meaning a possible expense of \$6 million to Minnesota taxpayers.

"I don't think I could hazard a guess on the cost to Minnesota," Erdahl said. "But the extra voting machines are going to cost something. I really think the most costly thing will be the confusion that will result."

"Moreover, a substantial increase in voting personnel will be required by dual-age voting even in jurisdictions relying on new voting machines," the subcommittee reported. "More clerks will be required to fill out the two sets of registration forms. More clerks will also be required to handle the extra bookkeeping which will be involved when each under 21 registrant becomes of age and has to be transferred to the regular election list."

The confusion Erdahl spoke of is also cited in the Bayh subcommittee report.

"There is another set of difficulties which could bring chaos to the process by which we select our President," the report says.

The 1970 Voting Rights Act provides "the right to vote in any state or political subdivision in any primary or any election."

"It was clearly the intent of Congress to let younger voters take part in all elections—not just the final determination," the subcommittee reported.

Erdahl said the current situation leaves many decisions on who may vote and where to local election officials.

Erdahl said some 19 and 20 year olds were being refused registration by some local election officials when they went to register after the 1970 state constitution amendment.

"One commissioner of registration demanded personal certification from the governor that the amendment had passed," Erdahl said. "I just hope this isn't a preview."

"Very few states consider it possible to complete action on a state constitutional amendment in time for the 1972 elections," the Bayh report says.

Of the 47 states with a voting age greater than 18 for state elections, change before the 1972 elections appears impossible in 39

states without a federal constitutional amendment.

"The thing I can't see," Erdahl said, "is why, if we're going to lower the voting age to 18 anyway, why we shouldn't go right ahead with a federal constitutional amendment rather than wait for each state to lower their requirements."

Constitutional amendments have often been ratified in less than a year. The 23rd Amendment—allowing residents of the District of Columbia to vote for President and Vice President was ratified in nine months; the 13th Amendment—outlawing slavery—was ratified in 10 months, as was the 21st—repealing prohibition.

"I think it should be done as quickly as possible," Erdahl said. "I don't think anyone has doubts about the qualifications of the young people anymore."

HAPPY BIRTHDAY—BELLE
MISHKIN

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 11, 1971

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, one of the great advantages of public service is the opportunity to meet people—people from different backgrounds, people with varied experiences, people who are dedicated to the service of their country and to their fellow man. Over the years, I have found that the great majority of those I have come in contact with are sincere, dedicated individuals whose one goal in life is to leave this great country and her peoples in a better condition than when they entered.

I am thankful for the opportunity to serve, and I am thankful for the acquaintances I have made. Among those I admire most, those I respect greatly, and those friendships I hold dearest, stands Mrs. Belle Mishkin.

I first met Belle when I entered the California Assembly, and I am eternally grateful that I had the foresight and good fortune to request that she join my staff. This decision proved to be among the wisest that I first made in Sacramento. At first, I was pleasantly surprised at her outstanding ability; however, I quickly came to realize that the exceptional accomplishment was routine duty—all in a day's work—for Belle Mishkin. Her knowledge, her dedication, her empathy for the problems of our people—all proved to be a tremendous asset to me in serving the people of California. I dare say that any contributions I may have made to improving the quality of life for our citizens may be attributed, in no small way, to Belle Mishkin.

When I left the assembly and became chairman of the Democratic State Central Committee, I brought Belle with me. Again, her devotion and knowledge served me well.

In 1952, Mrs. Mishkin was chosen to be a delegate to the Democratic National Convention—the convention which nominated Adlai Stevenson for President. She later served as the personal secretary of Senator Richard Richards, and

as Secretary of the Los Angeles Democratic Central Committee.

However, Mr. Speaker, her dedication, and devotion have not been limited to the political arena. She has been active in sustaining such community organizations as the Red Cross, the Community Chest, and the Heart Fund. In addition, she has been instrumental in the success of the United Nations chapter in Los Angeles.

Mrs. Mishkin's son, Lee, has brought his mother much pride. An animator, Lee created, "Is It Always Right To Be Right?" which has been nominated for an academy award.

On March 13, Belle's many friends will assemble at Michael's Restaurant for a birthday luncheon. While I will not be able to attend this function, my wife, Lee, and I will be with her in our thoughts and we will be wishing her a very happy day on her 80th birthday. It has been, indeed, a pleasure to have known her.

TAX CREDIT INCENTIVE VITALLY NEEDED FOR BUSINESSES TO HIRE HARD-CORE UNEMPLOYED

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 11, 1971

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, 37 Members of the House of Representatives have joined with me in introducing legislation to provide tax credits to businesses for hiring the hard-core unemployed.

The pressing problem of finding jobs for the unemployed is our No. 1 domestic problem. It has been my feeling that the best way to attack this drain on our society is by creating jobs in private industry for the hard-core unemployed.

Government cannot create permanent employment for all Americans; and should not attempt to do so. However, I believe Government can help in solving the problem of the 2 million "permanently unemployed" in America.

In both the 90th and 91st Congress, I introduced legislation to provide tax credits to businesses which hire the hard-core unemployed. This bill is patterned after the very popular act allowing tax credits for investment in new equipment by businesses. I have previously testified in support of this legislation.

This year, I have reintroduced my bill to provide tax credits for hiring the hard-core unemployed. The bill has 37 cosponsors, both Republican and Democrats.

The bill, H.R. 593, is pending in the House Ways and Means Committee, and I have written Chairman WILBUR MILLS requesting departmental reports and early hearings on the legislation. President Nixon has in the past supported the idea of tax credits and incentives to businesses to attack urban problems.

Jobs, I believe, are the key to getting our economy moving again. Manpower training programs, which I have supported, cannot create jobs. Businesses

must be given the necessary incentives to create new jobs and to train the hard-core unemployed.

Business has already played an important role in this through the National Alliance of Businessmen, the Urban Coalition, and other groups. My bill for tax credits would supplement these efforts and I am hopeful that Congress will act on the measure, which has strong bipartisan support.

The cosponsors of H.R. 593 with me are: Mr. ADDABBO, of New York; Mr. BARING, of Nevada; Mr. BLACKBURN, of Georgia; Mr. BYRNE, of Pennsylvania; Mr. CLARK, of Pennsylvania; Mr. COLLIER, of Illinois; Mr. DANIEL, of Virginia; Mr. DAVIS, of Georgia; Mr. DICKINSON, of Alabama; Mr. DONOHUE, of Massachusetts; Mr. DULSKI, of New York; Mr. DUNCAN, of Tennessee; Mr. ESHLEMAN, of Pennsylvania; Mr. FASCELL, of Florida; Mr. FISHER, of Texas; Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, of New Jersey; Mr. FULTON, of Pennsylvania; Mr. FULTON, of Tennessee; Mr. GALLAGHER, of New Jersey; Mr. HALEY, of Florida; Mr. HALPERN, of New York; Mr. HAYS, of Ohio; Mr. HOWARD, of New Jersey; Mr. KUYKENDALL, of Tennessee; Mr. LEGGETT, of California; Mr. LUJAN, of New Mexico; Mr. McDONALD, of Michigan; Mr. MCKINNEY, of Connecticut; Mr. PEPPER, of Florida; Mr. PICKLE, of Texas; Mr. PRYOR, of Arkansas; Mr. RIEGLE, of Michigan; Mr. SAYLOR, of Pennsylvania; Mr. THONE, of Nebraska; Mr. TIERNAN, of Rhode Island; Mr. WHITEHURST, of Virginia; and Mr. WOLFF, of New York.

A BILL TO ESTABLISH THE INDIAN PEAKS WILDERNESS AREA IN COLORADO

HON. DONALD G. BROTZMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 11, 1971

Mr. BROTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of myself and the distinguished gentleman from Colorado (Mr. McKEVITT), I am today introducing a bill which would set in motion the procedures necessary to establish the Indian Peaks Wilderness Area in Colorado.

My bill would direct the executive branch of the Federal Government to conduct suitability studies and hold public hearings on a proposal to set aside this segment of unspoiled wilderness in the Arapaho and Roosevelt National Forests directly south of Rocky Mountain National Park.

Mr. Speaker, I would urge the earliest possible action by the Congress to enact this legislation, for a massive volume of work must be done before the wilderness area designation can occur. Under the Wilderness Act, the Secretary of Agriculture must coordinate the efforts of various departments and agencies in conducting land use studies, a boundary study, a minerals study, and the holding of public hearings. My bill would require that this be accomplished in 18 months or less after its effective date. Even if this is accomplished during the next few

weeks, designation likely could not be effected until early 1973.

Furthermore, should the necessary studies not be initiated by this summer, the 18-month deadline might become unrealistic. Much of the survey work must be conducted during favorable weather conditions, and in the Indian Peaks high country the snowpack often begins to build as early as September. In my opinion we should do everything in our power to give the Secretary of Agriculture authority to initiate the work by June 1971.

The case for giving the Indian Peaks area full protection as a wilderness area is particularly compelling, in my opinion.

The area is one which I have personally visited and enjoyed over the years. It contains tens of thousands of acres of forests which have remained in their primeval state largely due to the very ruggedness of the terrain. The peaks for which the area is named—Arapaho, Arikaree, Navajo, Kiowa, Apache, Paiute, and Ogallala—stand as sentries over a land virtually uncut by logging and agricultural clearing.

Yet, the area lies unusually close to a major population area. More than a million people live within an hour's driving time of the probable east and south boundaries of the area. This is both fortunate and unfortunate. While on the one hand Indian Peaks would be more accessible to more people than is usually the case with wilderness areas, the very proximity of a megalopolis brings about pressures for commercial development.

The National Forest Service, to its credit, has been diligent about preserving the wilderness characteristics of the Indian Peaks area over the years. It has done this without the region having been afforded so much as primitive area status.

But special management status simply is not enough, in the long term. Indian Peaks should be preserved in its wilderness state into perpetuity.

While hearings still must be held to positively establish public attitudes on this proposal, there is no doubt in my mind that the testimony will indicate very broad and deep support, not only in Colorado but throughout the Nation. I have received letters from literally dozens of organizations and individuals in recent months urging in the strongest of terms that Congress do whatever is necessary to clear the way for this designation.

These expressions are summarized very concisely in a statement of support issued some time ago by the Wilderness Workshop of the prestigious and influential Colorado Open Space Coordinating Council.

The statement pointed out that:

This de facto wilderness is threatened by the uncontrolled push of population growth in Colorado which cannot but damage or entirely destroy the fragile terrain. Not only is this area threatened by population growth, but at the same time the burgeoning population which threatens the area stands to benefit greatly from the opportunity of wilderness experience. We feel the modern, ecological and scientific approach to management of this unique area demands that it be designated as a wilderness.

MEDICAL SCHOOL ASSISTANCE BILL

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 11, 1971

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a joint resolution which I conceive to be one of the most far-reaching measures I have proposed since I first came to Congress. It, in essence, proposes to permit the establishment, on a pilot basis of five new medical schools in conjunction with the Veterans' Administration Department of Medicine and Surgery. It is an effort to increase the number of doctors and trained medical personnel necessary to run the hospital and medical system of this country and will, in my judgment, be a concrete step forward in providing better medical care not only for veterans, but for the entire population.

Currently, the VA in its 166 hospitals, 202 clinics, 63 nursing homes, 16 domiciles and its staff of some 150,000 physicians, nurses and other health care personnel, provide health services to approximately 6 million of the 28 million American war veterans. This results in more than 800,000 hospital admissions and 8 million outpatient visits each year at a cost of over \$2 billion annually. It is my judgment that virtually all Veterans' Administration hospitals are at least the same quality as any good community hospital and many of these hospitals serve as medical school teaching hospitals and are comparable to the best university hospitals.

The Veterans' Administration has been able to maintain the quality of its care even though it has a substantially lower patient-staff ratio than the community hospitals and teaching hospitals. At a time when great concern is being expressed about the high cost of medical care, there seems to be a deliberate ignoring of the fact that the VA is providing quality care at about one-third the cost of other medical systems. At a time when concern is being expressed about a shortage of medical personnel, the administration seems determined to ignore the vast education programs of the VA and is proposing to cut the agency program.

There is no other system in the United States, nor for that matter in the entire world, which is centrally administered and which is involved in the education of some 11,000 medical students and 5,000 interns and residents each year. The Veterans' Administration has recently inaugurated a new employment category for physician assistants and a number of individuals are now being trained for this position and are actively working in VA hospitals in Muskogee, Okla., Houston, Tex., and Durham, N.C.

The Veterans' Administration is uniquely qualified to participate in the establishment of new medical schools for it is currently affiliated with 80 medical schools, 51 dental schools, 287 nursing schools, 274 universities and colleges, and 84 community and junior colleges. During the current fiscal year, 50,000

students will participate in more than 60 categories of training in our institutions. The general public does not realize what a tremendous contribution VA medicine has made to the general welfare. The fact that tuberculosis is no longer the scourge which it once was is due to the chemotherapy which originated and was practiced on a massive scale in VA hospitals. The pacemaker which has saved the lives of thousands of heart patients had much of its basic research performed thereon in VA hospitals. A research physician in the Bronx VA hospital was the first individual to isolate a virus which could cause leukemia. With 28 million veterans in this country, who with their families constitute 40 percent of our population, it is not strange for consideration to be given to better utilization of this great facility not only to improve the care of veterans' health, but to make a greater medical contribution to the entire population.

The bill which I am supporting today and which I strongly hope and believe will have favorable action during the 92d Congress authorizes a total of \$15 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, and a like sum for each of the 6 succeeding years. This pilot program would permit the Administrator to enter into agreements with not more than 5 States, geographically dispersed, to assist in the establishment of five new medical schools. This would involve:

First, the leasing to the State under such terms and conditions as the Administrator determines appropriate—and I intend for such action to be on the liberal side—such excess lands, buildings and structures under the control of the VA as may be necessary for such a school;

Second, the extension, alteration, and remodeling of buildings and structures to the extent necessary to make them suitable for use as medical school facilities; and

Third, the payment of grants to reimburse the States for the cost of salaries for the faculty of such schools during the initial 12-month period of operation and for the next 5 years thereafter. This latter provision is extremely liberal in that the Federal Government will pay 90 percent of the cost of faculty salaries during the first year, scaled down to 10 percent in the 6th year. Thereafter, the State would bear the entire cost of such salaries. The overall plans for the schools must meet appropriate professional and other standards as will be mutually beneficial in carrying out the mission of the medical facility in the school and contain such other provisions as to protect the interest of the United States and to accomplish the central purpose of the legislation.

What this proposal envisions is the use of surplus facilities of the Veterans' Administration in so-called remote areas. I have in mind the use of facilities in areas away from the big cities of our country and the establishment of comparatively small medical schools, but those which would be fully accredited and staffed at the highest professional level. In addition, this plan inherently

provides for the training of additional paramedical personnel below the professional standard of doctors, nurses and dentists, which would not only increase the ratio of staff to patients in VA hospitals, but provide for a much larger supply and reservoir of trained personnel available to community hospitals and university hospitals across the Nation. If this program is established and works in the fashion which I expect it to, there is no reason not to expect that it will have a dramatic effect in reducing the great shortage of doctors, nurses, and other medical personnel which this country so badly needs, if it is fully implemented.

I believe 10 definite benefits may be expected from the enactment of this bill.

First, there would be better care for the veterans of this country.

Second, it would improve the training facilities for doctors, dentists, nurses, and paramedical personnel by placing their training on a higher level and providing training for thousands who do not have that opportunity today.

Third, the training would provide a greater supply of personnel not only for the Veterans' Administration but for all hospitals of the country.

Fourth, the creation of new medical schools would be at least a step to reduce the estimated 50,000 shortage of doctors which we find in the country today.

Fifth, better medical care would come to "remote" areas.

Sixth, it would provide cooperation between the States and the Federal Government with each meeting its individual responsibility to its individual constituency.

Seventh, by such training we may fully expect better utilization of trained personnel.

Eighth, monetary savings would be expected to flow from this bill because of the higher quality of trained individuals performing medical tasks.

Ninth, it should and undoubtedly would provide an increase in the turnover ratio of patients not only in VA hospitals, but in all other hospitals affiliated in this program, thus reducing the cost of medical care and returning patients to their homes more promptly, and

Lastly, it would be giving improved individual attention to individual veterans providing a better quality of care than he has today.

In addition to the assistance given toward the establishment of new medical schools, those institutions which are already affiliated with Veterans' Administration hospitals will also benefit from this proposal. A second \$15 million, on a matching basis, is authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, and an identical sum for the 6 succeeding fiscal years. Grants may be made to existing medical schools affiliated with the Veterans' Administration where it is found by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs that such grants will result in a substantial increase in the number of medical students attending such schools.

I have carefully read the President's message on health and hospitalization which was delivered to the Congress February 18. This is a massive program which creates new agencies and new organizations to handle the question of health insurance and medical problems. I note that only two references in this lengthy document are made to the Veterans' Administration. One is the direction for the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to confer with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare on ways in which the Veterans' Administration medical system can be used to supplement local medical resources in scarcity areas. I submit that the President has his priorities and procedures in reverse order. The Veterans' Administration is hospitalizing approximately 85,000 patients today despite the fact that his 1972 budget proposes to reduce that figure to 79,000. The Secretary of HEW and the Public Health Service provide an infinitesimal small amount of health care in the active sense for citizens of this country. The Secretary of HEW should be conferring with the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, rather than the reverse. Be that as it may, I am glad to see some slight mention of the facilities which exist for providing health care operated by the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the VA.

If the administration will support the health training program already in the Veterans' Administration with adequate funds and will support the bill which I am introducing, we will make a sizable dent in reducing the shortage of allied health personnel which exists to such a high degree in the country today. There is no better source for training this type of personnel than presently exists in the 166 hospitals which comprise the Veterans' Administration system.

Again, I stress the importance of this measure and the fact that it is so far-reaching in its aspects and possibilities. I expect to have hearings on this measure in the immediate future and I hope to have the fullest sort of support for this measure.

reaching in its aspects and possibilities. I expect to have hearings on this measure in the immediate future and I hope to have the fullest sort of support for this measure.

IMPORTS, DOMESTIC PRODUCTION AND EXPORTS, APPAREL—VALUED IN U.S. PRICES

HON. BERTRAM L. PODELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 11, 1971

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert the following chart, "Imports, Domestic Production and Exports, Apparel (knit and woven), United States—Valued in U.S. Prices," that was inadvertently left out of the trade speech I delivered yesterday:

IMPORTS, DOMESTIC PRODUCTION AND EXPORTS, APPAREL (KNIT AND WOVEN), UNITED STATES—VALUED IN U.S. PRICES¹
[1957-59 dollars in millions]

Year	Imports	Domestic production	Exports	Imports as percent of domestic—		Year	Imports	Domestic production	Exports	Imports as percent of domestic—	
				Production	Consumption					Production	Consumption
1956	\$395.7	\$10,055.5	\$68.0	3.9	3.8	1963	\$1,230.4	\$11,635.4	\$74.7	10.6	9.6
1957	435.4	10,214.1	71.1	4.3	4.1	1964	1,435.9	12,172.9	83.3	11.8	10.6
1958	547.2	9,922.9	72.3	5.5	5.3	1965	1,720.6	12,877.0	96.3	13.4	11.9
1959	869.8	10,557.5	75.9	8.2	7.7	1966	1,857.4	13,122.0	105.9	14.2	12.5
1960	920.8	10,693.8	86.7	8.6	8.0	1967	2,094.7	13,461.9	107.4	15.6	13.6
1961	744.7	10,891.5	83.3	6.8	6.4	1968	2,444.2	13,816.1	115.7	17.7	15.1
1962	1,175.4	11,498.6	70.7	10.2	9.3	1969	2,939.5	13,601.0	140.1	21.6	17.9

¹ To measure the impact of the physical volume of imports on the domestic market, the dollar volume of imports has been expressed in terms of prices charged for equivalent goods of domestic origin.

² Preliminary estimate.

AN AGENDA FOR CHANGE

HON. BELLA S. ABZUG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 11, 1971

Mrs. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, the American people are demanding change: three-fourths of the population wants an immediate end to the war in Vietnam; there is increased alarm at the human price being paid by our economy of inflation. There are increasingly more Americans dissatisfied with the proportion of the Federal budget and of the gross national product devoted to defense, and increasingly more Americans frightened at the mounting cost of medical care, food, and other necessities of life. There is demand for full funding of Federal programs to meet human needs: for education, day care, better housing, jobs.

The present administration has failed these American people and continues to fail them. It has failed to combat inflation in a way that saves jobs and cuts profits; failed to fund programs that deal with education, housing, manpower, health; and failed above all to wind down the war in Indochina which is the source of much of the trouble we find ourselves in.

The task is now before the Congress, and I submit to that Congress the economic report of Mr. Meany of the AFL-CIO which lays out the guidelines that a concerned Congress will want to follow in deciding how to turn our country and our economy around:

STATEMENT BY AFL-CIO PRESIDENT GEORGE MEANY TO THE JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE OF THE 92D CONGRESS ON THE ECONOMIC REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT MONDAY, MARCH 8, 1971

American workers and their unions are deeply disturbed by the continuing economic stagnation in the United States that has curtailed production and wiped out the jobs and the incomes of millions.

They are alarmed by the ceaseless rise in the cost of living, fueled by high profits and high interest rates, that is eroding the purchasing power and wrecking the hopes and plans of millions more.

They are distressed at the Administration's solicitude for corporate America, expressed through tax concessions and prodigal depreciation allowances, and its disregard of the public welfare, expressed through cutbacks of government programs that benefit all of the people.

They are dismayed at the President's veto of badly needed education, health and manpower legislation.

They are impatient with the Administration's inability to provide leadership, or to cope with the range of domestic problems that must be solved if America's progress toward social and economic justice for all its people is to resume.

They are looking to Congress to fill the void.

In the light of the Nation's experience over the last 26 months, the AFL-CIO submits that the Congress cannot look to the Executive branch to offer a coherent, progressive legislative program designed to meet the needs of the present.

We believe the Congress must take the initiative in shaping such a program on behalf of all the people.

The AFL-CIO has repeatedly urged progressive action on the Administration, but without effect. We have repeatedly warned against the unbalanced domestic policies the Administration has chosen to pursue, but without effect.

The record of the last two years, in almost every area of domestic life, has been a record of adverse developments and deterioration of the social fabric.

Last month, the AFL-CIO Executive Council undertook a searching analysis of America's problems. We were sharply critical of what we found but we did much more than criticize. We offered viable, achievable solutions to the problems the nation faces.

In the firm belief that these alternatives will be of value to the Congress, in the pursuit of a nation fully employed, at decent wages and conditions; with sound policies for realistically solving the problems of the underprivileged in society, we submit to the Congress our program of specific actions for the public good.

I. THE ECONOMIC PICTURE IN 1971

The Administration's "game plan" to combat inflation through an economic slowdown has finally been abandoned in the midst of its tragic consequences—a prolonged

recession and increasing unemployment, combined with an accelerated rise of living costs.

But the new "game plan," recently outlined in the Administration's budget and economic reports, is a half-hearted exercise in success-through-optimism.

The unfortunate results of the discarded "game plan" are apparent in almost all parts of the economy.

There were 5.4 million unemployed in January—6% of the labor force—up 2 million from a year ago and 2½ million from January 1969, when the "game plan" got underway.

Economic distress has spread from six major industrial areas, when the Administration took office, to 40 in January. In addition, the Labor Department reports substantial unemployment in 622 smaller industrial communities.

Unemployment rates are up to 17.6% for teenagers, 11.2% for construction workers, 10.6% for the unskilled, 9.5% for Negroes and 8.6% for the semi-skilled.

Over the past two years, unemployment rates more than doubled for professional and technical workers, skilled craftsmen, workers in factories, transportation and public utilities; doubled for construction workers; and increased considerably for all other major groups of wage and salary earners.

Millions of additional workers have seen their paychecks shrink, as production cutbacks brought reductions in working hours.

However, the yearly rise of the Consumer Price Index accelerated to 6% in 1970 from 5.4% in 1969, 4.2% in 1968 and 2.8% in 1967.

The buying power of the weekly after-tax earnings of the average non-supervisory worker in private, non-farm employment—about 48 million—declined in 1970 for the second consecutive year. It was less than in 1968 and even below 1965.

The modest easing of the Federal Reserve's monetary policy since February 1970, was sufficient to halt the decline of the stock market and the threat of spreading business bankruptcies. Interest rates have moved down from their record highs, as the demand for business loans has weakened. But neither the Federal Reserve nor the Administration have moved to drive interest rates down.

The government has not taken decisive actions to turn the economy around from recession and stagnation to a sustained upturn. A rising trend of unemployment continues to threaten workers and their families.

With industry now operating at only about 75% of its productive capacity, business outlays for new plants and machines are leveling off—which means a decline in the real volume of business investment, after accounting for increased prices. It is unlikely that this part of the economy will pick up substantially until sales rise enough to convince most industries that additions to their productive capacity can be operated profitably.

The expected surge of consumer spending has not materialized, since most families have found their real incomes declining. Until employment, workers' buying power and consumer expectations turn up significantly, no major increases in consumer expenditures can be expected.

The only parts of the economy that are expanding rapidly are residential construction and the activities of state and local governments, which naturally respond to the availability of credit at lower interest rates. Residential construction, which was clobbered by the right economic squeeze of 1969 and early 1970 is now moving up—the strongest growth sector of the economy at present. Yet, even the 1.8 million housing starts expected by home builders in 1971—up from 1.4 million in 1970—are considerably below the number required by the national goal of 26 million new and rehabilitated units in

10 years, established by the Housing Act of 1968.

However, the combined advance of residential construction and the activities of state and local governments is far from enough to push the entire national economy forward, when all other economic sectors are stagnant or growing slowly. As a result, business inventories of goods on hand are rather high, in relation to sales; the number of wage and salary earners on non-farm payrolls throughout the economy is no greater than in the summer of 1969; and the average number of weekly working hours is down more than 2% from two years ago.

In the face of these conditions, only an immediate and substantial government stimulus can boost sales and production sufficiently to provide the growing number of job opportunities needed for the unemployed and the growing labor force in this period of cutbacks in military production and in the size of the armed forces.

During the last year, however, the President vetoed Congressional appropriations for the expansion of programs that would create jobs in providing needed public facilities and services. Toward the end of 1970, the President vetoed the manpower bill to aid the states and local governments in creating public service jobs for the unemployed.

In the face of all this, the Administration offers a new "game plan" and a new target: "an unemployment rate in the 4½% zone and an inflation rate approaching the 3% range by mid-1972."

This target of less than full employment and relative price stability, 1½ years from now, is based on a forecast of a 9% increase in the gross national product in 1971 and a nearly 12% rise between the October-December quarter of 1970 and the same quarter in 1971—mostly representing an expansion in the real volume of economic activity. To date, the Administration has not indicated how these targets and forecasts are to be achieved.

This new "game plan" is based on rhetoric and wishful-thinking arithmetic, rather than on specific programs to create jobs, increase consumer buying power and lift sales and production. Instead of the needed substantial stimulus, the Administration has presented a policy of mini-expansion for 1971. Proposed increases in budget expenditures are hardly any greater than last year, and much of these increases are for vaguely-defined "revenue sharing" rather than for specific, expansionary programs. Moreover, the expected budget deficit in 1971 results more from the low tax receipts of a sluggish economy and a depreciation tax bonanza to business than from decisive actions to lift the economy.

Expansionary economic measures to reduce unemployment rapidly would boost productivity and reduce cost-price pressures in the economy. Government efforts to drive down interest rates would encourage the needed expansion and ease inflationary pressures on costs and prices.

We recommend the following actions:

1. Full funding of government programs to meet America's public investment needs in such areas as education, health care, low- and moderate-income housing and community facilities could add at least \$6 billion to the economy's spending stream. In addition, a \$2 billion program of federal grants to states, local governments and federal agencies is needed to step up short-term public works construction and repairs in areas of high unemployment.

Such action is essential to lift sales, production and employment and could be a key to reconversion, by offsetting the declining defense proportion of national production with an increased emphasis on public investment. It would also boost government revenues as employment and incomes rise, the soundest way to reduce the growing budget deficit that results from the recession and persistent economic sluggishness.

2. Immediate Congressional legislation is needed to provide sufficient federal funds to state and local governments and private non-profit organizations to create at least 500,000 public service jobs this year for the unemployed.

3. America needs a more rapid expansion of money and credit, at lower interest rates, to stimulate economic expansion.

The Secretary of Housing and Urban Development should use his authority to drive down interest rates dramatically—to reduce the maximum rate on FHA-VA home mortgages immediately to 6½% and to further reduce that rate to no more than 6% no later than the end of the year.

We urge the Federal Reserve to take leadership in reducing interest rates, rather than following the weakening trend in the money markets, by reducing the discount rate it charges commercial banks to 4%.

The nation's major banks should immediately and dramatically cut their prime interest rate—the basic price of money—to 5%, a move that would result in reducing all interest rates.

We urge the Congress to direct the Federal Reserve to channel credit where it would most benefit the economy and to curb the flow of credit for such activities as conglomerate take-overs, land speculation and foreign subsidiaries. The Congress should also empower and direct the Federal Reserve to provide available credit, at preferential lower interest rates, for urgently-needed community facilities, health-care projects and low-income housing.

A Congressional review of the entire Federal Reserve system and the nation's monetary policy is long overdue—to bring America's central bank fully into the federal government structure, to provide improved coordination of the nation's monetary policy and to make the Board of Governors and the managing boards of the district banks more representative of the major groups in the economy, including workers and consumers.

4. Enforcement of the Administration's announced 20% speedup in depreciation write-offs of the costs of machines and equipment—as well as ending the requirement that business actually replace machines at about the same rate they are written off—should be barred by Congressional action. This tax bonanza to business, if enforced, will cost the government \$2.7 billion in the first full year, rising to over \$4 billion a year in five years. Middle- and low-income taxpayers will be forced to pay for these tax losses and the federal tax structure will be moved further away from the principle of ability-to-pay. Yet this windfall will result in little, if any, increased business outlays for machines, so long as considerable amounts of existing productive capacity are idle.

Since depreciation write-offs are listed as a cost of doing business, the speed-up will provide an inflationary rise of reported costs, on which prices are based. Moreover, termination of the requirement that business replace equipment at the approximate pace of the write-offs will destroy any rational basis for depreciation in the tax code. We urge the Congress to put an end to this application of "trickle down" economics.

5. Increases in the buying power of workers' wages and salaries are a basic prerequisite for economic growth in 1971—to provide workers with a share in the benefits of economic progress and to establish the foundation for the needed expansion of consumer markets. Rapid economic growth in 1971 will not be possible without a substantial boost of consumer sales, which account for almost two-thirds of the national economy. And the needed rise of consumer expenditures cannot possibly be achieved unless increases in the real incomes of workers are attained.

6. We urge the Congress to adopt an im-

mediate 15% across-the-board increase in Social Security and Railroad Retirement benefit payments—to improve the living conditions of the elderly and provide a lift to consumer sales.

7. The Employment Security Amendments of 1970 established a national extended unemployment compensation benefit program, effective January 1, 1972, to assist long-term jobless workers. The AFL-CIO urges the Congress to advance the effective date of this program so that it can be implemented immediately and to provide for full federal funding of the extended benefit payments.

8. To curb the price-raising ability of the dominant corporations, government action is needed to curtail the high rate of business mergers and conglomerate take-overs, which have been greatly increasing the concentration of economic power in a narrowing group of corporations and banks. In pursuit of this objective, a thorough Congressional study of the structure of the American economy is needed.

9. The specific causes of soaring pressures on living costs, such as physicians' fees, hospital charges, housing costs and auto insurance rates, should be examined for the development of practical, sensible measures to dampen these pressures.

We state again, as on numerous occasions since February 1966: If the President determines that the situation warrants extraordinary overall stabilization measures, the AFL-CIO will cooperate so long as such restraints are equitably placed on all costs and incomes—including all prices, profits, dividends, rents and executive compensation, as well as employees' wages and salaries. We are prepared to sacrifice as much as anyone else, as long as anyone else, so long as there is equality of sacrifice.

II. WAGE NEGOTIATIONS IN 1971

Substantial increases in wages and salaries are needed in 1971 if workers are to maintain and improve their real incomes.

The national economy needs increased workers' buying power to boost consumer expenditures, which account for almost two-thirds of total national production—to lift the economy out of stagnation.

The Administration has told the Congress that the achievement of the economic goals set in its budget call for a 9.4% increase in consumer spending. We say that the most realistic and effective way to meet that goal is by substantially increasing the real wages of workers.

Despite outcries in the news media about the size of collective bargaining settlements—and there have been some large ones—the overwhelming majority have been modest, in the face of the accelerated rise of living costs. Many workers are locked into two- or three-year agreements, that were negotiated in 1968 or 1969. The cumulative increase in the cost of living in the three years, 1967-1970, adds up to 16.2% and in the two years, 1968-1970, this rise was 11.5%.

Unfortunately, many long-term agreements, negotiated two or three years ago, underestimated the accelerated price-rise and provided deferred wage increases that were less than the rise in the cost of living. Workers covered by such contracts have had declines in the buying power of their hourly wages.

The modest size of wage gains of most workers can be seen clearly in the Labor Department's report that, in 1970, the average hourly earnings of nonsupervisory workers in private non-farm employment—including those who achieved wage increases in agreements negotiated during the year—rose only 5.9%, slightly less than the increase of living costs.

According to the Labor Department, the gross weekly earnings of the average nonsupervisory worker were \$119.78 in 1970. That

adds up to \$6,228 a year. Yet, the Labor Department reports that it cost \$10,664, before tax payments, to maintain a modest but adequate standard of living—with few luxuries—for an urban family of four at the price-level of the Spring of 1970. That comes to about \$205 a week for a full-time worker, 52 weeks in the year. With the rise in living costs since the Spring of 1970, the cost of maintaining such modest standard of living is now about \$11,000.

Even the Labor Department's lower family budget—with some amenities and no luxuries—cost \$6,960 for a family of four in urban areas at Spring-1970 prices, approximately \$134 a week for 52 weeks. At present prices, the cost is now approximately \$7,200.

In contrast with these income-requirements for an urban family of four, the Census Bureau reports that the mid-point earnings, before taxes, of even those male wage earners who were fortunate enough to work at least 50 full-time work-weeks in 1969 were only about \$8,400 or approximately \$168 per week.

So most wage and salary earners are pressed in their attempt to reach and maintain sufficient earnings for merely a modest standard of living from their regular job. A large group of workers does not attain even the before-tax \$7,200, required for the Labor Department's "lower budget" for a four-person family in an urban area.

Moreover, the trend of rising living costs in 1970, and cuts in working hours for many workers, resulted in a 1% decline in the buying power of the average nonsupervisory worker's weekly take-home pay—to 1.4% below 1968 and 1.3% less than in 1965. The weakening trend, during 1970, brought an even greater drop in buying power by December.

These are essential facts confronting workers and unions in wage negotiations in 1971. Under these conditions, trade unions have no recourse other than to seek substantial gains in collective bargaining this year—to offset previous increases in living costs and to achieve some gains in buying power.

The record since 1960 clearly shows that the accelerated rise in living costs came long before the push for larger wage settlements. That push is a reaction to inflation, not its cause.

Between 1960 and 1965, increases in the wages and fringe benefits of factory workers were less than the rise of industrial productivity. Unit labor costs of manufactured goods declined 1.6%. However, wholesale prices of manufactured goods increased 1.7%. Profit margins on each item widened and, with the expansion of sales, total profits of industrial companies skyrocketed.

In that same period, unit labor costs in the private economy increased slightly. But consumer prices rose more than twice as fast, at the rate of 6.6%. With other unit costs relatively stable or declining, profit margins widened throughout the private economy, bringing soaring profits to business.

During the course of 1965, the rise of living costs began to step up. However, it was not until many months later—1966 and 1967—that the size of collective bargaining settlements also began to move up. Unit labor costs then started to increase, and business raised prices at an accelerated pace in an attempt to maintain or even widen profit margins.

From 1960 to 1965, when living costs rose 1% to 1.5% a year, the median collective bargaining settlement was under 4%, according to Labor Department reports. Wage and fringe benefit settlements of over 5% did not become widespread until 1967, long after the sharper rise in living costs had begun in 1965.

By 1968, after three years of more rapidly rising prices, the median settlement of major collective bargaining agreements, including both wages and fringe benefits, was

6% per year over the life of the agreement and 8.1% in the first year. In 1969, it was 7.4% per year during the life of the contract and 10.9% in the first year. In 1970—with the cost of living rising 6%, after increases of 5.4% in 1969 and 4.2% in 1968—the median settlement was 8.5% per year over the life of the agreement and 11.3% in its first year. The major factor in the stepped-up rise of collective bargaining settlements was the prior acceleration of increasing living costs.

Wage and salary earners did not cause the inflationary rise of prices, nor have they been its beneficiaries. They are among its chief victims.

The inflation of recent years started with a profit inflation and one-sector capital goods boom plus a three-year rise of military spending, beginning in late 1965, that was not offset by an equitable tax increase to ease the actual pressures in the private economy. In the latter part of the decade, particularly 1969-1970, credit inflation was added and the price-rise accelerated, aggravated by skyrocketing interest rates and the suppression of productivity increases during the recession.

Corporate profits shot up sharply during the 1960s, much faster than wages and salaries.

In the first-half of 1969, before the onset of the recession, the after-tax cash-flow to corporations (after-tax profits plus depreciation allowances) was up approximately 91% from 1960.

But the after-tax personal income of all Americans was up only about 76%—about one-fifth less than the corporate cash-flow. And that includes the effects of a large increase in employment, as well as the income gains of individuals.

The after-tax weekly earnings of the average nonsupervisory worker were up only about 34%—three-fifths less than the corporate cash-flow. In terms of buying power, the gain was only about 10%.

The profit inflation of 1960-1965 continued through much of the second half of the decade until the economic slump—with the rise of interest rates, lag in productivity and weakness in sales and production—brought a decline in profits of non-financial corporations between mid-1969 and mid-1970.

However, in the latter 1960s and particularly in 1969-1970, interest rates rose sharply, increasing costs and prices and producing sharply rising bank profits. So, while the cash-flow of non-financial corporations rose more slowly in the later 1960s and declined somewhat between mid-1969 and mid-1970, bank profits soared.

Profits of banks shot up during the recession of 1969-1970, particularly the profits of the big banks. In 1970, for example, the net operating profits of J. P. Morgan and Co. were up 21.9%; First National Bank of Dallas, up 19.2%; Chase Manhattan Bank, up 16.1%; Bankers Trust, up 15.2%; First Chicago Corp., up 14.3%; National City Bank of Cleveland, up 11.6%.

Over the entire period since 1960—and in almost every year of the decade—the income gains of other groups in the economy forged ahead much faster than the gains of wage and salary earners. The 1970 Handbook of Labor Statistics, published by the Labor Department, reports that in the 12 years, 1957-1969, real output per manhour in the private economy rose at a yearly rate of 3.3%. But real compensation per manhour of employees (wages plus fringe benefits) increased at an average pace of only 2.6%. And AFL-CIO estimates indicate an even slower rise in real hourly compensation of nonsupervisory workers.

So the income gains of workers lagged considerably behind the gains of other groups in the society. This income shift has gone, in large part, to the benefit of business and

bank profits. And another part has gone to the benefit of such self-employed groups as physicians, dentists and lawyers.

Some government and business officials have tried to focus the blame for inflation on workers' wage increases. Yet the record clearly shows that workers and their families have been among the major victims of inflation. And they have been the principal victims of the Administration's misguided "game-plan" to combat inflation by an economic slow-down.

These are some of the major economic issues that confront workers and trade unions in the thousands of labor-management contract negotiations in 1971.

Thus, workers and their unions can be expected to press for substantial improvements in collective bargaining agreements negotiated in 1971.

III. THE FAIR LABOR STANDARDS ACT

Modernization of the Fair Labor Standards Act is urgently needed. The present minimum wage of \$1.60 an hour, under the amendments adopted in 1966, was barely tolerable at that time. It is utterly inadequate in 1971, in the face of five years of an inflationary rise of living costs. Moreover, millions of the lowest-paid workers remain unprotected by the Act.

The major purpose of this statute, as outlined in its Declaration of Policy, is to correct and as rapidly as practicable to eliminate labor conditions "detrimental to the maintenance of the minimum standard of living, necessary for health, efficiency, and general well-being of workers."

To fulfill the Act's intent, it has been amended four times in its 33-year history, both to extend its coverage and to raise the wage floor.

Modernization of the Act in 1971 would represent a major step in the effort to eliminate poverty. Nearly two-thirds of the 24 million poor people, according to the government's definition of poverty, are in families headed by a worker in the labor force—low-wage, part-time or unemployed workers. About one-quarter of the poor—and over 30% of all the children growing up in poverty—are in families headed by a full-time, year-round worker whose wages are so low that his family is impoverished.

An increase in the federal minimum wage to at least \$2 an hour, immediately, is now required on the basis of the economic facts. At a \$2 an hour minimum wage, a full-time, year-round worker would earn approximately \$4,000 a year. This is not much above the government-defined poverty line of approximately \$3,700 for a non-farm family of four. But it would represent quite an improvement over the \$3,200 such a worker earns at the present \$1.60 federal minimum rate.

The protection of the Fair Labor Standards Act should be extended to all workers. The Act's coverage, which now protects 46 million workers, should be extended to the remaining 17 million non-supervisory wage and salary employees who are still not covered by this federal law.

Approximately 6 million workers currently protected by the minimum wage provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act are denied its hour protection because of specific exemptions. We believe that farm workers, hotel and restaurant workers, local transit employees, agricultural processing workers and other similar groups need protection from excessive hours, as well as an adequate floor under their wages. This hodgepodge of exemptions should be eliminated.

We urge prompt Congressional action to update the Fair Labor Standards Act—to raise the minimum wage to at least \$2 an hour and to extend the Act's coverage to the 17 million non-supervisory wage and salary earners who are still excluded from the law's protection.

IV. REVENUE SHARING

The sharing of federal revenues with the states and localities is a well established principle. Today, about one-fourth of the federal revenues available for domestic use is shared with the states and localities.

Through the present system of federal categorical grants-in-aid, \$24 billion of federal money flowed to state and local governments in 1970.

There is widespread agreement on the responsibility of the federal government to provide financial aid to the states and local governments, particularly in this time of rapid social and economic change. The federal tax structure, with all of its deficiencies, is a more equitable and efficient producer of revenues than state and local tax systems that depend so largely on sales and property taxes. Moreover, many public needs involve nationwide social issues, such as education and welfare. Many others cross the boundary lines of states and local government units, such as requirements for highways, pollution controls, manpower training and regional economic development.

Categorical grants-in-aid transfer federal funds to a state or local government for specific purposes or "categories," geared to meet high-priority needs determined by federal legislation. Such programs are established by the Congress, through the normal process of legislation and appropriation, with the opportunity for Congressional review of how the programs are working. Moreover, the state or local government must use such federal grants, usually combined with additional small percentages of state or local funds, to provide specified public facilities or services, under performance standards—such as civil rights and labor standards—that are established by federal statute.

This system has served the nation well. In the past decade, for example, as public-service needs converged increasingly on state and local governments, federal grants-in-aid more than tripled—rising from \$7 billion in 1960 to \$24 billion ten years later. Significantly, the major share flowed to the larger cities and the poverty-stricken rural regions of the country, for such programs as the education of disadvantaged children, training workers in new skills, building hospitals, and underpinning other state and local government functions and services. Between 1960 and 1970, federal grants-in-aid to the hard-pressed urban areas shot up from about \$3.5 billion, or approximately half of all grants-in-aid, to \$16.7 billion or over two-thirds.

Despite this sharp rise of federal grants-in-aid—and despite increasing outlays by the states and local governments—mounting needs for public facilities and services have left many states, every large city and countless smaller government units in a financial bind.

These problems can be solved largely by an improvement in the system and a substantial increase in federal grants. And, in many cases, the programs that could provide the funds are already in operation, under federal law. However, the gap between Congressional authorizations for federal grants-in-aid programs and actual appropriations has grown from 20% in 1966 to 35% in 1970. The increase in this gap by 1970 amounted to about \$6 billion.

But the Administration has opposed full funding or even adequate funding of these programs. Indeed, the Administration vetoed Congressional appropriations, in 1970, in attempts to slow the advance of several federal grant-in-aid funds. And, in the final weeks of the year, it vetoed the manpower bill, passed by the Congress, which would have established a program of federal grants to the states and local governments to create public-service jobs for the unemployed.

On the heels of these actions, the Administration has responded, in the past several weeks, to the pleas of the state and local governments for more federal aid, by offering a change in the method of the delivery system.

The Administration is now advocating a two-part program of so-called general and special revenue sharing:

Under the "general revenue-sharing" proposal, the federal government would dispense about \$5 billion a year to the states on a no-strings basis—with formulas that would require a pass-through to the local governments.

Such funds, under this proposal, would be granted without any relation to program, purpose or adequate federal performance standards. Congressional processes of establishing priorities and program-purposes for the use of federal funds, as well as appropriations procedures and the oversight function, would be completely bypassed and the states and local governments would be free to do what they please with the money.

The AFL-CIO urges complete rejection of this proposal. We are firmly convinced that such no-strings money will not add one federal penny to the money available to the states and localities. It will merely be a substitute for the full funding of existing programs, which could quickly provide the state and local governments with at least \$6 billion of additional federal funds rather than \$5 billion. Establishment of a no-strings grant program would also block or slow down the needed expansion of grant-in-aid programs and the development of new ones.

With no requirement that the funds be spent for any specified purposes or programs, critical needs could be bypassed in the expenditure of these federal monies. There is no reason to believe that each of the 50 states and 81,000 cities, boroughs, townships and school districts is in a better position to weigh and balance national-priority needs and use federal funds to meet them more effectively and efficiently.

Moreover, without specified and enforceable federal performance standards there is no assurance that federal civil rights guarantees and fair labor practices will be applied to projects supported by no-strings federal grants.

The Administration's "special revenue-sharing" proposal has been presented with few details. It is clear, however, that the Administration envisions dismantling scores of present categorical grant-in-aid programs and replacing them with a system of broad "block" grants. Ten billion dollars for six vaguely defined functional areas would replace \$10 billion of categorical grant-in-aid programs, specifically authorized by federal legislation. And \$1 billion of federal funds would be added to the total, so that no state would receive less than it does under the present system.

Under this proposal, federal requirements and performance standards for the use of federal funds would be weakened, if not eliminated. What is more, this special revenue-sharing experiment would dismantle and replace existing, specific federal programs to meet vital and critical domestic needs with six broad functional areas, under the heading of urban community development, rural community development, education, manpower training, law enforcement, and transportation.

Among the scores of categorical programs threatened with dismantling are the Appalachia program for the regional development of the 13-state area, as well as the various specific aids for education and manpower training. Existing programs of federal grants for education include federal support to educate handicapped children, to prevent dropouts, and special programs for children of migratory workers, American Indians and

those in the ghettos of the nation's large cities. Elimination of such special-purpose programs and the placement of their funds in six "special revenue-sharing" broad functional areas—such as education—will mean that many, if not most, of the efforts to meet these critical needs will be lost in the shuffle, as each of the 50 states and 81,000 local governments determines how to use the funds.

The AFL-CIO will comment in detail on these issues as the Administration's "special revenue-sharing" proposals are presented to Congress and the public. However, we fail to see how this experiment will ease the financial burden of state and local governments. Moreover, we see great potential damage in dismantling the categorical programs and in weakening or eliminating the purposes, performance standards and federal requirements of these programs.

However, there is an urgent and immediate need for a substantial increase in the flow of federal funds to the states and local governments.

The AFL-CIO recommends the following:

1. Full funding of existing federal grant-in-aid programs is essential. If the gap between authorizations and appropriations had not widened over the past few years, federal aid to the states and localities would now be \$6 billion higher. In addition, a greater degree of certainty should be built into the system, so that state and local officials can plan expenditures and implement programs, with an assurance that the federal money will be forthcoming.

2. Immediate adoption and implementation of a program of federal grants to states and local governments to create public-service jobs is essential. This is realistic revenue sharing which would substantially reduce unemployment and allow the states and localities to meet community needs.

3. The federal government should take over the costs of public welfare. This would assure a flow of federal funds to where the needs are greatest and would ease the financial burdens of the states and local governments.

4. A careful review of present federal categorical grants is needed. Such a review should be done with the aim of consolidating overlapping grants, increasing their efficiency and making it easier for state and local officials to be aware of and obtain the federal aids available to them. However, the purposes, performance standards and requirements of the programs should not be destroyed in the process of consolidating and streamlining the grants.

In some programs, it may be appropriate to eliminate state and local financial matching.

5. The unfinished business of tax reform must be undertaken at all levels of government. The great reliance of the states and localities on unfair and unproductive tax structures has contributed substantially to their failure to meet their public needs. Much more emphasis must be placed on income taxes, based on ability to pay. The tax-break, in many localities, given to industrial and commercial property at the expense of the homeowner and renter through inequitable assessments is scandalous and must be corrected. Much also remains to be done to achieve justice in the federal tax structure, by eliminating the loopholes of special privileges for corporations and wealthy families and by rejecting any and all efforts that would move the tax structure further away from the principle of ability to pay.

6. A federal tax credit for state income tax payments should be established, in place of the present method of deducting such taxes from taxable income. This would add a big element of equity to the tax structure, realistically share revenues and encourage the states to make more effective use of income taxes.

7. A study of consolidation of inefficient

local government units should be pursued. Many of the 81,000 local spending and taxing units of government present an obstacle to raising and using public funds efficiently. This proliferation of local governments has led to difficulties in enforcing and collecting local taxes and to high tax-administration costs. Many localities are too small to raise the revenue needed for public facilities and services, and taxing jurisdictions determined by historic or geographic accidents—or overt attempts to "zone" out the poor—are usually unresponsive to modern economic and social needs. Many others represent boundary lines that are obsolete and do not reflect present economic realities.

8. New financing methods or institutions, such as a federal Urban Bank, should be explored to provide states and localities easier access to long-term, low-interest loans for the construction of public housing, urban transit systems, and other community facilities.

9. Finally, there is a long list of policies and proposals for the needed modernization of state and local governments. For some states, constitutional reform could be the most important step; for others, tax reform; still others might require a shift in responsibilities between the state and local governments. The consolidation of inefficient local government units, such as some local school districts, would be a forward step.

V. INTERNATIONAL TRADE AND INVESTMENT

New government policies are needed to meet the American people's needs in the international economic world of the 1970s. The United States position in world trade has deteriorated. The export of American jobs and displacement of U.S. production are continuing. The time for action is long overdue.

International economic relationships have been changing substantially since the late 1940s and at a stepped-up pace in the past decade. These changes are the major factors in the deteriorating American position in world trade.

Modern nations, with managed national economies, subsidize exports, add barriers to imports, adjust currency values and change their tax structures to benefit their national interests.

Sharply rising foreign investments of U.S. companies, as well as advances in transportation and communications, have sped the transfer of American technology, production and employment to operations in other countries. Technology, once the key to America's trading strength, has been exported. Multinational firms and banks, often U.S.-based, now juggle global operations to benefit from the laws of each nation. But their global management decision-making and transactions are intra-corporate, frequently reaching beyond the law of any single nation.

U.S. firms have invested billions of dollars in foreign subsidiaries every year for two decades; in 1970, the outlay for foreign subsidiary facilities was \$12.5 billion. Such foreign investments, license and patent agreements, joint ventures and other foreign affiliations of American companies have been changing the patterns of the U.S. economy in world trade.

As a result of these developments: U.S. exports have been retarded. Imports have been spurred. Production has been displaced. Jobs and employment opportunities have been exported.

The officially reported U.S. trade balance was only \$2.7 billion in 1970—including as much as \$2 billion in government-financed exports. The composition, as well as the balance of American trade has changed so that the U.S. is importing a sharply increasing volume of manufactured goods.

The transfer of technology, production, patents, licensing and other foreign-affiliate operations of U.S.-based multinational companies have caused the displacement of pro-

duction and employment in an increasing variety of finished products and components.

As much as half or more of what is reported as U.S. trade is now composed of intra-corporate transactions between U.S.-based multinational companies, their foreign subsidiaries and other foreign affiliates in both industrial and developing countries. Such intracorporate transactions are not competitive. Neither are they arm's length transactions between Americans and nationals of other countries.

The increasing impact on the U.S. position in world trade of managed national economies, the internationalization of technology and the operations of multinational companies have made old theories of free trade and protectionism obsolete. It is neither possible for the American economy to hide behind high tariff walls nor to pretend that free, competitive trade relations are possible.

U.S. policies that were designed for the world of the 1930s and 1940s, have become outmoded. They now contribute to undermining the U.S. economy at home and abroad.

A battery of realistic policies and measures are needed. The United States government must now make economic conditions at home a starting point for U.S. policy and posture in international economic relations. Policies should be based on the premise that trade is a complex network of international relationships, and measures are needed to deal with the foreign investments of U.S. companies and banks. At the same time, action is required to slow down the flood of imports that displace U.S. production and employment.

U.S. government measures are required:

1. To stop helping and subsidizing U.S. companies in setting up and operating foreign subsidiaries—for example, to repeal Section 807 and similar provisions of the Tariff Code, and to repeal the tax provision which permits the deferral of U.S. taxes on the income of U.S. companies from their foreign subsidiaries.

2. To supervise and curb the substantial outflows of American capital for the investments of U.S. companies in foreign operations.

3. To press, in appropriate international agencies, for the establishment of international fair labor standards in world trade.

4. As a stop-gap in the face of growing unresolved problems, to regulate and slow down the flow of imports into the U.S. of a variety of goods and product-lines, in which sharply rising imports and displacing significant percentages of U.S. production and employment.

5. To prevent the further deterioration of America's trade position by rejecting any new preferential tariff agreements or other special arrangements that actually benefit multinational firms.

6. To reject further tax bonanzas to business, in the name of encouraging exports—such as DISC, a measure which would add substantially to the burdens of American taxpayers, for the benefit of big exporting companies, largely multinationals, and with little net addition to the export of U.S.-produced goods.

7. The U.S. government should encourage the use of U.S.-flag ships and seek to remove freight rate discrimination against U.S. exports.

VI. HEALTH SECURITY PROGRAM

America needs to replace the profit motive as the heart of its medical care philosophy, a single primary goal—good health for all its people.

The AFL-CIO believes that the National Health Security Bill is the only truly comprehensive program of national health insurance that meets the challenges of care, financing, costs, development and reform.

America has the best available medical talent—but available to only part of the society.

Americans who live in poverty in city ghettos and rural shacks can expect seven fewer years of life than more affluent Americans; their babies have as much chance of surviving as infants in Ecuador; their young mothers have about the same chance of surviving childbirth as the women of Costa Rica.

Health care is not equally provided for all Americans. It is a myth that private insurance is doing—or can do—the job. More than 20 percent of the population under 65 is not covered against the most costly aspects of medical care—hospital and surgical services. More than half have no coverage for physician home and office visits. A minuscule number have coverage for dental costs.

Under National Health Security, every resident of the United States will be eligible to receive virtually the entire range of personal health care services without deductibles or coinsurance.

Financing of medical care today is a patchwork effort of personal, private, state, local and federal funds. Medical bills are paid part by private insurance, part out of workers' pockets, part out of welfare funds, part out of Medicare.

For example, state and local governments are burdened with a \$2.5 billion a year expenditure for health care, plus approximately \$500 million a year to provide private health insurance for their employees.

National Health Security will be financed by taxes on employers, employees, the self-employed and unearned individual income, as well as from general revenues.

The workers' share—1% of wages and unearned income up to a total of \$15,000—represents no new tax. Workers are now paying almost that amount toward Medicare. Further, National Health Security would significantly reduce workers' out-of-pocket, non-reimbursed medical expenses with the added bonus of better and more complete medical care.

Self-employed persons would be taxed at a 2.5% rate up to \$15,000.

The employer's contribution—3.5% on payrolls—is about what many employers now pay for inadequate private health insurance for their employees. Some pay much more; some pay less; some pay none.

General tax revenues would account for the remainder of the Health Security Trust Fund—approximately 50% of the total. This is not all new money. Medicaid, Medicare and other medical costs already constitute a significant and growing portion of the federal budget. Health Security would absorb these costs.

The program would also result in a direct form of revenue sharing by relieving state and local governments of much of their present health care burdens. Additionally, state and local government employees would receive comprehensive benefits at no cost to the governmental units.

National Health Security is needed to stabilize and control runaway medical costs. Medical care costs have been rising at least twice as fast as the general cost of living. Blue Cross premiums have more than doubled, on the average, since the late 1950s. In 1970, the average worker paid \$324 in health-care charges for each member of his family.

Union bargaining committees are faced with the dilemma of rising medical costs at every negotiation session. Reasonable wage gains are sacrificed for improvements in health insurance, but medical expenses increase faster than the increase in coverage.

Private insurance companies are unwilling or unable to deal with increased costs. They have acted simply as a pass-through mechanism, paying for whatever care was offered, good or bad, needed or unneeded, efficient or inefficient. Their rates go up not only to pay for increased medical costs of policyholders,

but also to maintain profit margins and pay high operating expenses.

National Health Security will have effective fiscal controls by contracting with hospitals and other institutional providers on the basis of an approved budget, and by maximum emphasis on prepayment to contracting groups such as medical and dental societies.

The program will not constrict individual liberty. Doctors will be free to choose whether or not they will participate. Patients will be free to choose their physicians and health delivery systems.

An essential feature of National Health Security is the Health Resources Development Fund which will be used for health manpower education and training, group practice development and other means to expand and improve health care personnel, facilities and services.

At present, health care is fragmented, disorganized, inadequate and spotty. It is a non-system—a haphazard collection of isolated and uncoordinated institutions.

National Health Security has built-in financial, professional and other incentives to encourage organized arrangements for patient care and to encourage prevention and early diagnosis and treatment of disease.

Hospitals will be encouraged to increase efficiency; to cooperate in planning, purchase and utilization of new equipment, and to eliminate unnecessary, wasteful and duplicative expenditures. Doctors will be given a financial stake in keeping their patients well. Care will be provided at the best—not the most expensive—location.

National Health Security—introduced in the House (H.R. 22) by Reps. Griffiths, Corman, Reid and Mosher and in the Senate (S. 3) by Sens. Kennedy, Cooper and Saxbe—is the proper program to provide quality health care for all Americans. The AFL-CIO is proud to endorse it.

We arrived at our decision after careful examination of other proposals—some substantive and some merely crude attempts to avoid needed reforms in the present system of delivering health care.

The American Medical Association's "medi-credit" plan and the private insurance carriers' "Healthcare" proposal are thinly disguised efforts to protect vested interests and insurance company profits. They are band-aids, where surgery is required.

There are other proposals—such as the bills introduced by Senators Javits and Pell and the proposal of the American Hospital Association—which are much more substantive. (Senators Javits and Pell are also co-sponsors of S. 3.)

But, generally, all of the proposals, except National Health Security, lack at least one of the following: equal access to health care for all people; comprehensive coverage; restructuring of the health care system; effective incentives for quality and efficiency or controls on costs; or they depend on inadequate private insurance as carriers or intermediaries or both.

It has been nearly a year since President Nixon declared there is a "massive crisis" in the area of health care and a threat of a "breakdown" of the medical care system. In that time, he has met that crisis by vetoing a hospital construction bill and a measure to provide for the training of more family doctors, and he threatened to close down vitally-needed Public Health Service hospitals.

After taking one action after another to forestall urgently needed health care measures, the President has at long last delivered a health message. It contains one or two constructive features such as the belated recognition that prepaid group practice can deliver better medical care at less cost and the proposal to eliminate the onerous Medicare premium the elderly must now pay.

But it is evident that the President's approach taken as a whole, is both piecemeal and inadequate. It places main reliance on discredited private insurance which has been largely responsible for the high cost, low quality medical care we have today. The President's proposals do not provide for effective cost controls or quality incentives.

His proposals fall far short of meeting the "massive crisis" in health care.

VII. PUBLIC INVESTMENT TO MEET AMERICA'S NEEDS

America, in the 1970s, needs a long-range, national effort to greatly expand and improve public investments in facilities and services. Planned public programs will be needed for the rest of the 20th Century to revitalize the nation's urban areas as centers of American civilization and to improve the quality of life of the American people. Such effort is essential to meet the requirements of a growing and increasingly urban population in the midst of rapid and radical changes in technology, urban growth and race relations.

For 40 years, the country has been undergoing vast social changes, with rapidly multiplying needs for every kind of public investment from sewer systems and waste treatment facilities to urban mass transit, education, health care, public safety, libraries, roads and airports. Despite efforts to meet these growing needs in the past 25 years—and particularly during the latter 1960s—large backlogs of unmet needs have remained and some have expanded to monumental size. Putting fingers in the dike can no longer be depended on to prevent a potential flood.

From 1930 to the end of 1970, the population soared from 123 million people to over 206 million, a rise of about 70 percent. Moreover, the Great Migration of the American population, in these recent decades, resulted in a sharp decline of rural areas, while the growth of metropolitan areas boomed. Huge rural regions of the country—in the southern, central and Rocky Mountain states—saw their populations decline, and some of these areas, such as Appalachia, remain in depressed economic condition. At the same time population-growth skyrocketed in the metropolitan areas that stretch along the Atlantic and Pacific Coasts and the Great Lakes.

Under the impact of the technological revolution in agriculture, employment in farming dropped from 10.3 million, or 20 percent of the labor force, in 1930, to 3.5 million, or only about 4 percent of the labor force, in 1970.

The rural and small-town life that dominated much of American society as recently as 1930 is now largely gone. About 70 percent of the population lives in urban areas, and this percentage is continuing to increase. Although the overall growth of the population has slowed down considerably in the past several years, after nearly two decades of very rapid expansion, migration to urban and, particularly, large metropolitan areas, has continued.

This social upheaval has been greatest among Negroes. From an overwhelmingly Southern rural population in 1930, Negroes have become overwhelmingly urban—as a result of the Great Migration out of the rural South to the cities, particularly the large cities of the North and West.

All of the new migrants to America's cities—whites and Negroes, Puerto Ricans and Mexican-Americans—have faced the difficulties of adjusting to a new and strange environment. The Negro migrants, in particular, have brought with them a history of 350 years of slavery, segregation, poverty, lack of education and, frequently, poor health, as well as suspicion of government authorities. The cities are now suffering, in part, from the social ills and delinquencies of the Southern rural areas.

On coming to the cities, the new migrants have faced the discriminatory practices of those areas, as well as a lack of low- and moderate-income housing and the impact of the technological revolution in industry on job opportunities for uneducated and unskilled urban workers. The types of industrial jobs that helped previous generations of foreign immigrants and rural Americans to adjust to urban life have not been expanding.

In addition, there has been another Great Migration in the past quarter of a century. Millions of middle- and upper-income families have been leaving the cities for the suburbs, the most rapidly growing sections of the country. This movement has opened up older housing in the inner cities. But, combined with the additional migration of industry to the suburbs and countryside, it has reduced the tax-base of the cities while the demands for low- and moderate-cost housing, welfare, education, police and fire protection, manpower training and other public facilities and services have been mounting. Increasingly, the inner-cities have become concentrations of decaying and poverty-stricken areas, with small pockets of wealthy families, while the needs for city facilities and services multiply and the tax-base narrows.

Moreover, the change of industrial location has compounded the problem of inadequate mass transportation facilities for lower-income city dwellers to get to the new areas of employment growth. And most suburban communities have had color-barriers, as well as a continuing absence of low-cost housing.

The major burden of trying to solve these problems has fallen on the state and local governments, whose expenditures and taxes have shot up. But most of these governments have inadequate, as well as unfair, tax systems and they lack the necessary resources. So public investment needs multiplied faster than the states and local governments could provide, even with a helping hand from the federal government. As a result, many states and most cities face an immediate or potential financial crisis, while public facilities and services fail to meet the mounting needs of their inhabitants.

During the early 1930s and from 1941 to 1945, many public investment needs were neglected when the Depression and World War II caused shortages of money, manpower or materials. For a brief period of about eight years, from 1933 to 1941, the New Deal started vast federal efforts to modernize and strengthen the underpinnings of American society—including a social insurance system, public housing, a federal home mortgage system, rural electrification, flood control, TVA, Bonneville, conservation, irrigation, the development of parks and recreational areas. But since the end of World War II, many of these federal public investment efforts were terminated or their expansion and improvement was slowed down by tradition, conservative opposition. Between 1952 and 1966, for example, the New Deal's low-cost public housing programs nearly perished.

Federal efforts to help meet public needs lagged through most of the late 1950s and early 1960s. Finally, in 1964-1966, the long-delayed federal response came with an outburst of programs, involving grants-in-aid to the states and local governments, including the hard-pressed cities. Such federal grants-in-aid—for such programs as elementary and secondary school education, model cities and public safety—almost doubled, from \$13 billion in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966 to about \$24 billion in fiscal year 1970. Nevertheless, actual appropriations and outlays for these programs fell increasingly behind the planned expansion of their authorized funding—from about 80 percent of authorizations in fiscal year 1966 down to only 65 percent in 1970.

An analysis by the staff of the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, issued in June 1970, reports:

"Dollar authorizations were established for these new and expanded programs three to five years in advance, in ever-increasing amounts . . .

"The fact remains, however, that the actual outlays represented a substantial scaling down of domestic program funding, when compared to the optimistic 'Great Society' program authorizations of the 1964-1966 period. As a consequence, the authorization-appropriation gap widened steadily, increasing from about 20 percent in fiscal 1966 to 35 percent in 1970. Had it been possible to retain even the 1966 gap margin, federal aid would approximate \$30 billion by the end of fiscal 1970, rather than the \$24 billion estimated for this year."

This increased gap of \$6 billion of federal aid for specific programs by 1970 is greater than President Nixon's \$5 billion of "general revenue sharing"—with no program purpose, no national priorities and no performance standards—for 1972, two years later.

The programs of 1964-1966 aroused expectations of overnight solutions to problems that had developed over many years. But the increasing gap between authorizations and appropriations held back even realistic achievement of their goals in aiding state and local governments to meet public investment needs. In addition, tight money, high interest rates and the recession of 1969-1970 resulted in smaller state and local tax receipts than expected, while their welfare burden, interest payments and other costs mounted.

So public needs and expectations multiplied, while increases in public investment outlays proved to be insufficient. The great growth of unmet public investment needs brought a deterioration in the quality of life of many Americans: the near-collapse of elementary and secondary school education in sections of the major cities; the increase of violent crime and lawbreaking; traffic jams in the cities and in the air above airports; the spread of poverty-stricken slum areas in the inner-cities; the increasing pollution of the water and air.

Moreover, during the past quarter of a century, the tax system, which provides the foundation for public investment outlays, moved farther and farther away from a structure based on ability to pay. Tax loopholes for the benefit of corporations and wealthy individuals riddled the federal tax system, and the Tax Reform Act of 1969, on net balance, was merely one small step forward. State and local government tax structures became increasingly regressive—with their emphasis on sales and property taxes, which are an inequitable and heavy burden on low- and middle-income families; and inequitable assessments make property taxes even more unfair. In addition, the tight-money and high-interest rate policies of 1969-1970 resulted in postponing many public investment programs and greatly increasing the costs and debt-burdens of those that were pursued.

Unfortunately, there are no instant solutions to such complex of pressing problems. But rapid forward strides are essential.

Some "public" investments are provided by regulated but privately owned public utilities, such as electric, gas and telephone facilities. And some are provided by private non-profit institutions, such as many hospitals. But for the overwhelming majority of public facilities and services, the American people depend on government at the state, local and federal levels.

The federal government, representing all of the American people, holds the key to workable solutions to most of the public investment needs of American society, since

they usually involve nationwide social issues that cut across the boundary lines of the states, cities, counties and school districts. Moreover, with all of its defects, the federal tax system is much more productive and equitable than state and local tax structures. In addition, only the federal government can establish national priorities, goals and nationwide performance standards.

No state or local government can solve the nation's vast public investment needs in isolation. Neither can private enterprise, even with the promise of tax subsidies. Meeting these needs requires national policies and nationwide measures, with adequate federal funds and standards—and the cooperation and backing of the states, local governments, business firms and private groups.

A long-range, planned national effort to meet the needs of the American people for public facilities and services can also provide the basis for economic growth in the period ahead. Each era of economic expansion in America has been accompanied by growing investments and employment in new industries. The last third of the 19th Century saw the building of the railroads, the agricultural implement, steel and oil industries. In the first two decades of the 20th Century, there were the public utilities—the electric, gas, telephone and urban transit systems. During the 1920s, economic growth was accompanied by the development of the auto and radio industries, and after World War II came television, aircraft, air travel, electronics and advanced technology. Now, in the 1970s, America's new frontiers are in a major emphasis on public investment to strengthen the foundation of American society and provide the investment—and employment-basis for a new period of national economic expansion.

Several steps are essential:

1. The first is the full funding by the federal government of present public-investment programs, plus a temporary acceleration of funds for short-term projects, to lift sales, production and employment in this period of economic stagnation.

Such immediate step-up in the appropriation of federal grants to state and local governments and federal agencies for the expansion and improvement of public facilities and services could be the key to reconversion—to offset the declining military proportion of total national production. It would provide opportunities to employ the talents and skills of unemployed scientists, engineers and technicians, as well as job opportunities for returning GI's and other categories of unemployed workers.

2. To sustain the planned expansion of public investment, the federal government should develop, coordinate and maintain a national inventory of public investment needs, based on estimated future population growth and present backlogs—in each major category, such as low- and moderate-cost housing, schools, health care facilities, day-care centers, parks, pollution controls, other community facilities and other services. Each state and metropolitan area should be encouraged, with the assistance of federal planning grants and technical aid, to develop a similar inventory of needs within its geographical jurisdiction. Such a comprehensive inventory of needs should provide the foundation for planned nationwide programs in each category, based on adequate federal financial and technical assistance to the states and local governments, including federal grants-in-aid and guaranteed loans, as well as direct federal efforts.

Target dates should be established for achieving specified objectives in each category—along the lines of the 10-year national housing goal, established by the Congress, under the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968—and the pace of continuing advance should be speeded up or slowed down,

with sufficient funds, depending on the availability of manpower and productive capacity. In this way, the inventory would also be a shelf of public works, with an accelerated pace in times of general economic recession and a slower advance in periods of shortages of materials and manpower.

To facilitate such programs, a federal urban bank or similar mechanism may be required to provide long-term, low-interest loans for the construction of moderate- and low-income housing and community facilities, as well as for aiding state and local governments in financial crisis.

3. An Office of Public Investment Coordination should be established in the Executive Branch of the federal government to encourage, assist and coordinate public investment planning and execution by state and local governments and federal agencies.

4. Congress should direct the Federal Reserve System to allocate a significant portion of available bank credit, at reasonable interest rates, to effectuate the construction of housing and community facilities.

5. A land-use policy should be formulated to provide the basis for the rational development of urban areas, new towns, parks and recreational facilities and to curb land speculation, which has substantially increased the costs of housing and community facilities. Idle or under-utilized federal land should be examined for such possible use as sites for housing, parks, recreation areas, wild-life and nature preserves.

6. We urge the Administration to develop a capital budget, as an integral part of the annual federal budget, to assist the federal government in planning, financing and executing public investment programs. Such businesslike budget for the federal government would establish a federal investment account, including outlays for the creation, improvement or acquisition of assets or the acquisition of recoverable claims—separate from the account for general housekeeping expenses and national security. Such budget methods are almost universally used by modern business firms, not western democracies, at least one-third of the states and most large American cities.

7. Proposals to dismantle the system of federal grants-in-aid to the states and local governments, as well as proposals to supplement the expansion of such programs with no-strings federal funds that lack program purposes, national priorities and standards, should be rejected. However, administrative simplification of the large number of federal grants requires the consolidation of many overlapping grants, without undermining their purposes, goals and standards.

8. Justice in the federal tax structure—and additional revenue—should be achieved by eliminating the loopholes of special tax privileges for corporations and wealthy families. Congress should also prohibit the implementation of the Treasury Department's tax bonanza to business in the form of accelerated depreciation, which will amount to annual revenue losses of \$2.7 to \$4.1 billion in the next several years. Efforts to move the federal tax structure farther away from the principle of ability to pay—such as the proposal for a national sales tax under the name of a value-added tax—should be rejected.

9. Federal efforts are needed to assume the costs of welfare payments and lift this burden from the backs of state and local governments. The federal government should also encourage and assist states and local governments in developing more productive and equitable tax structures. Such measures would provide state and local governments with additional funds to meet their responsibilities.

10. The provision of health care for the American people should be greatly improved by the establishment of a national health security system, as well as the expansion of health care facilities and services.

There will, as always, be those who say that America cannot afford these programs. The AFL-CIO is convinced that America cannot afford to stand still or move backward, as it has done for the last two years.

The AFL-CIO has absolute confidence in America and in America's ability to meet and overcome its problems. But those problems must be grappled with. It is time to move boldly, confidently and—above all—in the right direction: toward securing economic justice for all Americans.

It is in that conviction that we submit this positive program for building a better America.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE TO OUR FLAG DAY

HON. JACK F. KEMP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 11, 1971

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I introduced House Joint Resolution 452 to authorize the President to proclaim April 30, 1971, as Pledge of Allegiance to Our Flag Day. The boys and girls of Cleveland Hill Primary School did some fine research which provided the basis for my resolution and the class and their teacher, Mrs. Irene Priore, are to be complimented for their work and patriotism.

I most certainly will urge the President and the Committee on Foreign Affairs to give special consideration to House Joint Resolution 452 as well as Mr. DULSKI's bill, House Joint Resolution 451—the latter making the last school day in April as a permanent Pledge of Allegiance to Our Flag Day.

At this point I include a letter from 8-year-old Brenda Waddy, transmitting the proposal of the class along with their proclamation:

CLEVELAND HILL PRIMARY SCHOOL,
Cheektowaga, N.Y., February 22, 1971.

DEAR SIR: I've been thinking about our leaders helping the nation. I think it's very important. Every one knows we have a good leader to lead us. In 1789 we had a very good leader and he helped us very much. We need your help!

April 30th is an important day to our country. It is a day to honor the leaders of this great nation. When I grow up I'm hoping to be a leader because I want to honor our class. I am a girl.

Please read our proclamation and urge Congress and the President to pass it. Our President Nixon asked all citizens of our nation to help our nation. This is our way of helping.

I am 8 years old in Mrs. Priore's third grade class.

Your friend,

BRENDA WADDY.

PROCLAMATION TO THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Whereas, on April 30, 1789 George Washington took the oath of office and was inaugurated as the first President of the United States.

Whereas, George Washington was the only President of the United States of America inaugurated on April 30th.

Whereas, April 30, 1803 Congress passed the first enabling act authorizing the people of the eastern division of the Northwest Territory to hold a convention and frame a constitution in order to become a state, and a

precedent was set in helping Ohio's gaining its statehood, followed by the same, set for the rest of the states in this territory.

Whereas, on April 30, 1803 the United States of America, under the leadership of President Thomas Jefferson, made its first territorial expansion by purchasing 828,000 square miles of land (doubling the size of the United States by peaceful means) known as the Louisiana Purchase, which land eventually was divided into the states of Missouri, Nebraska, Iowa, Arkansas, North Dakota, South Dakota, most of Louisiana, Kansas, Minnesota, Montana, Wyoming and parts of Colorado and Oklahoma.

Whereas, on April 30, 1812, the state of Louisiana was admitted into the Union.

Whereas, on April 30, 1889, Congress fixed this date of April 30th as a national holiday to celebrate the inauguration of George Washington as the first President of the United States of America.

Whereas, on April 30, 1970 the proclamation sent by Mrs. Irene Priore's Third Graders of Cheektowaga, New York requesting that April 30, 1970 be proclaimed as Pledge of Allegiance to Our Flag Day in the United States of America for all school children in all schools of our nation, was read in Congress.

Whereas, schools, community leaders and citizens in all 50 states of our nation responded by letter, telephone and telegram to the Cheektowaga, New York Third Graders that they wished to participate in this unified promise of loyalty at 1:30 P.M. Eastern Savings Time so children's voices might echo throughout the land.

Therefore, We, the boys and girls of Cleveland Hill Primary School, Third Grade Room 211, do hereby ask the Hon. Jack Kemp, Representative of our nation to proclaim each April 30th as an annual special school day to honor our nation and its flag in school by song, speech and activities planned by the faculty and students of each individual school.

We request that this proclamation be made known to all the schools of our nation so that all the school children may have the pride and honor to help plan a dignified program for their own schools. We believe that by encouraging children to have the pleasure of involvement in planning a program for April 30th each year that we are taking a positive approach toward building better attitudes in school children and planning for better citizens and leaders of the future.

Brenda Waddy, Kelly Jaroszewski, Scott McGonagle, Randall Seville, Dennis Galligan, Lawrence Kosinski, Franklin Crane, Jane Knight, Beth Driscoll, and Jeanmarie Danner.

Ron Senick, Brian Meier, Martin John Napierski, Shaun Pralow, Debbie Moffitt, Michele Graziano, Marty Stanford, Susan Stein, Renata Rippa, and Lori Mazza.

Ken Lewis, Janet Gamd, John Marco, Terry Deideki, Blair Graham, and Mark Strozewski.

Carol Novo, Joanne Mook, Mary Ellen Sucato, Marshall Berger, Dawn Ambrose, Herman Falsetti, Carolyn Kerdell, and Richard Miller.

CONTROLLING THE SONIC BOOM

HON. JOHN N. ERLBORN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 11, 1971

Mr. ERLBORN. Mr. Speaker, in considering whether we should go ahead with development of the supersonic

transport, many of us have been alarmed by the prospect of disruption of our daily lives by sonic booms. In order to allay those fears, the Department of Transportation filed a notice of proposed rule-making last April 15, forbidding civil supersonic flight over the United States.

Since then, other officials, including the President, have declared that overland civil flights at supersonic speeds will not be allowed.

Nevertheless, some critics of the supersonic transport have not been convinced. A rule such as this can be easily changed or ignored, they say.

I agree that we do not want our daily lives disrupted by sonic booms and so I offer a bill which will put the Department of Transportation's proposed regulation into statutory form. This bill would prohibit, by law, the flight of any civil aircraft, including the SST, over the United States in such a manner as to create a sonic boom.

I believe we ought to proceed with development of the two prototypes of the SST and, if they prove successful—as the proponents of the SST expect—we should turn to the manufacture of these planes. On the other hand, if they cannot meet the criticisms which have been directed at the SST program, then I believe the program must be discontinued.

I believe that, in continuing this experiment, we should give whatever assurances we can to the American people that they will not be assaulted by these horrifying sonic booms.

THE PRIVACY-SECURITY DILEMMA

HON. WILLIAM D. HATHAWAY

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 11, 1971

Mr. HATHAWAY. Mr. Speaker, the Bangor, Maine, Daily News of Saturday, March 6, carried a very timely and perceptive editorial regarding the dilemma which the widespread use of computers by Government agencies poses for both the Government and each of the more than 200 million Americans it serves—"the preservation of privacy as against the preservation of security."

I believe what the Daily News has to say should be carefully considered by all of us and I am pleased to present its editorial herewith for inclusion in the RECORD:

PRIVACY VS. U.S. SECURITY

The right to privacy has been treasured by Americans since the adoption of the Constitution. But nowadays various agencies of the federal government are gathering in vast amounts of confidential information about its citizens and aliens living in the country.

It was recently disclosed that the Defense Department alone has records on some 25 million persons, about one-eighth of the population. Then there is the data gathered by the FBI. And don't forget what the Internal Revenue Service knows about you from your income tax returns. And the Census Bureau.

Development of that electronic device known as the computer has vastly increased the government's capacity to gather and store data. The machines can also spew out the

data at lightning speed with the push of a button or two. It is understandable that a citizen would feel uneasy, and perhaps indignant, by knowing how much Big Brother in Washington may know about his personal affairs.

He also has reason to wonder how accurate the information may be, especially that gathered by intelligence agents. And how confidentially it is kept. San Francisco's Mayor Alloto told the Senate's Constitutional Rights subcommittee that his reputation was damaged by an article published by a national magazine, based on information handed out to unauthorized persons—reporters—by unidentified federal personnel. Much of this information, he added, was "raw, unverified, unevaluated, hearsay information."

It is anything but comforting for a citizen to know that false and derogatory information about him may be on file as the gospel truth.

The federal intelligence agencies obviously must carry on secret operations and gather dossiers on persons known or suspected to be a danger to national security. They came in for severe criticism after the assassination of President Kennedy because they had not kept a sufficiently watchful eye on Lee Oswald.

Sad to say, the nation's populace includes many fanatics, many militants and disloyal citizens, and more than a few subversive foreign agents. And these are violent and perilous times, as witness the bomb blast in the Senate wing of the Capitol, the heart of the nation's government. The FBI, the military forces and other agencies charged with the nation's security necessarily must do a lot of snooping and keep records of what they learn.

Thus there is a dilemma—the preservation of privacy as against the preservation of security. A constructive suggestion was offered the Senate committee by Robert P. Henderson, an executive of one of the companies that produces some of the very computers that have brought the privacy issue to a head. He said:

"The phenomenal speed and efficiency of the computer has made it easy to invade the privacy of individuals and disseminate data about them without their knowledge or consent."

He went on to propose that each person have the right to examine whatever data the government may have about him, correct erroneous data and know what officials have access to his file.

We don't know what kind of practical problems such a proposal would pose. But we do know that it is contrary to American tradition for the federal government to have secret files on its citizens, including possible false information, which may fall into the hands of people who have no business knowing another person's business.

NORTH CAROLINA'S HANDICAPPED CITIZENS OF 1970

HON. WILMER MIZELL

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 11, 1971

Mr. MIZELL. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce to my colleagues in the House of Representatives that Miss Jo Cooley of Mocksville, N.C., has been selected North Carolina's Outstanding Handicapped Citizen of 1970 by the Governor's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped.

Handicapped citizens have proven

countless times that they are among the Nation's most valuable, energetic and resourceful people, as Miss Cooley's outstanding accomplishments will attest.

She has proven, as have others, that physical impairments need not be handicaps at all in terms of personal or professional success, and that handicapped citizens, rather than being patronized, should be encouraged to participate to the fullest possible extent in the Nation's working society.

Great contributions have been made, and will continue to be made, by handicapped citizens, and it is an honor for me to present to my colleagues one outstanding example of the active and involved and needed individual every handicapped person can be.

At this time, I insert in the RECORD an article announcing Miss Cooley's selection, which appeared in the February 25, 1971, edition of the Davie County Enterprise Record:

JO COOLEY SELECTED FOR MOST OUTSTANDING HANDICAPPED HONOR IN NORTH CAROLINA

Miss Jo Cooley of Mocksville has been selected as North Carolina's "Outstanding Handicapped Citizen of the Year" for 1970 by the Governor's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped.

Miss Cooley will attend the awards ceremony at 11 a.m. on March 18th in the Governor's Conference Room in Raleigh. At this time Governor Bob Scott will present the award to Miss Cooley and others. Immediately following the awards ceremony, the Sir Walter Lions Club will host an informal luncheon in her honor.

As a state winner, Miss Cooley will enter national competition for the most outstanding handicapped person of the year in the nation.

Miss Cooley was recommended by a local committee composed of Mayor D. J. Mando, Mrs. Agnes Leary and Peter Hairston. This recommendation was supported by a large number of letters from admirers throughout the state.

The recommendation of Miss Cooley cited the fact that:

"Jo is a person who transformed a tragic experience to one of service above self. Her deep concern for the individual has been displayed by her generosity and time given to others. Unlike many who would use adversity as an excuse, Jo proved herself as a worker rather than a talker."

Some of her activities since her accident were cited as follows:

Introduction of wheelchair basketball in this area which raised funds to build ramps in Mocksville for wheelchair patients.

She spearheaded the local bloodmobile visit for many years.

Taught Sunday School at the local Methodist Church for many years.

She is a volunteer worker at the V.A. Hospital in Salisbury, N.C.

She is active in the North Carolina Symphony and organized the drive for this organization in Davie County.

She was one of the leading organizers and supporters of the North Carolina Paraplegic Association.

She has made countless speeches before civic groups explaining the program on rehabilitation and employing the handicapped.

She made an appeal to N.C. Governor Bob Scott for additional funds for the rehabilitation program.

She has made numerous visits to the nursing homes and hospitals giving comfort to many.

She is a self-employed operator of one of the town's leading beauty shops and an active member of the merchants association.

Through her efforts the Davie County Board of Education employed a handicapped person with the qualifications and state certification as a high school guidance counselor—a first for Davie County.

Miss Cooley was injured in an automobile accident in January 1941 and since that time has been paralyzed from the waist down. Since that time she has continued the active management of the Mayfair Beauty Shop and has been active on behalf of handicapped persons throughout the state and south. She drives her own specially equipped car and has travelled extensively.

NEW PERMANENT SMALL BUSINESS COMMITTEE ORGANIZED, SUBCOMMITTEE ASSIGNMENTS MADE

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 11, 1971

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the new Permanent Select Committee on Small Business which you recently named for the 92d Congress has organized and the following subcommittees appointed and assignments made:

Foundations: Their Impact on Small Business—Representative WRIGHT PATMAN, Democrat of Texas, chairman, Representative FERNAND J. ST GERMAIN, Democrat of Rhode Island, Representative PARREN J. MITCHELL, Democrat of Maryland, Representative J. WILLIAM STANTON, Republican of Ohio, Representative MANUEL LUJAN, Jr., Republican of New Mexico.

Taxation, Oil Imports and Marketing—Representative TOM STEED, Democrat of Oklahoma, chairman, Representative JOHN C. KLUCZYNSKI, Democrat of Illinois, Representative JOHN D. DINGELL, Democrat of Michigan, Representative J. WILLIAM STANTON, Republican of Ohio, Representative JAMES D. McKEVITT, Republican of Colorado.

Small Business Problems in Smaller Towns and Urban Areas—Representative JOHN C. KLUCZYNSKI, Democrat of Illinois, chairman, Representative JAMES C. CORMAN, Democrat of California, Representative CHARLES J. CARNEY, Democrat of Ohio, Representative FRANK HORTON, Republican of New York, Representative J. WILLIAM STANTON, Republican of Ohio.

Activities of Regulatory Agencies Relating to Small Business—Representative JOHN D. DINGELL, Democrat of Michigan, chairman, Representative WILLIAM L. HUNGATE, Democrat of Missouri, Representative FERNAND J. ST GERMAIN, Democrat of Rhode Island, Representative SILVIO O. CONTE, Republican of Massachusetts, Representative JAMES T. BROYHILL, Republican of North Carolina.

Subcommittee on Special Small Business Problems—Representative NEAL SMITH, Democrat of Iowa, chairman; Representative JOSEPH P. ADDABBO, Democrat of New York; Representative WILLIAM L. HUNGATE, Democrat of Missouri; Representative JOSEPH M. McDADE, Republican of Pennsylvania; Representative JAMES T. BROYHILL, Republican of North Carolina.

Government Procurement—Representative JAMES C. CORMAN, Democrat of California, chairman; Representative NEAL SMITH, Democrat of Iowa; Representative JOSEPH P. ADDABBO, Democrat of New York; Representative JAMES T. BROYHILL, Republican of North Carolina; Representative FRANK HORTON, Republican of New York.

Minority Small Business Enterprise—Representative JOSEPH P. ADDABBO, Democrat of New York, chairman; Representative JAMES C. CORMAN, Democrat of California; Representative PARREN J. MITCHELL, Democrat of Maryland; Representative MANUEL LUJAN, Jr., Republican of New Mexico; Representative SILVIO O. CONTE, Republican of Massachusetts.

Environment Problems Affecting Small Business—Representative WILLIAM L. HUNGATE, Democrat of Missouri, chairman; Representative NEAL SMITH, Democrat of Iowa; Representative CHARLES J. CARNEY, Democrat of Ohio; Representative JAMES D. McKEVITT, Republican of Colorado; Representative FRANK HORTON, Republican of New York.

Two new subcommittees have been created, the Subcommittee on Small Business Enterprise, with Representative ADDABBO as chairman, and the Subcommittee on Environmental Problems Affecting Small Business, with Representative HUNGATE as chairman.

Certainly the agenda of these subcommittees underscores the important areas of study and investigation for the 92d Congress by our committee and we look forward to cooperating with and working with all Members of Congress in the best interests of American small business in the public interest.

MAKE THE PUBLIC AWARE OF IRRIGATORS NEEDS

HON. B. F. SISK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 11, 1971

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, the development of water resources in the State of California is one of the most vital factors in assuring the continued orderly development of the State. For some time now, I have been deeply concerned about the slowdown in construction of irrigation projects because of the lack of funds available. Although, these funds have been appropriated by Congress they have been set aside in reserve.

With the money appropriated last year Westlands Water District in central California would continue construction to complete a system of water distribution. In addition to creating employment now in an area of considerable unemployment, the system when completed would put additional land into agricultural production and increase production on acres already watered but insufficiently. The water distribution system will pay for itself through the sale of water to users. It is estimated that when completed it will return \$9 million annually to the Government.

The realization of these factors makes it difficult to understand why construction on this important project is not progressing.

I just recently received a text of a speech by Mr. Ralph M. Brody, the manager and general counsel of the Westlands Water District, given before a Bureau of Reclamation's water users conference this year.

Mr. Brody says that those of us interested in water and agricultural development are not getting our story across. I agree with Mr. Brody.

Mr. Speaker, because Mr. Brody's remarks are an eloquent exposition of the need for explaining the importance of irrigation to western land development, I place them in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

MAKE THE PUBLIC AWARE OF IRRIGATORS NEEDS
(By Ralph M. Brody)

As we all know—and some of us more acutely than others—water resource development construction is at its lowest ebb. Funding of projects is grossly inadequate—or virtually nonexistent. Authorizations of new projects are difficult to come by. Local projects fall because of the lack of popular vote appeal and, to put it succinctly, irrigation water resource development seems to have lost its sex appeal—but for no good reason.

It occurs to me that we in the water resource development field are, to a large extent, at fault. Inadvertently, but nevertheless in fact, we have been at fault. Over the years, until very recently, we took for granted that a growing nation in a growing world would continue to realize the importance of irrigated agriculture and agriculture in general. We assumed that the rest of the public would realize this importance—but we were wrong.

I can recall when the farm lobby was the strongest in the country, but the farmers have lost their ability to work together for their common cause and to put the story of their plight before the nonfarming public.

We failed to take cognizance of the fact that without our continuing to stress its equal importance, agriculture would assume a minor role in a world where urban problems, ecological and environmental problems, social welfare problems—yes, and space exploration, were permitted, becloud the fact that food and clothing were indispensable to the solution of any of those newer dilemmas.

Yes—we in the water resource development field failed to see or ignore what was happening to agriculture in general; and along with it, irrigated agriculture. For, make no mistake about it, whatever is happening to irrigated agriculture is just a part of what is happening to agriculture as a whole. The diminishing support for irrigation projects stems from the lack of knowledge about and understanding of the importance of agriculture to all mankind.

Isn't it astounding that, in spite of the fact that food and fibre are basic to the very existence of mankind, the importance of the continued availability of its products are not recognized and is, indeed, being minimized by the general public? Somehow, the view has come to prevail that farming is of subjective and great importance only to the farmer himself.

It is time that the public and our government be made aware of the fact that farming is important not only as source of income to the farmer, but perhaps more importantly, indispensable as a means of sustenance and existence for every other segment—not only of this nation, but also of this world's rapidly growing population.

Yes, the fault is ours to a great extent. Because we took for granted that the public in general that was not directly associated with agriculture would realize and continue to realize its indispensability of the continually increasing need for food and fibre and its indispensability.

We should have seen the signs that were becoming apparent many years ago.

As an example, in 1933 the people of the State of California had before them a bond election which was to fund State construction of the Central Valley Project.

Again, just a few years ago in 1960, the people had before them an election for the authorization of the State Water Project. It is interesting to see the press clippings from newspapers published on each of these occasions. In each case, one of the principal arguments used against the projects was "Why build water projects to produce more crops, when we already are in agricultural surplus?"

I urge you to contemplate what we would have done in the intervening years had the Central Valley Project not been constructed. What would we have done in those intervening years, including the years of World War II? Where would we have been today had our agricultural production remained constant as of 1933?

What is even more important, what will the world be like 40 years hence if our agricultural production remains as it is today? Already we are told that if, today, all of the food of the world were distributed equally to everyone in the world, we would all be hungry.

We have permitted ourselves into becoming psyched into believing we are no longer an agricultural nation—that we have become industrialized. Don't you believe it.

We must no longer take for granted that the public in general, and especially in urban areas, is going to know the importance of agriculture to each member of that public. We must constantly carry that message home to them.

We have to remind them constantly through public education programs that their lives and their economies directly or indirectly are heavily reliant on agriculture. For example, we must show them that in this State, agriculture is directly or indirectly responsible for more than half of the jobs.

We must show that more than half of every dollar of agricultural income ends up as a retail expenditure.

We must point out to the public that farm programs and farm subsidies are as much or more of a subsidy to the consumer as to the farmer. To educate the public as to the cost-price squeeze of the farmer and its present and ultimate impact on the consumer, we must constantly point out that every agricultural dollar increases by three as it passes through the various channels of trade and commerce.

We must also show the negative effects of the reduction or elimination of water resource development. We must point out that a goodly portion of our projects now are not for the purpose of developing new land—but rather are for the purpose of keeping land in production that is falling because of dwindling water supplies. That the failure to sustain this agricultural economy affects not only the farmer but the business man and the urban worker as well.

In our own Westlands Water District, we still find people in this immediate area who do not know that the San Luis Project service area is over 95% developed and that the project is needed to sustain an existing economy and not to develop a new one.

We must convince the Federal government, and particularly our friends in the Office of Management and Budget, that agriculture must not be relegated to an inferior position.

We must show them that the growing of food to feed the urban undernourished is as much an urban problem as it is an agricultural problem. The difficulties of agriculture are the broadest kind of urban dilemma, for we must produce the food and the opportunity for clothing the entire urban population. We must provide for the "haves" as well as the "have-nots." We must show them that water to produce the food for those in the urban areas is as important to the city resident and as vital to his existence as is the water for drinking and industrial water and power necessary to run his factories.

We must convince the people in the Bureau of the Budget that water projects are not "make work" projects to be pursued only as a means of providing construction jobs or to be used as a pawn in the game of inflation fighting. We must balance and compare the benefits and the losses.

We must convince the ecologists and environmentalists that we stand together with them in their objectives and that feeding and clothing our people and protecting our lands from deterioration are a part, and not a foe, of the ecological and environmental movements. We have delayed too long. We have shut our eyes to these problems and isolated ourselves.

We must, as the workers and technicians in water resource development activities, come to a greater realization that these projects which we have had built and are seeking to have built are not merely monuments to the engineering profession nor devices constructed solely for putting dollars into the coffers of water users. We must constantly emphasize to ourselves and, in doing so, demonstrate to others that the projects are justified for their social objectives—including the feeding of all peoples and the creation of wealth and well being for all peoples of the State and the Nation.

Each year in the past 10 or 15 years, funds for water resource development have become more scarce and threaten to disappear entirely. And we have refused to recognize this fact, or at least refused to face it. If we had recognized it, we would have been doing something about it. But we did little or nothing. We continued to hold our board meetings. We continued to hold our association meetings. We continued to hold our association conventions. But *always* we were talking to *each other*. I would hope that none of us needs convincing. What we should have been doing and what we should be doing is pooling resources and familiarizing the public that the farmer and agriculture—and the irrigation farmer and irrigated agriculture are important to the city dweller and are important to the business man and are important to the industrialist.

We must do this not only in our immediate communities but throughout the entire nation. For most assuredly if we do not, not only are new water resource development projects to be a thing of the past, but agriculture, as we know it and have known it for years, will go.

Indeed, even in the ascribing of a subject to be disclosed at this conference, we have fallen into the trap of isolating ourselves. We have given my own subject the title "Make the Public Aware of Irrigators Needs."

I would suggest that a more appropriate topic would be "Make the Public Aware of the Public's Irrigation Needs"—and even more important, "Make the Public Aware of Agriculture and the Public Need of It."

None of this will be done until the farmer recognizes his own major problem and its solution—that of uniting farmers and providing a concentrated and united public relations program to all of the people. We must do this as individuals, as districts, as associations and—above all—as a united industry.

REPUBLIC OF LITHUANIA

HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 11, 1971

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, last month marked the 53d anniversary of the establishment of the modern Republic of Lithuania. The original state of Lithuania was formed 720 years ago when Mindaugas the Great unified all of the Lithuania principalities in 1251.

Although the Lithuanians are a small ethnic group in Europe they have secured a place in European history by means of their valorous deeds and accomplishments. During the 14th and 15th centuries they were a significant force in thwarting Asiatic incursions into Europe.

The history of the Lithuanian people has been characterized by long periods of oppression and foreign domination. In the late 18th century Lithuania fell under Russian rule and remained a province of the Russian empire until the First World War. At that time they were overrun by the Kaiser's armies.

With the fall of the czarist regime in 1917, the Lithuanians saw a chance to gain their freedom. On February 16, 1918, they proclaimed their independence and established a democratic republic. For the next two decades, they enjoyed freedom to the fullest, rebuilding their war-ravaged country and making great advance in all phases of national life.

In June 1940, the Russians again moved troops into Lithuania and annexed the republic. Fraudulent elections were held and Lithuania became a part of the Soviet empire.

The Russians began a systematic liquidation of the population. Cities were jammed onto trains and shipped to Arctic Siberia. Families were separated, men were used as slave laborers and tortured, and women were sexually abused.

For the last 30 years the Lithuanians have valiantly struggled under the hell of their Russian oppressors. Shut off from the rest of the world by the Iron Curtain, they enjoy none of the freedoms that we regard as a birthright.

The U.S. Government has never recognized the Russian occupation of Lithuania and her Baltic neighbors, Estonia and Latvia and we have maintained relations with the former free Government of Lithuania.

The time has come for the rest of the world to join Lithuania in her struggle for independence. The 89th Congress took a step in the right direction when it adopted House Concurrent Resolution 416, which urged the President to direct the attention of world opinion upon the Russian denial of the rights of self-determination for the people of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania.

Last month Mr. RARICK introduced a similar resolution—House Concurrent Resolution 61:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (The Senate Concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that the President, acting through the United States Ambassador to

the United Nations Organization, take such steps as may be necessary to place the question of human rights violations, including genocide, in the Soviet occupied Lithuania on the agenda of the United Nations Organization.

It is imperative that we do all possible to see that Lithuania gains her independence. This Russian oppression should be repugnant to all freedom loving Americans. As we took note of the 53d anniversary of Lithuanian independence and look back on the recent history of Lithuania, we can only hope and pray that her patriotic citizens will soon again be free from the shackles of Russian rule.

MAKING GOVERNMENT MORE RESPONSIVE

HON. ROBERT PRICE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 11, 1971

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, acting as ombudsman on behalf of his constituents is a large part of the job of a Representative in Congress. In order to facilitate my performing this function, I have employed a district representative to spend 1 day each month in the 28 counties of the 18th Congressional District of Texas. Following is a copy of the announcement I am mailing each postal patron in the 18th District advising them when my representative will be in their area.

The announcement follows:

My District Representative, Mr. Charles Lanehart, will be in Clarendon on Wednesday, March 17, to assist local residents with any problems they might have with the Federal Government.

Mr. Lanehart will be at the Farmers State Bank from 9 a.m. to Noon and from 1 p.m. to 5 p.m.

I find that with each passing year my legislative workload becomes heavier in Washington, and it is becoming more and more difficult for me to be in each of the 28 counties in our district on a regular basis. For this reason, I have made arrangements for Mr. Lanehart to be in each county in the 18th District on a regular basis, hopefully once a month.

Mr. Lanehart will be available to relay information to my Washington office where we will be pleased to make every effort to cut through the red-tape and attempt to get faster action on problems ranging from delayed Social Security checks, to military problems, to businessmen who want to know how to sell their products or services to the Federal Government.

If you have a problem which you feel I may be of assistance in solving, please feel free to see Mr. Lanehart while he is in Clarendon. No appointment is necessary. You may go by the Farmers State Bank office at your convenience.

Sincerely,

BOB PRICE,
Member of Congress

P.S. As you probably know, the Texas Legislature is presently considering legislation to redistrict congressional districts on the basis of the 1970 census. Each district must have approximately 466,000 people. This means that 76,000 people must be added to our District.

One of the plans now being considered would leave the present 18th District intact and add enough counties adjoining us on the

south to bring our population up to the 466,000 range. The other plan would divide the Panhandle on north and south lines. Thus, the west side of the Panhandle would be in a District with Lubbock and the east side would be in a nearly 400 mile long District from Perryton to near Dallas.

If you believe the Panhandle should be kept in one Congressional District because of our common interests you should contact your State Representative and State Senator now. You can also express your views to the Chairmen of the House and Senate redistricting committees: Senator J. P. Word and Rep. Delwin Jones at the State Capitol in Austin.

"ACTION OF SOCIAL SECURITY NEEDED"

HON. CLARENCE E. MILLER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 11, 1971

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the problems brought on by inflation are becoming more apparent to all of us every day. But inflation weighs heaviest on our senior citizens. A large number of citizens in Ohio's 10th District who are living on fixed incomes have been looking for swift congressional action on the social security benefits to help ease the burden of inflation. To date, they have been disappointed by our inaction.

It is important that we do all we can to speed up enactment of H.R. 1, the Social Security Act Amendments. Unfortunately, the major hurdle preventing ready consideration of this vital legislation by the House is the fact that the welfare reform controversy has been tacked onto the social security bill.

The two proposals should be considered separately.

For one thing, the entire welfare system in this country needs to be updated and placed under more effective control. As it stands today, welfare is nearly uncontrollable in terms of costs and caseloads. In the past decade, welfare costs have more than tripled and the caseload volume has doubled. As welfare exists today, there are few work incentives while the working poor are virtually excluded from welfare assistance. In addition, the differences in the State welfare systems are appalling. State welfare programs differ in such essential areas as benefits, coverage, and administrative procedures. In short, overhauling our Nation's welfare system is such a monumental task that it will command lengthy congressional scrutiny before any workable and acceptable plan is finally ironed out.

As I said, we need the social security legislation now; but unlike welfare reform, the proposals presently tied up in the House Ways and Means Committee are generally acceptable to the Members and I am confident that passage of a beneficial social security bill would be forthcoming if this matter were considered solely on its own merits.

I am in favor of a social security bill which will readily meet the most pressing needs of the recipients. I support a 10-percent across-the-board increase in benefits as well as an increase in the minimum monthly benefit and an increase in the outside earning limitation. I

have sponsored legislation in this Congress calling for all three such increases.

While the House version of the social security bill is held up, the 27 million recipients who depend on its benefits are forced to wait out this legislative impasse until the sundry issues stalling its progress are finally resolved. Making these Americans wait any longer for the benefits they deserve is, I feel, both unfortunate and unfair.

U.S. POLICY ON SOUTHERN AFRICA ENDORSED

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 11, 1971

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, 5 years ago, I joined with six of my Republican colleagues in urging President Johnson to exercise effective leadership in promoting nonviolent policies which would further a peaceful and integrated society in southern Africa. Our concern was heightened by the failure of the International Court of Justice to act on the question of whether South Africa's mandate over South-West Africa was still valid.

I am pleased to note that, in the intervening years, the United States has taken the leadership we called for, and that enlightened and progressive policies have been pursued, first by the Johnson administration and now by the Nixon administration. With U.S. support, the United Nations General Assembly has assumed direct responsibility for South-West Africa, which has now been renamed Namibia.

In a letter to the Washington Post on March 10, I noted that the policy of the Nixon administration on the issue of South-West Africa "has been marked by a consistent regard for legal process and by a clear preference for persuasion and peaceful progress." I am especially gratified by the logical and forthright position our country has taken in supporting the Security Council decision to ask the International Court for an advisory opinion on the legal consequences for states of South Africa's continued presence in Namibia.

While the essential question before the Court is one of self-determination for the people of Namibia, it is to be hoped that the Court's deliberations will not be diverted by the recent South African offer to conduct a plebiscite in the territory. South Africa, of course, has no right to take such an action under the terms of the General Assembly resolution which canceled its mandate. Moreover, the history of South African administration of South-West Africa, and, in particular, of the contrived and misleading plebiscite conducted in the territory in 1946, give little grounds to hope that such a plebiscite would, in fact, ascertain the true wishes of the inhabitants.

The International Court of Justice now has the opportunity to resolve the vexing problem which has caused so much suffering, inspired so much controversy and threatened so often to break out into violence. We will all eagerly anticipate the results of its deliberation.