

Messrs. WILLIAMS, HARTKE, METCALF, HOLLINGS, SCOTT, JORDAN of Idaho, and MILLER.

PROGRAM FOR TUESDAY AND WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, if the able minority whip has nothing further at this time, I shall proceed to state the program for Tuesday next.

Mr. President, the Senate will convene at 10 o'clock a.m. on Tuesday next, following an adjournment.

Immediately following the recognition of the two leaders under the standing order—and the transaction of any unobjectioned to business on the calendar—the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY) will be recognized for not to exceed 15 minutes, following which the distinguished Senator from Connecticut (Mr. WEICKER) will be recognized for not to exceed 15 minutes, following which there will be not to exceed 30 minutes for a colloquy on the subject of American prisoners of war, the time to be under the control of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. DOLE), the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. BROCK), and the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BAYH), following which there will be a colloquy on the subject of U.S.-Middle East relations, the colloquy not to exceed 1 hour, and to be under the control of the Senator from New York (Mr. JAVITS) and the Senator from Washington (Mr. JACKSON).

Following the colloquy conducted by Senators JACKSON and JAVITS, there will be a period for the transaction of routine morning business, with statements therein limited to 3 minutes, the period not to extend beyond 12:30 p.m.

At the conclusion of morning business—at 12:30 p.m.—the unfinished business, which is the continuing resolution, will be automatically laid before the Senate.

Just for the purpose of repeating what has been agreed to with respect to action on the continuing resolution on Tuesday next, at 12:30 p.m., time will begin running and will be under the control of the

distinguished majority leader and the minority leader, or their designees. Time on any amendment will be limited to 1 hour, to be equally divided between the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee, Mr. ELLENDER, and the mover of the amendment; and should the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, Mr. ELLENDER, support such amendment, time in opposition to the amendment will be under the control of the minority leader or his designee. There may be rollcall votes on Tuesday.

In accordance with the agreement, there will be a vote on the amendment dealing with the SST, if amended as amended, at 4 p.m. on Wednesday next. This will be a rollcall vote. It has also been agreed that there will be a rollcall vote, and the yeas and nays have already been ordered, on final passage of the continuing resolution, at 4:30 p.m. on Wednesday next. So Senators are on notice that there will be at least two yeas-and-nay rollcall votes on Wednesday next, with the possibility of rollcalls on Tuesday, and a possibility of additional rollcalls on Wednesday beyond those which have been referred to.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM CONTINUED

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, continuing with the program, permit me to say that the calendar is clean. There is nothing on the calendar other than the pending business which is before the Senate. I think this speaks well for the Senate. It speaks well for Senators, in that they have progressed so expeditiously in taking action on all measures that have been placed on the calendar to date.

It is hoped—and I know I speak for the distinguished majority leader and, for that matter, for the leadership on the other side, since the minority whip is here and has indicated he concurs—that all committees will work during the adjournment over to Tuesday to complete action on bills and resolutions, so that they may be placed on the calendar and

action may be taken thereon by the Senate at an early date.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. ON TUESDAY

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move, in accordance with the previous order, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 10 o'clock a.m. on Tuesday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 1 o'clock and 47 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until Tuesday, March 23, 1971, at 10 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 19, 1971:

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

George C. Guenther, of Pennsylvania, to be an Assistant Secretary of Labor, effective in accordance with the provisions of law; new position.

Horace E. Menasco, of Washington, to be Administrator of the Wage and Hour Division, Department of Labor, vice Robert D. Moran.

OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY AND HEALTH REVIEW COMMISSION

The following-named persons to be members of the Occupational Safety and Health Review Commission for the terms indicated, effective in accordance with the provisions of law; new positions.

Alan F. Burch, of Maryland, for a term of 2 years.

James F. Van Namee, of Pennsylvania, for a term of 4 years.

Robert D. Moran, of Massachusetts, for a term of 6 years.

WITHDRAWAL

Executive nomination withdrawn from the Senate March 17 (under authority of the order of March 16), 1971:

Chester L. Mize, of Kansas, to be a member of the U.S. Tariff Commission for the remainder of the term expiring June 16, 1974, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate, which was sent to the Senate on January 28, 1971.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

AFL-CIO REVIEWS CHALLENGE OF SOLID WASTE DISPOSAL—OFFERS VALID RECOMMENDATIONS FOR POSITIVE ACTION

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, March 19, 1971

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, the collection and disposal or reuse of increasing quantities of solid wastes are among the most pressing environmental problems facing the United States today.

It was my responsibility to serve as the chairman of the joint Senate-House conference on the vitally important Resource Recovery Act of 1970. I know of

the commitment of the Members of the Congress in accelerating our efforts to cope with the menace of solid waste materials. I believe the administration to be fully committed to this gigantic undertaking.

As our population and our affluence grow, so do the strains on our capacity to process the mountains of solid wastes that threaten the health and liveability of our communities.

Congress has approached this problem directly in recent years with legislation to facilitate the development of new disposal and recycling technology and to aid public agencies in providing the necessary facilities. We are making progress, but a substantial challenge remains.

Mr. President, the executive council of the American Federation of Labor and

Congress of Industrial Organizations recently adopted an enlightened statement containing a concise appraisal of this challenge and valid recommendations for dealing with it.

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

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

STATEMENT BY THE AFL-CIO EXECUTIVE COUNCIL ON SOLID WASTE DISPOSAL

BAL HARBOUR, FLA.,

February 18, 1971.

This Nation is beginning at last to take some affirmative steps toward abatement of air and water pollution, but it lags far behind in dealing with solid wastes—the vast and uncontrolled debris of industrial expansion and population growth.

Solid wastes are not merely local dilemmas.

They constitute a most serious national environmental problem. They contribute substantially to air and water pollution, complicate land use, endanger public health, spread esthetic blight, and squander the diminishing stockpiles of natural resources.

The sheer dimensions of the problem are tremendous:

A total of about 4.3 billion tons of solid wastes are produced each year—mainly from mining operations, construction and agriculture.

350 million tons come annually from municipal and industrial sources, of which 70% are disposed by localities or private contractors, the remainder at industrial sites. More than 30 million tons of paper, 30 billion glass bottles of all types and 60 billion cans of all types are included in the proliferation of solid waste materials.

A particularly knotty sector of the solid waste front is the mushrooming packaging industry which accounts for about 50 million tons of wastes per year from residential, commercial and industrial sources. Only 10% of this tonnage, however, is re-used or recycled, to be returned to the industrial process adding to the costs of disposal systems, air and water pollution, and to the waste of natural resources.

America's annual bill for handling solid wastes is \$4.5 billion, but 94% of all land waste disposal facilities and 75% of all incinerators are inadequate, and there is no regular collection of wastes from 12% of all households. To provide and operate adequate disposal facilities would increase present costs by 20% excluding allowances for population growth, increasing per capita generation of solid wastes and rising investment and operating costs.

The typical locality keeps little or no data on either the quality or makeup of its refuse, and what private industry does in this respect is little known.

Without long range planning, cities all over the nation, particularly the larger metropolitan complexes, will exhaust available disposal sites.

The Solid Waste Disposal Act of 1965 placed the federal government in the picture for the first time with a modest research and development program, including federal grants to the states, to develop new or improved disposal methods.

Enactment of the Resource Recovery Act of 1970 now enables the federal government to institute programs to deal with separation, re-cycling and re-use of solid wastes, and to provide demonstration, construction and application grants for states and localities.

Under this Act, the federal Bureau of Solid Waste Management, now shifted from the Department of HEW to the Environmental Protection Agency, is also authorized to issue guidelines, governing all federal solid waste activity, and to conduct a national study to find suitable sites for federal storage of toxic materials which could endanger the public health.

The Act sets up a seven-member commission, appointed by the President, to undertake a national materials policy study, to consider the effect of its recommendations on conservation of natural resources and protection of the environment. Appropriations aggregating \$460 million for a three-year program, ending with fiscal year 1973, were authorized to operate the Act.

America stands now at the beginning of a national attack on solid waste. A long difficult road lies ahead, before America no longer need fear the danger of being engulfed by this debris.

The AFL-CIO believes that:

1. We endorse the program set forth in the Resources Recovery Act of 1970 as the promising beginning of a concerted effort to deal

with solid wastes, and we will actively support its full funding.

2. We urge the President to appoint a representative of organized labor as a member of the National Commission on Materials Policy, since this Commission's conclusions and recommendations could exert pervasive influence on the course of raw material technology and future employment patterns.

3. Solution of the solid waste problem depends on development of a broad and systematic program, rather than a fragmented approach like the so-called "ban the can" or "ban the bottle" campaigns, which are self-defeating.

Key to achievement of the over-all goal is the rapid development of technologies that result in efficient, economical methods of collection, separation, re-cycling and re-use of solid wastes. Evidence that these methods can be achieved in the near future is particularly heartening. This will make it more feasible to achieve the national goals embodied in getting the solid waste disposal job done. At the same time, there should be full consideration and protection of the human values involved—including the jobs and livelihoods of workers in the private sector of the economy, and the effects of changing solid waste management technologies on workers employed in the disposal field.

Fragmented and expedient proposals that deal merely with the smaller and more visible aspects of the total problem will not only fail to achieve their stated aims, but they will accomplish more in depriving workers of jobs than in lessening the burdens of solid waste. Such self-defeating schemes do not deserve public support and will be vigorously opposed by all elements of organized labor.

Organized labor supports organizationally and financially the construction efforts of the National Center for Solid Waste Disposal Inc., for the re-cycling and reuse of solid wastes.

4. Strengthening amendments to the Resource Recovery Act of 1970 should be adopted in order to:

a. Require private industry and public agencies receiving federal operating grants for disposal facilities, to record and report to the federal government the kinds, quantities, and disposal methods used.

b. Require that all solid wastes containing toxic materials be specifically reported to the federal government which would be authorized to issue regulations governing their collection, handling, and shipment to federal disposal sites.

c. Provide that federal grants to states and municipalities for planning or operation of disposal facilities be conditioned on regional design and operation to lower costs, improve efficiency, and reduce site acquisition problems.

5. We urge all members of organized labor to effectively step up their efforts to help stop pollution and to place high on their list the increasingly dangerous threat from solid wastes.

Containers do not litter; people litter. We support practical programs for eliminating litter of all kinds. A good start is to engage in campaigns to clean up litter. While we engage in these kinds of campaigns, like the Union Label Department's drive to promote the use of litter bags in cars, we will not lose sight of the fact that the long-term, absolutely essential solutions to the grave problems of solid waste lie in technological development of re-cycling and reuse.

Solid wastes constitute a serious problem which will continue to become worse without the total commitment of all Americans to attack it unrelentingly on all fronts. We of organized labor must and shall assume our full share of this responsibility.

NORTH CAROLINA DEAF STUDENTS
SEE CIRCUS

HON. WILMER MIZELL

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 1971

Mr. MIZELL, Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to call my colleagues' attention to an event that took place last month in Winston-Salem, N.C., a part of the Fifth Congressional District which I represent.

It is the kind of event that rarely makes headlines, although it was well covered by news media on this occasion, and it is also the kind of event that represents a welcome change from most of the news fare we see every day.

It is a heartwarming story that I believe will be of interest and of benefit to every Member of this body. Television station WSJS in Winston-Salem made arrangements last month with the Ringling Brothers-Barnum and Bailey Circus to provide, free of charge, tickets to see "The Greatest Show on Earth" for 620 students at the North Carolina School for the Deaf.

An article appearing in the Morganton, N.C., News Herald tells the whole story of this adventure, and at this time I insert the text of this article in the RECORD for the benefit of my colleagues.

At the same time, I include in the RECORD a sampling of the letters written by the students to Mr. Tom Findley, promotion director at WSJS-TV, who arranged the trip. The letters speak for themselves: [From the Morganton (N.C.) News Herald, Feb. 11, 1971]

IT'S CIRCUS DAY FOR ENTIRE DEAF SCHOOL STUDENT BODY

(By Edna Mae Herman)

The faculty and staff of the North Carolina School for the Deaf are undertaking a monumental task this afternoon . . . moving the entire student body of the school to Greensboro to see a performance of the Ringling Brothers-Barnum and Bailey Circus at the Greensboro Coliseum.

This means chaperoning a trip involving 620 students between four-and-one-half and 20 years of age.

The NCSD students and their 80 chaperones will be special guests at the 4 p.m. matinee performance of the circus today.

They will travel to Greensboro on 17 chartered buses provided by the circus.

The big event is being made possible through a cooperative effort of the circus and WSJS-TV in Winston-Salem.

The trip was instigated by WSJS-TV which has a special interest in the deaf and has a daily morning program of current events and special interest features for the deaf, with Miss Nancy Ashley serving as interpreter.

WSJS officials made arrangements with the circus to provide free tickets and transportation for the NCSD students.

The television station is planning to film the children's visit to the circus for future showing.

There will be deaf interpreters to help explain to the children what is going on under the Big Top.

For many of the children it will be their first circus performance and they are eagerly looking forward to the experience.

The long caravan of buses left NCSD at 1:30 this afternoon with a happy group of students and chaperones.

Peter Ripley, dean of students at NCSD, who has been coordinating arrangements from the school, has been a very busy man. Taking 620 young people on a trip involving several hours and to such a large place as the Coliseum involves a multitude of details.

Going to the circus just wouldn't be complete without popcorn and hotdogs and other goodies to eat, so Ripley has made arrangements with the concession stands at the coliseum to be ready to provide 1,000 each of hotdogs, popcorn, soft drinks, and ice cream.

N.C.S.D.,

Morganton, N.C., February 11, 1971.

DEAR MR. FINDLEY: Thank you very much. I went to circus yesterday. It was fun and we were happy. It was wonderful and beautiful.

I also enjoyed the hot dog and soda.

We too, must work carefully,

Truly yours

FLOYD McLAMB.

February 11, 1971.

DEAR MR. FINDLEY: Yesterday was the first time I had ever been to a circus. I had a wonderful time and I'll never forget it.

Thank you again for the wonderful trip that you made possible. It was a great day.

Your friend,

CATHY CECIL.

DEAR MR. FINDLEY: Thank you for inviting us to the circus yesterday.

We enjoyed the bus trip, the performance and the food.

It will be a day to remember for as long as we live.

We are truly grateful for thoughtful friends like you.

Very truly yours,

EMMA LEE CUMMINGS.

Feb. 11, 1971.

DEAR SIR: Thank you so much for inviting all of us to the circus yesterday. I surely enjoyed seeing the acts and beautiful colored costumes. I was really impressed. We appreciated it so much that you invited us to go. I will recall it with much pleasure as long as I live.

Yours truly,

TONDA GILMORE.

N.C.S.D.,

Morganton, N.C., February 11, 1971.

DEAR MR. FINDLEY: How are you! I am fine. I am in the 3rd grade.

My name is Arnold Roos.

I saw Mrs. Nancy Ashley stand up and sing.

I saw her on WSJS-TV.

Thank you for the circus. We enjoyed it very much.

Trina Long lost her ring in the bathroom. She forgot it.

Love,

ARNOLD.

MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN— HOW LONG?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 1971

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, a child asks: "Where is daddy?" A mother asks: "How is my son?" A wife asks: "Is my husband alive or dead?"

Communist North Vietnam is sadistically practicing spiritual and mental genocide on over 1,600 American prisoners of war and their families.

How long?

ECONOMIC POLICIES OF THE ADMINISTRATION

HON. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 19, 1971

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, the Wall Street Journal of March 18 included an excellent and informative editorial on the economic policies of the Nixon administration.

The editorial emphasizes that the primary problem of the economy now, as Dr. Arthur Burns, Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, has stressed, is business and consumer confidence. I concur in that view.

I join the Wall Street Journal and Dr. Burns in believing that the best way to increase that confidence emphatically is not to set off a fresh wave of inflation. As Dr. Burns himself has said, a lack of caution in monetary policy could release a new wave of inflationary forces.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial, entitled "The Impatience With Gradualism," be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

THE IMPATIENCE WITH GRADUALISM

When the Nixon administration came to office, a key element of its domestic economic policy was gradualism. While this was a considerable improvement on the policies of its predecessors, administration officials for some time have been getting increasingly impatient with it.

In the past the usual method for dealing with inflation, when it was dealt with at all, was to apply sudden and massive financial restraint. This steered the inflation, all right, but usually at the cost of a sharp drop in economic activity and a large rise in unemployment.

On the other hand, when policymakers decided the economy needed stimulation, such action also was usually sizable and abrupt. Since the early results often were rather intoxicating, the stimulation was continued until the economy reached another inflationary crisis.

The Nixon administration inherited that sort of crisis, and it decided that it wanted to escape the old stop-go pattern of the past. It sought to check inflation gradually, and thus to minimize the resulting impact on economic activity and employment.

The translation of policy into action was not always smooth, but in a way that only helped to prove the wisdom of gradualism. As long as the instruments of economic policy are imperfectly understood, the policymakers had better handle them cautiously.

Nonetheless the inflationary pressures did begin to subside, and by historical standards the rise in unemployment was unusually small. But before much progress was evident to the public, along came last fall's elections and numerous defeats for Republicans.

One reason that economic success led to political failure was that the administration oversold the country, and apparently itself,

on the probable results of gradualism. An audience that expects to see an elephant emerge from the magician's hat isn't going to cheer a rabbit.

Now the administration is pointing toward another election, in November 1972. And although in theory it is still committed to gradualism, in practice it appears to be moving away from it. By its own tradition its budget is "expansionary," and Congress and coming events quite probably will make it even more so. Administration officials are also doing all they can to press the Federal Reserve System into a much more expansionary monetary policy.

Fortunately, Reserve Board Chairman Arthur Burns so far is resisting such pressure. In testimony before the Senate Banking Committee the other day, Mr. Burns said that "caution in the monetary sphere is required lest a fresh wave of inflationary forces be released" with incalculable damage to the international economic system.

If confidence is to be strengthened at home and abroad, the chairman continued, "the proper course for monetary policy in the months ahead is to continue on the narrow road that we have been traveling—namely to provide adequate funds but guard against excessive rates of expansion in supplies of money and credit."

In view of Mr. Burns' position, it is a little strange to hear Treasury Secretary John Connally say that, while the chairman is "committed to trying to solve the problems of the economy, I don't know . . . that he's committed to reaching" the administration's goal of a \$1,065 billion gross national product in 1971.

Of course the Federal Reserve is not committed to any precise GNP target. The primary problem of the economy now, as Mr. Burns has stressed repeatedly, is business and consumer confidence. And the best way to increase that confidence emphatically is not to set off a fresh wave of inflation.

It is instead to return the economy to reasonable stability, so that businessmen and consumers can both plan for the future with increased assurance. The government can best encourage that stability by moving carefully and cautiously in the realm of economic policy.

The administration, along with its critics in and out of Congress, seems to be giving up on gradualism. Fortunately for the country, the idea is still popular at the Federal Reserve.

LEGALIZING ABORTIONS IS SICKENING AND SADDENING

HON. LAWRENCE J. HOGAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 1971

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, State legislatures throughout this country have been caught up in heated controversy over the introduction of legislation designed to legalize abortion. The issue has been muddled with emotionalism, inaccurate statistics, clashes between standards of morality, and varying religious philosophies. One aspect of the argument, however, strikes me as being remarkably lucid—that it cannot be right, nor should it be legal to end one human life for the personal convenience of another human being.

In the Chicago Tribune of February 7, 1971, Joan Beck, the Child-Care editor, devoted her column to an analysis of the

serious consequences involved in the legalization of abortion. Since I found this article to be an objective and lucid approach to the issue, I request that it be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point:

LEGALIZING ABORTIONS IS SICKENING AND SADDENING

All the seminars and conferences I've attended, all the arguments I've considered, all the books, pamphlets, medical journals, theological treatises and particularly the studies on fetology I've read lead me to the inescapable conclusion that it can't be right to end one human life for the convenience of another human being.

This is not a popular conclusion today. It is not considered "liberal" or in tune with women's liberation ideas or "civil rights" or the new morality or situation ethics. It seems to me, however, to be inescapable.

The abortion controversy is so fogged by emotionally loaded words, by tragic case histories, by inaccurate statistics, by conflicting standards of sexual morality, by religious attitudes and by deeply ingrained personal feelings that it is difficult to think objectively about it. [Abortion proponents, for example, talk about abortion as "medical treatment of a problem pregnancy" by removing "a bit of tissue." Opponents use "killing" and "murder" and vivid descriptions of tiny mutilated bodies.]

But cutting thru the emotional fog, I cannot help but reach these conclusions:

1. An unborn baby has an identity of his own, separate from his mother's. Medically, he is distinctly an individual in his own right. *The genetic component of his cells is different from that of his mother.* His body reacts differently to certain drugs and viruses than does hers.

Medical books and journals concerned with pregnancy and childbirth frequently remind physicians that they are dealing with not one patient, but two. New medical specialists, the fetologists, are growing in number and developing a whole new science of treating the unborn. Intrauterine blood transfusions are now almost routine when needed. Drug treatment, surgery and even the correction of genetic diseases before birth are considered seriously as possibilities for the future.

It must take a medical schizophrenic to consider one unborn baby in this light—and to abort another, for the convenience of an adult. There are increasing reports from states like New York where abortion is legal that many nurses and doctors are finding this an unbearable contradiction.

2. Legally, an unborn baby is also considered to be a distinct person. He can inherit property. He is entitled to seek redress for injury. His father can be compelled to contribute to his support. His mother cannot be executed for a capital crime lest he also die. The courts have even held that an unborn baby must be given intrauterine blood transfusions despite his mother's objection on religious grounds because the unborn baby's right to treatment supercedes his mother's religious rights.

So how can an unborn child be deprived of life without due process? And why don't civil rights advocates defend his right to live?

3. Improved life support systems for premature babies, induced labor and Caesarean section all tend to blur the time of birth itself as the beginning of life and the distinction between the unborn and the born. If birth is not the beginning of life, but just a part of a continuum of life, when does life itself start?

There is no magic moment of "quickening" when an unborn baby suddenly becomes alive. "Quickening" merely means that a prospective mother becomes aware of the unborn child's activity.

An unborn infant moves, turns, kicks, somersaults, swallows, swims, makes a fist, may even suck his thumb long before "quickening." All of his organs and features are well formed, even to fingernails, eyelids and buds for his permanent teeth before his mother can feel him moving. He is also definitely human and distinctly individual, even to some family facial resemblance.

Paul Ramsey, professor of Christian ethics at Princeton University, has suggested that if the fertilization is not the beginning of life, the only other logically supportable milestones would be the time of implantation of the fertilized ovum in the lining of the uterus, or the time [at about the end of eight weeks] when the embryo has finished the formation of organs and medically becomes known as a fetus.

4. Illegal abortion is undoubtedly dangerous and degrading, but there is no good statistical evidence that it occurs in the United States anywhere near the million-a-year frequency claimed by abortion proponents.

More to the point, there is considerable evidence that legalizing abortion does not end illegal abortion. In Japan, for example, where abortion is legal and widely accepted, there were more than 250,000 illegal operations in 1969. Liberalizing abortion laws in Sweden did not reduce criminal abortions, and the experience has been similar in several countries in eastern Europe.

5. When abortion is legalized, it tends to become used increasingly as a method of birth control. Repeated abortions are common.

There is, of course, an urgent need to halt the spiraling increase in population both in the United States and in the world as a whole, but abortion is a needlessly hazardous, unpleasant and needlessly expensive method of birth control.

Instead, greater efforts should be directed toward developing long-term contraceptives, toward sterilization for couples who already have all of the children they wish and toward widespread efforts at making family planning information available to all.

6. Rape and incest as arguments for abortion are weak, indeed. When reported immediately, rape can almost always be treated medically to prevent pregnancy. Incest is rarely reported in time to make any conceivable deadline for abortion.

The situation which comes closest to justifying abortion in my own mind is that in which there is a certainty, or probability, that the unborn baby suffers from serious defects. Some of the chromosomal abnormalities which result in severe handicaps, like mongolism, can now be diagnosed with certainty between the 12th and 15th weeks of pregnancy. Rubella early in pregnancy carries great risk of multiple handicaps including blindness, deafness, and mental retardation. At least a dozen other serious genetic diseases can now be diagnosed long before birth. More will be in the near future.

Physicians and scientists working on the frontiers of fetology with whom I have talked usually feel that abortion is justified when the unborn infant is abnormal and I find it difficult to disagree. Princeton's Ramsey, however, makes the point that to be rational and oral, any such argument for feticide must also be an argument for infanticide.

What has suddenly made abortion so popular, points out John T. Noonan Jr., professor of law at the University of California, Berkeley, is the changing code of sexual morality.

Unrestricted access to contraceptives is not enough to make full sexual freedom possible without consequences. Noonan says, "Many persons lacked the knowledge, many persons resented the effort involved and many persons acted in a confident belief that while others became pregnant through intercourse, they would not. A sure means of 'backstopping' omissions or errors was necessary. . . . Abortion was necessary if sexual revolution was to succeed."

But, argues Noonan, "One person's freedom to obtain an abortion is a denial of another person's right to live." It is to avoid this conclusion that proponents of unrestricted sexual freedom insist that the unborn child is not human.

Says Noonan, "In a society peculiarly conscious of the difference made by age, it is easy to define one classed by age so that it is not regarded as even human, so that then there can be no objection to elimination of members of the class whenever a member of it interferes with the freedom of those who are human. In this case, then, there is no need to balance the gain in freedom of some humans by the loss to other humans."

"If widespread abortion is the price of the new sexual morality, then the price is too high. It's time to examine this concept of morality, just as we have the morality of warfare in Viet Nam, racism and other aspects of contemporary life."

[The quotations are from the book "The Morality of Abortion: Legal and Historical Perspectives," edited by Noonan. Among other issues, the book discusses the legal situation in which a statute is declared invalid by a court on the grounds of vagueness, as occurred in Illinois last week and earlier in California.]

[Notes the book, "About the same time that California invalidated its law, the Supreme Court of Massachusetts and the Supreme Court of New Jersey found parallel phrases in their statutes on abortion to be clearly understandable by ordinary persons. It is difficult to believe that what is comprehensible to ordinary men in Massachusetts and New Jersey is not comprehensible to ordinary men in California."]

[The book, published in 1970 by Harvard University Press, covers many more issues, legal points and documentations than are possible here. I recommend it to anyone who has a moral or legal or human concern for abortion.]

In a recent issue of Saturday Review, Norman Cousins deplored the increasing desensitization of this nation to violence, to the exploitation of sex and to our decline of respect for life.

"What is most damaging of all is that the process itself obscures what is happening, so that our highest responses are being blunted without our knowing it," Cousins wrote. "It is easy enough to be appalled by the reports of young Americans machine-gunning infants and other noncombatants at point-blank range in Viet Nam, but where is our indignation over the authorized rocking of powerful explosives from the air on villages—or is it proper to kill babies so long as you don't see their faces?"

COMMISSIONER OF EDUCATION
SIDNEY P. MARLAND, JR.,
STRESSES CAREER EDUCATION—
URGENT NEED TO UPGRADE
VOCATIONAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 19, 1971

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, the American dream of a higher education for everyone may be far off in the future. It escapes the reality that making every-one a philosopher leaves necessary tasks undone. It is questionable whether endless streams of degree-holders contribute to our greatness. To point out this fact evokes cries of elitism and anti-

intellectualism. Yet we continue to force educational irrelevancies on the uninterested or incapable, while denying them the necessary training to survive in our world. Almost every day we read articles on college graduates scratching for jobs, of high school graduates deficient even in the fundamental skills, while very often demands for those with skills in productive trades go begging.

Realization of the fact that America's educational system is not providing the bulk of our young people the necessary tools to do the job comes not only in the economic sector of our society, but from within the high councils of the educational establishment itself. The problem they face is that it is difficult to sell the idea that any work well done is worth doing, and that pride of craftsmanship is as essential to our system as the writing of sonnets.

U.S. Commissioner Sidney P. Marland, Jr., has made a significant step to overcome this difficulty, by focusing on the need to upgrade vocational education into "career" training. Recently, he pointed out that only three of every 10 students now in high school will go on to academic college-level work.

One-third of those will drop out before obtaining a baccalaureate degree. "That means," said Commissioner Marland, "that 8 out of 10 present high school students should be getting occupational training of some sort."

Mr. President, Commissioner Marland has cogently delineated the problems between academia and the real world, and given us new insight into what may hopefully become a major thrust toward more realistic educational patterns. I ask unanimous consent that his recent speech before the National Association of Secondary School Principals at Houston, Tex., be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

CAREER EDUCATION NOW

(By Sidney P. Marland, Jr., Commissioner of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare)

Since I intend to devote a major part of my remarks today to the subject of career education, it seems appropriate to begin by mentioning that I am finding my new job to be a richly rewarding learning experience.

Take the matter of the Commissioner's place in the Washington pecking order. I have always held the commissionership to be one of the great and auspicious positions in the Federal Government. So naturally, when I learned that a prominent Federal official is issued a brand new \$30,000 bulletproof limousine each year, I immediately inquired into the nature of the transportation furnished to the Commissioner of Education.

It turned out to be rather basic—a small, misshapen, used Rebel. When I asked for an improvement, I was sent a slightly newer, small, misshapen, used Rambler.

I am not discouraged. I am merely chastened. It's really a very nice car. And, besides, I have been assured that the Commissioner hardly ever gets shot at.

Career education is an absorbing topic at the Office of Education lately. In essence we are attempting to answer a very large question: what is right and what is wrong with vocational education in America today and

what can be done to build on our strengths and eliminate our weaknesses?

I will indicate to you in a few moments the major points of our reply, the steps we believe should be taken by the Federal Government and particularly by the Office of Education to strengthen your hand in refashioning the vocational or career curriculum. For we are in wholehearted agreement that it is in serious need of reform and it is my firm intention that vocational education will be one of a very few major emphases of the U.S. Office, priority areas in which we intend to place the maximum weight of our concentrated resources to effect a thorough and permanent improvement.

But let me broaden the discussion a bit at this point to talk about career education not simply from the Federal point of view but from the point of view of you and me and of everyone who has committed his life's work to the proposition that education's prime task is to seek and to free the individual's precious potential. My concern with this vital area of education was with me long before I came into possession of my bent Rambler. It is the result of more than 30 years in school life, ample time to observe the vocational education problem in such diverse settings as New York City, Pittsburgh, and Winnetka, Illinois. For even in Winnetka, archetypal suburb, blessed in material things far above most communities in this country, there are many people who are worried about the logic and relevance of what is being taught their youngsters, particularly when considered in the light of the amazingly sophisticated, complex, and rapidly changing career situations they will face upon graduation from high school or from college.

Winnetkans, like most Americans, ask: what are we educating our children for?

Educators, it seems to me, have too often answered: we simply are not sure.

Uncertainty is the hallmark of our era. And because many educators have been unsure as to how they could best discharge their dual responsibility to meet the student's needs on the one hand and to satisfy the country's infinite social and economic appetites on the other, they have often succumbed to the temptation to point a God-like finger at vocational educators and damn them for their failure to meet the Nation's manpower requirements and doubly damn them for their failure to meet the youngster's career requirements, not to mention his personal fulfillment as a human being.

Most of you are secondary school administrators. You, like me, have been preoccupied most of the time with college entrance expectations. Vocational-technical education has been a second-level concern. The vocational education teachers and administrators have been either scorned or condemned and we have been silent.

There is illogic here as well as a massive injustice. How can we blame vocational educators for the hundreds of thousands of pitifully incapable boys and girls who leave our high schools each year when the truth is that the vast majority of these youngsters have never seen the inside of a vocational classroom? They are the unfortunate inmates, in most instances, of a curriculum that is neither fish nor fowl, neither truly vocational nor truly academic. We call it general education. I suggest we get rid of it.

Whatever interest we represent, Federal, State, or local, whether we teach or administer, we must perforce deny ourselves the sweet solace of knowing the other fellow is in the wrong. We share the guilt for the generalized failure of our public system of education to equip our people to get and hold decent jobs. And the remedy likewise depends upon all of us. As Dr. Grant Venn said in his book, *Man, Education, and Manpower*: "If we want an educational system designed to serve each individual and to de-

velop his creative potential in a self-directed way, then we have work to do and attitudes to change."

The first attitude that we should change, I suggest, is our own. We must purge ourselves of academic snobbery. For education's most serious failing is its self-induced, voluntary fragmentation, the strong tendency of education's several parts to separate from one another, to divide the entire enterprise against itself. The most grievous example of these intramural class distinctions is, of course, the false dichotomy between things academic and things vocational. As a first step, I suggest we dispose of the term vocational education, and adopt the term career education. Every young person in school belongs in that category at some point, whether engaged in preparing to be a surgeon, a brick layer, a mother, or a secretary.

How absurd to suggest that general knowledge for its own sake is somehow superior to useful knowledge. "Pedants sneer at an education that is useful," Alfred North Whitehead observed. "But if education is not useful," he went on to ask, "What is it?" The answer, of course, is that it is nothing. All education is career education, or should be. And all our efforts as educators must be bent on preparing students either to become properly, usefully employed immediately upon graduation from high school or to go on to further formal education. Anything else is dangerous nonsense. I propose that a universal goal of American education, starting now, be this: that every young person completing our school program at grade 12 be ready to enter higher education or to enter useful and rewarding employment.

Contrary to all logic and all expediency, we continue to treat vocational training as education's poor cousin. We are thereby perpetuating the social quarantine it has been in since the days of the ancient Greeks, and, for all I know, before then. Since the original vocational fields were defined shortly before World War I as agriculture, industry, and homemaking, we have too often taught those skills grudgingly—dull courses in dull buildings for the benefit of what we all *knew* were young people somehow pre-judged not fit for college as though college were something better for everyone. What a pity and how foolish, particularly for a country as dependent upon her machines and her technology as America. The ancient Greeks could afford such snobbery at a time when a very short course would suffice to instruct a man how to imitate a beast of burden. We Americans might even have been able to afford it a half-century ago when a boy might observe the full range of his occupational expectations by walking beside his father at the time of plowing, by watching the farmers, blacksmiths, and tradesmen who did business in his home town.

But how different things are today and how grave our need to reshape our system of education to meet the career demands of the astonishingly complex technological society we live in. When we talk of today's career development, we are not talking about blacksmithing. We are talking about the capacity of our people to sustain and accelerate the pace of progress in this country in every respect during a lifetime of learning. And nothing less.

The question seems to be fairly simple, if we have the courage and creativity to face it: Shall we persevere in the traditional practices that are obviously *not* properly equipping fully half or more of our young people or shall we immediately undertake the reformation of our entire secondary education in order to position it properly for maximum contribution to our individual and national life?

I think our choice is apparent. Certainly continued indecision and preservation of the status quo can only result in additional mil-

lions of young men and women leaving our high schools, with or without benefit of diploma, unfitted for employment, unable or unwilling to go on to college, and carrying away little more than an enduring distaste for education in any form, unskilled and unschooled. Indeed, if we are to ponder thoughtfully the growing charge of "irrelevance" in our schools and colleges, let us look sharply at the abomination known as general education.

Of those students currently in high school, only three out of 10 will go on to academic college-level work. One-third of those will drop out before getting a baccalaureate degree. That means that eight out of 10 present high school students should be getting occupational training of some sort. But only about two of those eight students are, in fact, getting such training. Consequently, half our high school students, a total of approximately 1,500,000 a year, are being offered what amounts to irrelevant, general educational pap!

In pained puzzlement they toil at watered-down general algebra, they struggle to recollect the difference between adjectives and adverbs, and they juggle in their minds the atomic weight of potassium in non-college science. The liberal arts and sciences of our traditional college-preparatory curriculum are indeed desirable for those who want them and can use them. But there must be desire and receptivity, and for millions of our children, we must concede, such knowledge is neither useful nor joyful. They do not love it for its own sake and they cannot sell it in the career market place.

Small wonder so many drop out, not because they have failed, but because we have failed them. Who would not at the earliest convenient and legal moment leave an environment that is neither satisfying, entertaining, or productive? We properly deplore the large numbers of young men and women who leave high school before graduation. But, in simple truth, for most of them dropping out is the most sensible elective they can choose. At least they can substitute the excitement of the street corner for the more obscure charms of general mathematics.

I want to state my clear conviction that a properly effective career education requires a new educational unity. It requires a breaking down of the barriers that divide our educational system into parochial enclaves. Our answer is that we must blend our curricula and our students into a single strong, secondary system. Let the academic preparation be balanced with the vocational or career program. Let one student take strength from another. And, for the future hope of education, let us end the divisive, snobbish, destructive distinctions in learning that do no service to the cause of knowledge, and do no honor to the name of American enterprise.

It is terribly important to teach a youngster the skills he needs to live, whether we call them academic or vocational, whether he intends to make his living with a wrench, or a slide rule, or folio editions of Shakespeare. But it is critically important to equip that youngster to live his life as a fulfilled human being. As Secretary Richardson said, "I remind you that this department of government more than anything else is concerned with humaneness."

Ted Bell, now Deputy Commissioner for School Systems in OE, made the point particularly well in a recent speech to a student government group. He was speculating on the steps a young person needs to take not just to get a diploma or a degree today, but to make reasonably sure he will continue to learn in the years ahead, to be an educated man or woman in terms of the future, a personal future.

"Here," Dr. Bell said, "the lesson is for each person to develop a personal plan for lifelong learning: learning about the world we live in, the people that inhabit it, the environment—physical and social—that we find

around us; learning about the sciences the arts, the literature we have inherited and are creating; but most of all, learning the way the world's peoples are interacting with one another. If one educates himself in these things, he will have a pretty good chance of survival and of a good life."

In other words, life and how to live it is the primary vocation of all of us. And the ultimate test of our educational process, on any level, is how close it comes to preparing our people to be alive and active with their hearts, and their minds, and, for many, their hands as well.

True and complete reform of the high school, viewed as a major element of overall preparation for life, cannot be achieved until general education is completely done away with in favor of contemporary career development in a comprehensive secondary education environment. This is our ultimate goal and we realize that so sweeping a change cannot be accomplished overnight, involving as it does approximately 30 million students and billions of dollars of public funds. Until we can recommend a totally new system we believe an interim strategy can be developed entailing four major actions:

First we are planning improvements in the vocational education program of the Office of Education. This program, as you know, involves the expenditure of nearly \$500,000,000 annually and our intention is to make the administrative and programmatic changes that will enable the States to use this money to make their vocational education efforts more relevant to the needs of the young people who will spend their lives in careers in business and industry. We intend to give the States new leadership and technical support to enable them to move present programs away from disproportionate enrollments in low-demand occupations to those where national shortages exist and where future national needs will be high.

Right now State training programs fill only half the jobs available each year. The other half are filled by job seekers with no occupational job training of any kind. We do better in some fields than others, of course, particularly production agriculture where we are able to come closer to meeting the total need because it is a relatively static job market with little growth projected. About 70 percent of the demand in farm jobs will be met with trained help this year compared with only about 38 percent in the health occupations and 35 percent in various technical fields. This is nice if you happen to own a farm, not so nice if you run a hospital or laboratory.

We obviously require greater emphasis on such new vocational fields as computer programmers and technicians, laser technicians, and jet mechanics. We particularly need qualified people in health occupations such as certified laboratory technologists, dental assistants, occupational therapists, and the like. And, of course, we badly need men and women to capably service the rapidly growing environmental industries. Though when we speak of new occupations it is always useful to remind ourselves that even some of the newest, such as computer programming, for example, will very likely be obsolete in 20 years or so, affirming once again the need for a sound educational base underlying all specific skill training.

Second—here I speak of all cooperating agencies of education and government—we must provide far more flexible options for high school graduates to continue on to higher education or to enter the world of work rather than forever sustain the anachronism that a youngster must make his career choice at age 14. This demands that we broaden today's relatively narrow vocational program into something approaching the true career education we would eventually hope to realize. Vocational students need much more than limited specific skills train-

ing if they are to go on to post-secondary education, whether at the community college or four-year level. And young people presently drifting in the general education wasteland need realistic exposure to the world of work, as well as to the option of general post-secondary schooling.

Third, we can effect substantial improvement in vocational education within current levels of expenditures by bringing people from business, industry, and organized labor, who know where the career opportunities are going to be and what the real world of work is like, into far closer collaboration with the schools. Eventually, further subsidies or other encouragement to industry to increase cooperative education and work-study could greatly enhance these programs. Efforts should be made by people in educational institutions offering occupational courses to get nearby employers to help in the training. This will not only aid the students but employers as well by providing these cooperating firms a ready supply of skilled workers well prepared for the specific demands of their particular fields. I would add only this caveat: that these work experience arrangements be accepted and operated as genuine educational opportunities, of a laboratory nature, not simply as a source of cheap help for the business and pocket money for the student. Youngsters should be given the opportunity to explore eight, ten, a dozen occupations before choosing the one pursued in depth, consistent with the individual's ambitions, skills, and interests.

Fourth, we must build at all levels—Federal, State, and local—a new leadership and a new commitment to the concept of a career education system. For we require leaders willing to move our schools into more direct and closer relationships with society's problems, opportunities, and its ever-changing needs. I believe these leaders will come primarily from the ranks of organizations such as yours. Not only will the present vocational-technical education leaders be partners in change, but general educators, long dedicated to the old ways, must become new champions of the career program.

In closing, a word about two very promising OE efforts to help strengthen vocational-technical education in its most crucial aspect, personnel.

The teacher is by far the most important factor in the school environment. We all know this. And we also know that vocational teachers are in seriously short supply.

We are also keenly aware that vocational-technical education is starved for other critical personnel, especially those qualified to develop and administer productive programs.

The first effort, called Leadership Development Awards, is a doctoral-fellowship program under the Education Professions Development Act. It seeks to identify and train a cadre of leaders for the vocational-technical career education field. As an initial move we have made the first group of awards to 160 experienced vocational educators to enable them to undertake full-time study at the doctoral level.

These men and women are attending 11 universities which share an emphasis on career education. These institutions pay special attention to the needs of the disadvantaged and handicapped; they cooperate closely with industry, the States, and the local districts; and they have established close working relationships with the surrounding communities.

Training lasts from two to three years. It is not tied to the campus but is essentially an intensive internship program with opportunities for research and exploration into the complexities of our constantly changing occupational structure.

We believe these doctoral candidates will make a very constructive imprint on the world of career education. But they will not be cast adrift upon graduation to search out

their own niche in that world. Their home States will develop plans for the most strategic use of their skills—in colleges and universities which prepare career educators, in State departments of vocational education, in community colleges, and at the local level for development of the entirely new approach school systems must take to career education.

Our second effort is a program, already producing impressive results, to help the States attract and train teachers and administrators in vocational-technical education. The Leadership Development Awards I have described will produce the shapers and developers of the new career education; this second effort will produce the teachers to carry out the realistic and contemporary plans and programs they develop.

We are funding a variety of State plans. The money is helping to train personnel to work with the disadvantaged and the handicapped, to develop innovative and effective methods of exchange between teachers and businessmen, and to design and carry out more effective vocational guidance, a particularly crucial area. The funds are also being used to increase the number of trades and industry teachers in the emerging occupations that I spoke of a few moments ago.

The overriding purpose of this program is to encourage the States to develop their own capacities and their own resources to produce vocational-technical teachers in the numbers we need and of a quality we need. This new blood will energize career education, particularly in our city schools, whose revitalization is certainly education's first order of business.

President Nixon put the matter well when he said, "When educators, school boards and government officials alike admit that they have a great deal to learn about the way we teach, we will begin to climb the up staircase toward genuine reform."

We have, I believe, begun to climb that staircase. We have begun, at least in part, the difficult, continuing work of reform. These recent tumultuous years of challenge and strife and all-encompassing change have given us lessons to learn, especially lessons in humility. But they have also taught us to hope and to act. The actions in vocational education and teacher education that I have outlined to you today are but the first in a series of reform which I intend to initiate and carry out within the U.S. Office of Education. I solicit your reactions to what I have said for I particularly want to bridge the gulf between the Federal Government and the education leaders in the States, in the communities, indeed, in all the classrooms of America.

With a guarantee of your tolerance and support I will return to Washington and my new duties confident that the absolute need to develop a strong new program of career education is well understood by you who must understand it, that you and I agree on the kind of action that must be taken and the urgency of taking it. I respect and salute your capacity to reform the secondary schools of the land. In sum, the schools are engaged in swift change because you the educators have chosen to change them. The schools, I conclude, are in good hands.

**SEXITIVITY TRAINING SESSION
DISRUPTED BY ADVERSE GROUP
FEEDBACK**

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 1971

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, I insert in the RECORD an account of a recent speech

by the controversial Mary S. Calderone—SIECUS director and America's leading libertine—whose claim to fame is breaking the decency barrier and making illicit and abnormal sex normal.

The speech follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, March 18, 1971]

PRO-SEX EDUCATION SPEAKER HECKLED

(By Toni House)

Dr. Mary S. Calderone, a prominent sex-education advocate, cut short her speech in Alexandria last night because of heckling.

Announcing she did not intend to be "part of a circus," Dr. Calderone, director of the Sex Information and Education Council of the United States (siecus), turned from the podium after three or four hecklers consistently contradicted her from the audience.

Dr. Calderone said earlier in her address at T. C. Williams High School that Siecus works as a consultant to communities wishing to set up sex education curricular.

"The decisions are left up to the communities, as well they should be," she said.

A man who identified himself as Edward Reed of McLean insisted Siecus had established a sex education program for New York City in 1964, as well as in Annapolis and other communities.

Dr. Calderone said Siecus had only been a consultant in New York.

"I'm a Quaker and a physician and neither Quakers nor physicians are known to lie," she said.

"Well, I'm a Roman Catholic, and they're not liars, either," retorted Reed.

Dr. Calderone also rejected the line of questioning from a man who wanted to know whether Siecus has been successful in "getting its publications accepted by (the Department of) Health, Education and Welfare."

Siecus, said Dr. Calderone, has three publications—a monthly newsletter and two books aimed at professionals, one published by Scribner and Sons, the other by Johns Hopkins University.

The interruptions had begun earlier in the evening. As Dr. Calderone was discussing a study on "normal" sexual behavior, a man who identified himself as William O. Collins of McLean rushed to the microphone and asked, "Can't you keep this on a decent level? This is a disgrace."

Dr. Calderone replied she was "honoring" the audience "with a scientific paper," and applause drowned out Collins' rebuttal.

After her speech, Dr. Calderone said she addresses two or three community meetings a week and is frequently heckled by members of the Movement to Restore Decency (Motrede).

Although her antagonists last night said they are not affiliated with any specific organization, Motrede material was passed out at the door.

Dr. Calderone appeared under the joint sponsorship of the Alexandria Community Health Clinic, the bar and medical associations and a group of clergymen.

U.S. POLICY TOWARD RHODESIA

HON. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 19, 1971

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, the Lynchburg, Va., News of March 17 published an excellent editorial critical of U.S. policy toward the African country of Rhodesia.

I long have favored an end to our policy of economic sanctions against Rhodesia. The editorial lists some of the sound reasons for changing our policy.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial, entitled "Support for Rhodesia," be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

The editor of the Lynchburg News is Mr. F. James Murdock.

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

SUPPORT FOR RHODESIA

Senator Harry Byrd, Jr. made a vigorous and sound plea for the United States to "end its foolish policy against Rhodesia and resume trade with that nation."

He attached this plea to something that should have prevented the foolish policy ever being adopted. Chrome is strategic metal. Rhodesia is the best source for it, and the most economical. Instead of buying it there this country gets it from the Russians at twice the price it can be obtained in Rhodesia.

While it is wholly meritorious to make chrome one of the reasons for resuming relations with Rhodesia, there are even better ones, principally in recognizing Rhodesia as an independent republic adequately motivated in breaking away from Britain, as this country did in the American Revolution.

Contrary to claims in Washington and in Britain that Rhodesia would be a flop in its stand as an independent republic, it has prospered. But far from what it could accomplish if we officially recognized it and resumed full trade.

Morally, legally, economically and in historical perspective, the United States can not justify its stand against Rhodesia. While spending billions in aid to less worthy countries we hurt both ourselves and Rhodesia through our present policy. It is long past due that we rectify this, and there is no valid reason for not doing so.

**LAURELS TO THE TREASURY
DEPARTMENT**

HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 1971

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, I was very gratified to learn last week that the U.S. Tariff Commission ruled that special "dumping" duties will be applied to both color and black-and-white television sets imported from Japan. This action will affect sets sold since September 1970.

In its simplest form, dumping means that imported goods are offered at wholesale prices lower than those charged in the home market or another country. The Anti-Dumping Act of 1921 enables the Treasury Department to levy a special tax that would erase the margin of difference.

Although a decision of this type may seem rather remote from the interests of most citizens, I believe that is significant and an important step that allows for free trade in the world market. The stakes involved are thousands of American jobs in electronics industries that are falling to unfair competition.

The investigation in this case has been going on for over 3 years and was initiated by a request from the Elec-

tronic Industries Association. The charge that domestic industries are being hurt by the dumping has been substantiated by the Treasury Department.

Business in dumping-prone industries has long felt that a clampdown has been overdue. Japanese imports last year, accounted for 28 percent of American television sales and were valued at \$255 million. The percentage of Japanese imports in 1965 was only 10 percent of the U.S. market.

Dumping is a very subtle way for foreign interests to undermine an American industry and especially when it is as competitive as electronics. By underselling in this country, Japanese companies can slowly increase their share of the market and eventually cause competitors to fail. A final result might be an oligopoly of foreign interests that could raise prices at will without fear of any domestic company meeting the challenge.

When one analyzes the track record of foreign companies in the sales of small electronics gadgets, one truth becomes evident. American companies cannot compete. Foreign sources now supply 90 percent of the U.S. tape recorder market, 88 percent of the U.S. radio sales, and 54 percent of all phonograph sales in this country.

Electronic component sales by the U.S. electronics industry have increased from \$1 billion to \$25 billion since 1950. The U.S. Government provided fully two-thirds of the research and development funds used by the electronics and communications industries between 1957 and 1965 for a total spent of \$23 billion. The Federal Government spent \$3.7 billion for electronic components in 1969, making it one of the largest purchasers of electronic equipment.

Unfortunately, there are those who point to these billion-dollar figures and say that the dumping represents little threat to the economy. I disagree and urge that the procedure for submitting an antidumping case be expedited. It now takes 3 years to research and present a case. I would like to see these procedures speeded up so that the action can be taken within 1 year. The proper application of the antidumping statute will alleviate pressures for extreme protectionist measures and will, in fact, promote free trade on a fair reciprocal basis.

**"NO TWO MEN ARE EQUAL"
SAYS MILLARD BENNETT**

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 19, 1971

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, the oft-quoted and misquoted observation by George Orwell, to the effect that "all animals are equal, but some animals are more equal than others," is becoming increasingly valid today. The noble idea of equality of opportunity must coincide with equality of interest and ability to make the concept viable. Those who suggest this are frequently misinterpreted; the pure motive here is to try to prevent what has been called "a great

leveling of souls." The happy day will come when man is judged solely on his abilities and activities.

Noted author, lecturer, and business executive Millard Bennett, of Santa Monica, Calif., recently took note of this in a brief essay published in the West Los Angeles Tribune. His words are relevant to every phase of our political, economic, social, and academic efforts. I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Bennett's article be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

NO TWO MEN ARE EQUAL

(By Millard Bennett)

Recently, while on a speaking trip, I heard a speaker state, "The Declaration of Independence says that all men are born equal." Period. This is a ridiculous assertion.

There is no such thing as equality in nature. No two snow-flakes are of equal weight or exact in design. No two blades of grass are identical and so on throughout nature ad infinitum.

The difference between human beings is even more pronounced. The physical difference is markedly evident in every contest of strength, skill and endurance. This is what makes a football, baseball, basketball game or prize fight attractive to the spectators. They believe their favorites are superior. Every classroom bears testimony to the mental difference and every religion evidences our difference in belief.

Heredity plus environment gives each human being his psychological outlook. Since each gene is different, so, too, is each individual. Therefore, since we all differ genetically, we also differ in our potential skills. Emerson, the great American philosopher, said, "In some way every human being is my superior." This is a profound truth. Every normal human being has great potential in some area of human endeavor.

Psychologically, we know that an individual's liking and his ability runs parallel. He can do well that which he likes to do. The wise individual will recognize this truth and resolve to learn to like a line of work. And just as one learns to create a taste for a particular food, so, too, can one learn to like a line of work. Then through study, thought and practice, he will improve himself in that area.

Many years ago as a young salesman I visited Salt Lake City, Utah. I attended a meeting in the famous Tabernacle. There I heard Heber J. Grant, then president of the Latter Day Saints (Mormon) Church, make a statement which I have never forgotten: "That which we persist in doing becomes easier to do, not that the nature of the thing becomes less difficult, but, through doing our power to do increases."

Moral: Less talk about equality except that unalienable equality before the law upon which this great nation was founded which embraces equality of opportunity. Instead, let us put greater emphasis upon intelligent and persistent effort for self-improvement. This is every individual's only answer to a fuller and richer life.

REDUCTION IN NUMBER OF PATIENTS OF VA HOSPITALS

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 1971

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the Members of this House

the article which appeared in the Thursday, March 18 issue of the Washington Star by Judith Randal entitled, "Nixon's Performance on Health Sad." It relates in some detail the situation now facing the veterans of this country who have been and are eligible for care in the 166 hospitals located throughout the 50 States. The 1972 budget will reduce the average daily census from the latest figure of 87,600 to 79,000. There is no rhyme or reason for this except built-in prejudice among certain officials of the Office of Management and Budget who, unfortunately, seem to have more influence with the President than do others who see the true situation and are aware of the care given in VA hospitals and the need for the continuance of such care. I am sure that the vast majority of the Members of this House will agree that there can be no reduction of this magnitude, in fact, an increase is warranted.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the text of Miss Randal's unusually perceptive article:

NIXON'S PERFORMANCE ON HEALTH SAD

For an administration that clearly hopes to make its record on health a strong suit in its 1972 campaign, President Nixon's surely is going about it in odd ways. Aside from rhetoric, scarcely anything in the health field done in the name of the White House lately could do anything but make millions hopping mad.

What is the silent majority to think, for instance, about a recent budget directive that would reduce the average number of patients treated daily in Veterans Administration hospitals from 83,000 to 79,000 beginning in July—particularly when the hospitals are now about 90 percent full?

To be sure, veterans with non-service-connected disabilities would be the first to get the shove. But with unemployment climbing and medicare programs being curtailed, as in California, this will be little comfort to a jobless ex-G.I. who finds himself sick and without either private health insurance or access to public care.

A similar Middle America constituency is infuriated as the Department of Health, Education and Welfare seeks to divest itself of the eight general hospitals and 30 outpatient clinics operated by the Public Health Service for merchant seamen, Coast Guardsmen and certain retired military personnel. (Under legislation enacted in 1970, the hospitals and clinics can care for the poor as well.)

The hospitals and clinics, HEW officials assured congressional committees last week, will be turned over to local governments, medical schools or other community organizations, rather than be closed. But HEW's own survey shows that no one in the places where the facilities are located can afford to take on these "gifts"—many of them in need of renovations—and that other nearby hospitals are, for the most part, too crowded already to absorb the patient load.

Nor will the government save money if the transfers go through, since it will continue to have to pay for the care of most of the present beneficiaries at higher rates than before. By the administration's own admission, it probably will have to subsidize the facilities in other ways.

Meanwhile, the longer the issue hangs fire, the lower the staff morale, making it quite likely that if direct orders from Washington don't close the facilities, attrition will. Recently, for example, all the radiologists at the San Francisco hospital quit.

The PHS system and the VA are heavily depended on as training grounds by many medical schools that are seeking at government urging to expand their enrollments.

What is more, both sets of hospitals also educate physicians' assistants and technicians—the very personnel categories the Nixon administration looks to for relief of the health care crisis. This pair of paradoxes defies explanation. Incidentally, it also should be noted that there is \$6.6 million less for the training of badly needed nurses in the 1972 White House budget than there was in 1971.

The administration's footing in other health areas is equally shaky. As it talks of a massive assault on cancer, for example, it proposes to phase out the Chronic Disease Control Program and cut the funding for the Regional Medical Program. The purpose of the latter is to get therapeutic advances out of the laboratory and teaching hospital and into the hands of ordinary physicians.

And while all the money that is needed for cancer research is said to be forthcoming grants for the training of young scientists will, if the President prevails, all but disappear. Predictably, this will have two deleterious effects: (1) It will create a "generation gap" in laboratories. (2) Since scientists go where the money is, it will leave few available for medical research not related to cancer.

In addition, there is the matter of programs enthusiastically endorsed on Capitol Hill which also have received the blessing of the White House.

When, for example, Congress authorized the expenditure of \$300 million to combat alcoholism, the administration gave every indication of being eager to get on with the job. But, in fact, only about \$7 million is allotted to the task in the Nixon budget, and even this is largely negated by the elimination of counterpart efforts by the Office of Economic Opportunity.

With an estimated 9 million chronic alcoholics in the nation, the suggested outlay works out to a per capita medical expenditure of approximately 75 cents—about enough to buy each alcoholic a few beers. Certainly, this kind of financing will do little to alleviate the suffering of the afflicted and their families or to reduce the massive toll of death and injury that results from alcohol-related highway accidents.

The cases cited here are only a few of many—all in all, a rather sad commentary on an administration said to be dedicated to pragmatism and known to pride itself on political good sense.

FOREIGN STEEL

HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 1971

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, the American Iron and Steel Institute has just released data concerning the importation of foreign steel into this country for January 1971. The report is disheartening and portends of future disaster.

Stimulated perhaps by the threat of a work stoppage in the domestic industry this summer or by the pending expiration of the voluntary restraint agreement, the foreign steel manufacturers are off and running.

According to AISI, the January import total was a new monthly high. More than 1.3 million tons came into the Nation during that month. The total was more than 200,000 tons above that for January 1968, when imported steel was on the way to a record high of 18 million tons for the year.

Domestic exports of steel, however, continued their steady slump which began last spring. The January total was 254,000 tons, the lowest level in nearly 2 years.

A breakdown of the January import total revealed nearly 530,000 tons consisted of steel products extensively used in the manufacture of automobiles and major high-volume consumer appliances. This report lends credibility to persistent rumors that major U.S. automakers were considering the purchase of substantial quantities of steel abroad this year.

Import of stainless and alloy steels also continued to increase, despite the promise contained by member nations of the so-called voluntary restraint agreement not to change "too greatly" the mix of their product shipments. Nearly 53,000 tons of stainless and alloy steels came into the United States in January.

On numerous occasions during 1969 and 1970, I, along with several colleagues, tried to warn the Congress that our Nation's steel industry was in grave danger from foreign competitors. Time and time again we decried the hollow promises contained in the restraint agreement. We predicted there would be a shift to higher priced products since the agreement stipulated only tonnage limitations, not dollar limitations.

We were right. Imports of stainless steel in 1970 increased 32 percent and tool steel was up 81 percent over the agreed levels. Japan showed a 54-percent increase over her stainless shipments to the United States, despite her declaration she would not change too greatly the product mix. In tool steel she was 77 percent above the previous figure and the Common Market was up 86 percent.

My colleagues and I also warned that other nations, not party to any agreement on limitations, would not hesitate to feather their own nests at the expense of the American steel industry and steelworker. Again, we were right. Last year more than 50 percent of stainless imports to the United States and three-fourths of the tool steel imports came from nations who have not signed any restraint agreement.

Mr. Speaker, I am not overestimating the danger when I say the jobs of 52,000 steelworkers in the specialty steel segment of our industry are in grave danger from foreign imports. It is estimated that 20 to 25 percent of the domestic specialty market already has been lost to overseas manufacturers while, in specific areas, the foreign penetration is up to nearly 70 percent.

Roger S. Ahlbrandt, president of Allegheny Ludlum Industries Inc., has prophesied what will happen to the specialty steel industry if help is not soon forthcoming. He has said America will become "the dumping ground for all the world's economic surplus"; that our Nation will be converted to a "service economy . . . a vast national warehouse for the storage of overseas-produced goods." Mr. Ahlbrandt adds, "When this occurs, the American people will lack the resources to buy the goods they store for the rest of the world."

Steel management is not alone in its requests for protection for the industry.

Labor leaders, too, are sounding the cry. Joseph P. Moloney, vice president of the United Steelworkers of America, has pointed out that not only is the industry and its employees threatened by imports, but that entire American communities will cease to exist if the invasion of imported products continues unchecked. Many, in fact most, especially steel companies are located in small cities across this Nation. Often these communities are one-industry communities; they stand or fall with specialty steel production.

Yet, look at what has happened to our domestic specialty steel market in just 4 short years, 1966-70, a period spanning the life of the so-called voluntary restraint agreement. Total stainless imports have increased from 13.4 percent to 21.2 percent; tool steel from 12.8 percent to 16.9 percent; stainless cold rolled sheets from 20.1 percent to 34.4 percent; stainless wire rod from 42 percent to 67.1 percent; stainless wire from 21.6 percent to 53 percent; and stainless bars from 3.4 to 14.6 percent.

As Mr. Moloney has stated, the loss of a stockholder's investment because of imports is grievous; the loss of a job to the worker is often tragic. But worst of all is the job loss that may occur because of a plant closing in a one-industry community, where alternate employment is practically impossible.

Last year the value of imported steel was nearly \$2 billion, an increase of \$225 million over 1969, despite a drop of nearly 5 percent in total import tonnage. The lucrative target for foreign producers was our domestic specialty steel market. Imports of specialty steel products constituted less than 4 percent of the total tonnage but accounted for more than 13 percent of the total value.

It is incredulous to believe, Mr. Speaker, that we in the Congress can hem and haw over the lofty philosophy of free trade versus fair trade while our steel industry, the backbone of our Nation's national security and the source of income to hundreds of thousands of people, reels down the road toward total collapse. Time is running out. We in the Congress must do something to protect our industry and its workers. Delay can well mean disaster.

SOCIAL SECURITY INCREASE

HON. LAWRENCE J. HOGAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 1971

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, as a cosponsor of legislation to provide a 10-percent across-the-board increase in social security benefits, I am pleased that the House and Senate have acted promptly to approve such an increase, even though I disapprove of its being tacked onto totally unrelated and somewhat controversial legislation.

I am particularly pleased that this increase will be retroactive to January 1, 1971, but regret that the conference committee concluded to strike those provisions which set a \$100 monthly mini-

imum benefit and increased the earnings limitation to \$2,400. I feel strongly that these are much-needed changes in the law and hope that their rejection at this time is based on the view that amendments of this nature should not be rushed through and not a result of disagreement with the principle. Hopefully the Ways and Means Committee will continue to give full consideration to both provisions.

In the Fifth District of Maryland, my district, senior citizens living on a fixed retirement income such as social security, are faced with living expenses with which they cannot begin to cope. Extremely high apartment rentals and property taxes, high medical costs, high transportation and food costs have reduced many beneficiaries to a state of poverty.

Even those who are willing and able to work to earn additional income to supplement their meager and inadequate pension, are prohibited from earning more than \$1,680 per year without reduction dollar for dollar in their benefits. We are forcing these people to be resigned to their poverty state when we should be encouraging them to earn to their full potential.

In my bill, H.R. 4268, I have proposed both the \$100 monthly minimum benefit and an increase in the earnings limitation to \$2,400, which I truly feel is completely inadequate but has a more realistic chance of being approved. I urge all Members of the House to reevaluate the status of our social security retirees and lend their support toward obtaining congressional action and approval of one or both of these provisions.

HOW DOES THE PRESIDENT REALLY FEEL ABOUT CONSUMER PROTECTION?

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 1971

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, if there is one area of public concern in which partisanship has no place, it is consumer protection.

All of us, Republicans and Democrats, are consumers, and we all share the same interests in quality and integrity in the marketplace.

Unfortunately, however, the administration has been lukewarm in its support for meaningful consumer legislation. As a sponsor of bills to create a separate Consumer Protection Agency and to permit consumer class action lawsuits, I must confess my disappointment in the administration's attitude.

The lack of enthusiasm for solid consumer legislation was pointed out recently in a thoughtful editorial in the Honolulu Advertiser, the text of which I include at this point:

[From the Honolulu Advertiser, Mar. 1, 1971]

NIXON & CONSUMERS

President Nixon has presented Congress with a package of consumer proposals that he says is designed to provide "a buyer's bill of rights."

An examination of the President's recommended legislation shows that it falls considerably short of being a bill of rights.

The best example of the difference in thinking between Nixon and more militant consumer advocates is seen in the proposal concerning hazardous products.

The President prefers that a product safety program be included in the Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Private organizations would develop the standards which would be enforced by HEW.

In contrast to this low-key approach, the National Commission on Product Safety, which studied the problem for some time, recommended a powerful, independent agency be created whose sole job would be to set and enforce product safety standards.

The independent agency position is backed by Senator Warren G. Magnuson, chairman of the Commerce Committee and a strong backer of the consumer movement.

Magnuson notes that the HEW's record in the product safety field is uninspired. He recalls the agency had to be practically goaded into enforcing a law intended to safeguard children from dangerous toys.

An independent consumer agency in the Federal government is a leading aim of the consumer movement, and the proposal has substantial bipartisan backing in Congress. But the President prefers that a consumer "advocate" be placed within the Federal Trade Commission, at best a half-hearted approach.

The class action lawsuit concept, by which consumers could band together and sue if they thought they had been cheated, was an important—and losing—part of last year's consumer interest drive. The President was never very strong on the idea and has shown no sign of changing his mind.

The consumer movement within Congress, led by such men as Magnuson and Representative Benjamin S. Rosenthal of New York, has more ambitious plans than those expressed by the President.

In addition to independent consumer protection and product safety agencies and tough class action legislation, consumer-oriented lawmakers want minimum standards for warranties, a strengthening of the flammable fabrics act and authority for obtaining preliminary injunctions against unfair or deceptive business practices.

Consumer bills fared badly in Congress last year, partly because the Nixon Administration provided very little help. From the look of the President's latest consumer message, it appears that any important consumer victories this year will have to be won without White House assistance.

REPEAL OF SECTION 302 OF VOTING RIGHTS ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1970 SHOULD PRECEDE 18-YEAR-OLD VOTE AMENDMENT

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 1971

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, we will shortly be debating a proposed constitutional amendment for the 18-year-old vote in accordance with article V of the Constitution which outlines the amending process. This is what should have been done 9 months ago when Congress in June of 1970 passed a statute which was a usurpation of the amending process.

George Washington, with great vision and eloquence, declared in his Fare-

well Address as President of the United States:

If, in the opinion of the people, the distribution or modification of the Constitutional powers be in any particular wrong, let it be corrected by an amendment in the way which the Constitution delegates. But let there be no change by usurpation; for though this, in one instance may be the instrument of good, it is the customary weapon by which free governments are destroyed.

From Washington's native State of Virginia, cradle of liberty and of our constitutional republican form of government, have come other great men, including Thomas Jefferson, James Madison, George Mason, and Woodrow Wilson, who have made similar declarations concerning the dangers of amending the Constitution by usurpation rather than by the manner prescribed in the Constitution itself.

Mr. Speaker, the proposed constitutional amendment for the 18-year-old vote which we are to consider, if in the wisdom of Congress it should be placed before the State legislatures for consideration for ratification, should have been placed before those legislatures 9 months ago when on June 17, 1970, the 91st Congress decided to usurp constitutional power it did not possess by enacting section 302 of the Voting Rights Act Amendments of 1970. Congress was without constitutional power to pass that statute. The President signed the bill that even he regarded unconstitutional, and the Supreme Court bowed to media-created public opinion and by one vote validated such patently illegal legislation.

Aside from the constitutional question, no effort seems to have been made in Congress to determine the chaos and confusion—in fact disaster—which was brought about by the enactment of that section and its half validation by the Supreme Court. This has resulted in a very serious situation in the States which opens up the road to grave errors in voting procedures and even provides the groundwork for fraud in our elections if the statute is permitted to remain on the statute books. It should be repealed at once as the root of the whole evil. The placing of a proposed constitutional amendment before the States will not remove the cancerous condition.

The Virginia General Assembly on February 26, enacted a house joint resolution memorializing all members of its delegation in Congress to initiate and support legislation to repeal section 302 of the Voting Rights Act Amendments of 1970. A similar resolution is now being processed in the State of Maryland. Other States should join in this movement to protect the citizens of our country against violation of the Constitution by Congress.

A committee formed of people of high attainment in the constitutional field, the "Committee for Constitutional Integrity," and dedicated to preservation of the Constitution from usurpation is placing in the mail today an individual leaflet to each State legislator in the Nation asking all State legislatures to join with the Virginia Legislature to memorialize their respective delegations in Congress to repeal, as usurpative, section 302 of

the Voting Rights Act Amendments of 1970 and to take no action on any proposed constitutional amendment for 18-year-old vote sent to them for ratification by Congress unless and until the usurpatory statute is repealed.

This is altogether proper, since the States have no other way in which to protect the people against usurpation except by that means.

Section 302 of the Voting Rights Act Amendments of 1970 should not have been passed. Allowing the 18-year-old vote should have been done by amendment in the first place. Surgery is now required to remove the cancer caused by the constitutionally offensive legislation. To allow section 302 of the Voting Rights Act Amendments of 1970 to stand while States are to ratify the constitutional amendment which we will consider shortly amounts on the part of Congress to buckpassing by shifting the pressure to State legislatures to rubberstamp the illegal act of Congress. If State legislatures find the pressure too great, and it is their desire to do what their people want, they can always submit the ratification of the amendment to popular vote of the people of the State. Congress should repeal section 302 of the Voting Rights Act Amendments of 1970 so that the legislators of the States will be able to deal with the proposed amendment as free and deliberative men and not as men stampeded into action by the confusion caused by the usurpatory legislation of Congress as validated in part by the Supreme Court.

I have introduced H.R. 385 to repeal not only title 3 of the Voting Rights Act of 1965 but to repeal the act in its entirety inasmuch as the other sections are discriminatory as applying only to that region of the country known as the South and thereby denying citizens of that section equal protection of the laws—which was the legal argument used by the judge in upholding section 302.

I insert a statement on the 18-year-old vote issue of the Committee for Constitutional Integrity and a copy of their letter to State legislators.

**GROUP CONDEMNS PANICKY ACTION ON
18-YEAR VOTE**

(Statement by Committee for Constitutional Integrity)

"Don't destroy the integrity of the amending process laid down in the U.S. Constitution in a panic scramble to achieve at once the 18-year vote!" This is the theme of a campaign launched by the newly formed Committee for Constitutional Integrity.

The Committee announces the dispatch of letters to each of more than 7,500 members of the legislatures of all 50 States, asking the legislators:

(1) to urge their respective legislatures to memorialize Congress requesting the repeal of the Congressional statute granting the vote at 18 (Section 302 of the Voting Rights Act Amendments of 1970) in order to prevent that statute from becoming a precedent justifying acts of usurpation in the future, and

(2) to urge their respective legislatures to defer any action on any proposed constitutional amendment dealing with the 18-year vote until that constitutionally offensive statute is repealed, so that the legislators will be able to deal with the proposed

amendment as free and deliberative men and not as men stampeded into action by the mess created by the Congressional usurpatory legislation.

Francis G. Wilson, professor emeritus of political science at the University of Illinois, who is Chairman of the Committee for Constitutional Integrity, explained at a press conference today the reasons for the Committee's campaign.

"We must bear in mind," said Prof. Wilson, "that Congress last year exceeded its constitutional powers and committed an act of usurpation in enacting Section 302 of the Voting Rights Act Amendments of 1970, granting the right to vote at 18 in both Federal and State elections. The Supreme Court, in a decision which has been likened to the Dred Scott decision in its lack of soundness, validated—by vote of 5 to 4—the grant of the vote at 18 in Federal elections, but held invalid as unconstitutional—also by a 5 to 4 vote—the statute as it applied to State elections.

"This partial validation and partial invalidation of the Congressional statute has created the present voting mess—dual-voting lists, legal snarls, enhanced opportunities for fraud, etc."

"We cannot properly cure the present mess," Professor Wilson emphasized, "by a panic campaign to get the States to ratify the Congressionally proposed constitutional amendment sight unseen. Such a procedure, in addition to leaving last year's ill-fated Congressional statute on the books as a precedent for further usurpations of power, robs the State legislatures of their right to exercise freedom of judgment in a calm atmosphere.

"The proper procedure is for Congress to repeal immediately Section 302 so that the State legislatures may consider the proposed constitutional amendment calmly and carefully.

"This is the American way, the constitutional way of doing things."

To illustrate the need for careful, deliberative action, the Committee, in its letter to the State legislators, made reference to a New York Times article, which indicated that there is great concern in university towns over the possibility that, with the voting age lowered to 18, students not permanently residing in the towns and having little knowledge of their problems, could nevertheless capture the town governments and raise taxes irresponsibly.

"We do not say," declared Professor Wilson, "that the amendment should be rejected on this ground or on any other ground. Our Committee takes no stand on the question whether the voting age should or should not be lowered to 18. But we do feel that the issue raised in the New York Times article, as well as other sub-surface issues, should be fully considered and debated in order that the final decision be an informed decision."

Support for the Committee's approach has already been manifested by the State of Virginia, where the General Assembly recently passed a joint resolution asking Congress to repeal the vote-at-18 statute. A resolution to the same effect is pending in the legislature of Maryland. The Committee invites the legislatures of other 48 states to pass similar resolutions.

A copy of the Committee's letter to all the State legislators follows.

**COMMITTEE FOR
CONSTITUTIONAL INTEGRITY,
Bethesda, Md., March 1, 1971.**

DEAR MR. STATE LEGISLATOR: The Committee for Constitutional Integrity is a non-partisan group that has been formed to implement the deep concern felt by all responsible and informed Americans for the defense of the U.S. Constitution and for the protection of constitutional processes of

government in the States as well as in the Nation.

The Committee wishes to address to you, and to each of the more than 7,000 members of the State legislatures in all 50 States, this urgent report concerning the grave crisis that has arisen in our country as a result of the 18-year vote action taken by Congress last year. This report will, we are confident, demonstrate to you the imperative need for strong affirmative action by the State legislatures, acting in their high sovereign capacity as the natural protectors of the people, to preserve intact the integrity of our Constitution and to safeguard our freedoms against the usurpation which now threatens them. We entreat you to read—indeed study carefully—this report in view of the gravity of the crisis.

We hold it to be the duty of all citizens, and particularly of legislators sworn to defend the Federal Constitution and the constitutions of their respective States.

(1) to insist upon the repeal of the Congressional statute (Section 302 of the Voting Rights Act Amendments of 1970) in order to prevent that statute from becoming a precedent, justifying acts of usurpation in the future, and

(2) to urge their respective State legislatures to defer any action on any proposed constitutional amendment dealing with the 18-year vote until that constitutionally offensive statute is repealed, so that the legislators will be able to deal with the proposed amendment as free and deliberative men and not as men stampeded into action by the mess created by the Congressional usurpatory legislation.

To begin with, we emphasize that our group is taking no stand on whether 18-year-olds should or should not have the right to vote. Our interest is solely that the decision should be made in accordance with constitutional processes.

The Congress of the United States is rushing through a proposed amendment to the U.S. Constitution which it will shortly submit for ratification by the state legislatures, granting the vote at 18 both in State and Federal elections. The leaders of the drive for this amendment hold that an emergency has been created by the action of the Supreme Court in validating (by a 5 to 4 vote) the statute passed last year granting the vote at 18 in Federal elections, but invalidating that section of the law which granted the vote at 18 in State elections. They hold that dual voting lists and the difficulty of distinguishing in many situations what is a State and what is a Federal election (e.g., voting for delegates to a State convention that will nominate party candidates for both State and Federal offices) will create endless confusion, legal snarls, and a heavy financial burden for the State election boards which administer all our elections, Federal as well as State. They have therefore started a panic campaign to get you and your fellow state legislators to ratify this proposed amendment in a sight unseen manner so that a mess in 1972 will be avoided.

We hold that the leaders behind the amendment drive not only do not come to you with clean hands but are asking you to participate in a rape of constitutional processes. The facts are that these same leaders last year chose to circumvent the U.S. Constitution and got the Congress, by a usurpation of authority, to enact the 18-year vote (in both Federal and State elections) by simple statute. The plain words of the Constitution leave to the individual States the power to set voting qualifications not only in their own elections but in Federal elections as well. The State-set qualifications can, of course, be overridden by duly ratified amendments to the U.S. Constitution, and this has been done several times in our history. But at no time, until

the episode of last year, did any responsible constitutional authority venture to suggest that Congress override the constitutional provision for State-set age qualifications by simple statute.

In the debates on last year's statute, the leaders in Congress made it clear that they had no hope of bringing about an 18-year vote by the process of proposing a constitutional amendment and getting it ratified by three quarters of the States. They resorted to the technique of usurpation—granting to 18-year-olds what was not in the power of Congress to grant—in defiance of the advice given by George Washington in his Farewell Address never to be tempted to accomplish even a good purpose by violating the Constitution.¹ They hoped that the Supreme Court (which in recent years has exhibited a great tendency to validate Congressional actions with which individual justices were in political sympathy) would validate the 18-year voting provisions.

The hopes of the Congressional leaders were almost fulfilled—but not quite. By a vote of 5 to 4, the Supreme Court upheld the vote at 18 in Federal elections but by another vote of 5 to 4 (with Justice Black supplying the swing vote) the Court held the statute unconstitutional as applying to State elections. It is highly significant that Justice Stewart (with the concurrence of the Chief Justice and Justice Blackmun) noted that the opinions supporting the 18-year vote "contain many pages devoted to a demonstration of how beneficent are the goals of this legislation," and that "a casual reader might get the impression that we are being asked . . . whether or not we think allowing people 18 years old to vote is a good idea."

In short, Justice Stewart plainly hinted that the pro-vote-at-18 justices had acted to validate their political predilections rather than to disinterestedly consult the Constitution as to whether Congress had authority to enact the vote at 18.

When the proposed constitutional amendment is before your legislature, you, the legislators, will be in effect serving as a jury to determine whether the amendment should be adopted or rejected. Now just as a jury cannot function properly in an atmosphere of panic and political pressure from the outside, so we believe that you the legislators cannot exercise your judgment wisely and properly in the atmosphere of panic and pressure which has been created by the ill-conceived Congressional statute and its half validation and half invalidation by the Supreme Court.

The enactment of a constitutional amendment providing for an 18-year vote is no simple matter that can be decided at a moment's glance. It involves complex questions affecting the political life of the Nation. By way of illustration, we call your attention to an article in the New York Times of February 6, which cites the concern in many quarters that an 18-year vote may enable students in university towns to take over the town governments and in the manner of carpetbaggers raise local taxes irresponsibly and unconscionably. In many university towns students (over 21) are now allowed to vote regardless of their lack of permanent residence; in other places the

¹"If, in the opinion of the people, the distribution or modification of the Constitutional powers be in any particular wrong, let it be corrected by an Amendment in the way which the Constitution designates. But let there be no change by usurpation; for though this, in one instance may be the instrument of good, it is the customary weapon by which free governments are destroyed."

right of students to vote is expected to be granted by the trend of court decisions. With the enormous inflation of the student vote that would be brought about by a lowered voting age, problems that are now minor or negligible could develop serious proportions.

We do not ask you to vote against the 18-year amendment on this ground or on any other ground. We simply say that this problem and other problems that are below the surface of the 18-year vote issue be properly studied and appraised in a calm atmosphere before making a decision pro or con on the question. The people of the State which choose you and others as legislators on their behalf expect you not to vote in haste (for them to repent in leisure) and to consider all aspects of the question.

It seems to us—as it will no doubt seem to you when you consider the matter—that in order to carry out your duty properly and conscientiously on the proposed 18-year amendment, the present atmosphere of panic and pressure will have to be removed. And it can be removed only by an action of Congress repealing the 18-year vote statute and thus restoring the normal atmosphere which existed before the passage of the ill-fated legislation.

In the interest of all citizens of this great Nation—and in your interest as conscientious legislators fulfilling your responsibilities to the people who elected you—we appeal to you to have your legislatures join forces with Virginia, whose General Assembly has passed a joint resolution memorializing Congress to repeal the 18-year voting statute. The resolution should make it clear that your State will take no action on any amendment proposed by Congress until the constitutionality offensive statute is repealed.

We trust that you will give this communication the earnest attention which is demanded by the gravity of the questions we have discussed.

Respectfully,

FRANCIS G. WILSON,

Chairman.

FRANZ O. WILLENBUCHER,

Vice Chairman.

BENJAMIN GINZBURG,

Secretary.

(Note concerning the signers of this communication. FRANCIS G. WILSON, Ph.D. (Stanford), is Emeritus Professor of Political Science, University of Illinois, and is the author of several books and numerous articles on political science, including *The American Political Mind* (McGraw-Hill). FRANZ O. WILLENBUCHER, Captain USN (Ret.) is an Attorney at Law, whose doctorate in jurisprudence from Georgetown University was awarded largely on the basis of studies in constitutional interpretation. BENJAMIN GINZBURG, Ph.D. (Harvard), is a former Research Director of the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights of the Judiciary Committee on the U.S. Senate, and author of *Rededication to Freedom* (Simon & Schuster).

A CONDENSED COPY OF VIRGINIA HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 66

Memorializing the Virginia members of the Congress to initiate and support the enactment of legislation to repeal Section 302, of the Voting Rights Act Amendments of 1970 (Public Law 91-285, 84 Stat. 314).

Offered February 11, 1971.

Patrons—Messrs. Phillips (and 36 other patrons).

Referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Whereas, the Congress by the enactment of Section 302 of the Voting Rights Act Amendments of 1970 (Public Law 91-285, 84 Stat. 314), attempted through legislation, to usurp power not delegated to the Congress

by the Constitution but reserved by the Constitution to the States in Article I, Section 2, Article II, Section 1, and by the Tenth and Seventeenth Amendments thereof; and

Whereas, on December twenty-one, nineteen hundred seventy, the Supreme Court in *Oregon v. Mitchell*, rendered what purported to be a 5-4 decision in which it held the Congress to be without power to fix voting age qualifications for persons to vote in State and local elections, but on irrational and unsupported grounds held the Congress possessed of power to establish such qualifications for persons to vote in national elections; and

Whereas the said usurpatory statutory provision can remain effective only until repealed and the Supreme Court's decision valid only until overridden; and

Whereas, as George Washington in his farewell address, as President of the United States declared, "If, in the opinion of the people, the distribution or modification of the Constitutional powers be in any particular wrong, let it be corrected by an Amendment in the way which the Constitution designates. But let there be no change by usurpation; for though this, in one instance may be the instrument of good, it is the customary weapon by which free governments are destroyed"; now, therefore, be it

Resolved, by the House of Delegates, the Senate concurring, That the members of the Congress of the United States from Virginia are hereby memorialized to initiate, and support the enactment of legislation to repeal Section 302 of the Voting Rights Act Amendments of 1970 (Public Law 91-285, 84 Stat. 314).

(Condensed to eliminate certain references to the enactment of a proposed constitutional amendment by Congress now no longer pertinent.)

EX-TEXTILE EMPLOYEES TO GET GOVERNMENT ASSISTANCE

HON. WILMER MIZELL

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 1971

Mr. MIZELL. Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to call my colleagues' attention to a newspaper account related to the recent ruling by the U.S. Tariff Commission that former employees of the Arista Mills Co. in Winston-Salem are eligible to apply for Government assistance provided to workers who lose their jobs because of the U.S. Government's trade agreements with foreign countries.

The story, written by Mr. Bill Connelly, the very able Washington bureau chief of the Winston-Salem Journal, points to a possibility I raised in this Chamber earlier this week. The story was published on March 19, 1971.

I call particular attention to the last paragraph of Mr. Connelly's story which reads:

The Tariff Commission's ruling in the Arista case could pave the way for similar decisions regarding textile companies that contend they were put out of business—or seriously damaged—by import competition.

I urge my colleagues to seriously consider my proposal for textile quota legislation as they read this newspaper account.

I insert text of Mr. Connelly's article into the RECORD:

EX-ARISTA EMPLOYEES TO GET AID—U.S. CONCEDES IMPORTS HURT

(By Bill Connelly)

WASHINGTON.—The U.S. Tariff Commission ruled yesterday that former employes of Arista Mills Co. in Winston-Salem are eligible for government assistance provided to workers who lose jobs because of U.S. foreign trade agreements.

The Labor Department now must decide what type of assistance will be provided and which former Arista workers are entitled to benefits. Arista closed about a year ago, eliminating some 350 jobs.

Rep. Willmer Mizell of the 5th District was informed of the Tariff Commission decision, the first in which a textile firm's employes have been granted aid under the Trade Expansion Act of 1962.

Mizell said the decision indicates official government recognition that textile imports from Asian countries are "directly responsible for the loss of textile jobs in the United States."

U.S. RULING

In another ruling last November, the Tariff Commission held that the owners of Arista Mills were eligible for government aid under the 1962 law. In January, three former Arista workers filed a petition to gain the same right for employes.

The commission ruled yesterday, in effect, that concessions granted in U.S. trade agreements led to an influx of directly competitive textile imports that was largely responsible for putting Arista employes out of work.

Arista Mills produced cotton and man-made fabrics used for work shirts and sports shirts. The Tariff Commission said the company had a monthly average of 350 employes during 1969, its last full year of operation.

THREE FORMS

Under the Trade Expansion Act of 1962, government assistance for the employes can take three forms: (1) job retraining; (2) relocation; (3) a cash supplement to the worker's unemployment benefits.

It will be up to the Labor Department to determine which benefits are available to specific employes. A department spokesman told Mizell's office that an investigation would begin in two to three weeks.

According to the Labor Department, an employe must have worked at Arista for 26 weeks during the year before the plant closed and must have earned at least \$15 a week to be eligible now for government aid. Other eligibility rules will be spelled out after the department's inquiry.

The Tariff Commission's ruling in the Arista case could pave the way for similar decisions regarding textile companies that contend they were put out of business—or seriously damaged—by import competition.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Monday, March 22, 1971

The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Ye shall proclaim liberty throughout all the land unto all the inhabitants thereof.—Leviticus 25: 10.

"Lord shelter the prisoners of war in Southeast Asia. Open the hearts and minds of their captors that they may be restored to their homes and loved ones. Each has carried the burden of battle. Each has discharged an obligation to his country. Each has been subjected to hazard, pain, and imprisonment beyond the lot of the soldier.

"O Lord, these gallant men who bear so great a burden must not be forsaken. God of justice to whom we pray, Thy compassion we beseech: Lift their burden, give them strength and strike the shackles that deny them freedom." Amen. An American Legion prayer for our prisoners of war.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Without objection, the Journal stands approved.

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Leonard, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on March 19, 1971, the President approved and signed a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H.J. Res. 16. Joint resolution to authorize the President to designate the period beginning March 21, 1971, as "National Week of Concern for Prisoners of War/Missing in Action."

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed bills of the

following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1117. An act to provide for regulation of public exposure to sonic booms, and for other purposes; and

S. 1181. An act to remove certain limitations on the granting of relief to owners of lost or stolen bearer securities of the United States, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Vice President, pursuant to Public Law 86-42, appointed Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. HARTKE, Mr. METCALF, Mr. HOLLINGS, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. JORDAN of Idaho, and Mr. MILLER to attend the Interparliamentary Union Meeting to be held at Caracas, Venezuela, April 8 to 18, 1971.

The message also announced that the Vice President, pursuant to Public Law 80-816, appointed Mr. HOLLINGS, Mr. CHILES, Mr. BOGGS, and Mr. SAXBE as members of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Naval Academy.

The message also announced that the Vice President, pursuant to Public Law 84-372, appointed Mr. MATHIAS and Mr. HATFIELD as members of the Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial Commission.

ADDITIONAL LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I wish to serve notice that the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PATMAN) will ask unanimous consent tomorrow to bring the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 55) to provide a temporary extension of certain provisions of law relating to interest rates and cost-of-living stabilization.

PUBLIC LAND LAW REVIEW COMMISSION RECOMMENDATIONS AND THEIR IMPLEMENTATION

(Mr. ASPINALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, we have been waiting a long time—some may say too long—to bring public land policy into the 20th century. But it is not easy to

unravel the complex web that constitutes the chaotic legal jungle of public land laws that grew up since the inception of the Union.

As you know, the Public Land Law Review Commission was established in 1964 and went to work in August of 1965; it completed its work and presented its report to the President and the Congress on June 23, 1970. Thereafter we had an educational period during which the report and its recommendation were debated throughout the country.

It was our purpose to initiate legislation at the beginning of this Congress and start the long road toward revision of the public land laws in a logical manner so that we would avoid pitfalls of the past. In pursuance of that purpose I wrote to the President on January 5, 1971, urging that we embark on a cooperative effort, and asking that he designate an individual to represent the administration in working with us toward our mutual goal of avoiding those past pitfalls and assuring that, as legislation is scheduled, we would have an administration position presented so that we could move forward expeditiously.

At the same time it was my conviction that the Commission recommendation to merge the Forest Service with the Department of the Interior should be the first order of business in the logical consideration of the restructuring of our land management policies, practices, and procedures.

The second piece of legislation that I believed must be considered, and it probably can be accomplished simultaneously with consideration of organizational changes, may be categorized as foundation legislation. It would constitute a statute or a series of statutes setting forth basic policy for the use of the public lands, setting forth the goals and objectives for such use—matters that are unfortunately absent today and that have caused public land management to drift—without any direction from the policy making body: Congress.

It is now over 2 months since I wrote to the President and, although I have