

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

POLLUTION OF OUR CULTURE WITH PORNOGRAPHY MAY BE AS SERIOUS A PROBLEM AS POLLUTION OF OUR WATER; DIRTY MOVIE BUSINESS CALLED MULTI-MILLION-DOLLAR INDUSTRY IN SAN FRANCISCO

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 23, 1971

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, the constant flow of pornography in all of its degrading forms should be cause for increasing concern by officials and citizens alike. Rightfully, we express alarm with frequency with respect to the degradation of the quality of the air and the pollution of our oceans, lakes, and streams. But why are we so patronizing of the pollution of the sight and the minds of ourselves and our fellow citizens—and especially those of our children?

The increase in the availability of unadulterated pornographic smut and obscene materials is an appalling fact. Is our civilization, in the name of freedom, to see and read what some persons believe should be an unlimited range of pornography and obscenity, marching backward under the impact of these freedoms? I believe so, and, Mr. President, there are abundant facts and compelling reasons for believing pornography and obscenity are dragging the former high standards and the progress of our civilization down to level of the polluted streets and gutters.

Mr. President, the San Francisco Examiner of February 5, 1971, contained a most revealing article by Robert Patterson under the headline, "How To Clean Up on Dirty Movies," and the reference was to moneymaking by the dirty movie industry, unfortunately not to cleansing the movies of their filth. And the February 1971 issue of the magazine, *Success Unlimited*, contained a far-ranging and incisive article called "Smut Alley."

Because both articles have the tendency to arouse the desire to improve the bad situations being generated and stimulated by pornography and obscenity at their worst, I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the *RECORD*.

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

HOW TO CLEAN UP ON DIRTY MOVIES

(By Robert Patterson)

The dirty movie business in San Francisco—recently called "the smut capital of the world" in a national magazine—has become a multi-million-dollar industry.

This estimate covers San Francisco alone in respect to theater admissions, releasing charges, and profits from films being made clandestinely in warehouses, lofts, private homes, and blinded store-front "studios."

A reliable, authoritative source places the national take of the new industry at "more than five hundred million dollars as of the fall of 1970." The action and the profit are

escalating at breakneck pace. Another source states that the total grab has already reached 2 billion dollars annually as the market spreads and the film production proliferates.

In San Francisco what was a cheapie, back-alley operation a year-and-a-half ago is now a gilt-edged, buck-producing industry, though still carried out along semi-clandestine, quasi-underworld business patterns.

In San Francisco, according to a private report submitted today to Board of Supervisors President Dianne Feinstein, the gross profit to exhibitors—the retail take—is in excess of \$7 million a year. The poorest of porno houses, according to this report, does \$2000 a week. One deluxe house, on the basis of a head-count, took in \$22,000 in one day.

UNTAXED MONEY

Those close to the industry, incidentally, suggest that the tax collector sees but a portion of his legal percentage of these bonanzas. They assert that casual admission procedures, plus tickets sold collected and re-sold, plus the greediest "skimming" techniques this side of Las Vegas, materially reduce the known take.

"We can't yet say how accurately the gross receipts of the porno houses are reported," City Tax Collector Thad Brown said. "Some claim their bookkeeping is done out of state and we have no realistic way of checking admission procedures. However, we are going through an extensive audit on them at the moment."

GROWTH

There were but seven outlets for fifty pictures in the summer of 1969 and the outlets were modest and the pictures less than completely obnoxious. By the fall of 1970, there were 28 of them. As of Feb. 1, there are 42 and the great majority of these offer cinema fare that makes much of the "adult entertainment" shown in 1969 and 1970 seem like an "Our Gang" comedy.

Until shortly ago the City's libidos were offered titillation via nude art films, love scenes in which the more biological aspects were suggested by undulation and deep breathing rather than by more clinical detail, and pseudo-educational epics that warned against immorality by abundantly demonstrating it.

CORNYPORNY

The latter group usually carried a strait-laced narration via a friendly pseudo-Ph.D. over the shots of sex. The customers didn't seem to mind the narration. All of this was merely corny-porny.

Today's porn is straight out of a textbook on abnormal psychology. Kraft-Ebbing and Freud would have to throw up. And the central theme is bestiality instead of sex.

As one former dirty film-maker phrased it, "anything that makes women look like stupid meat, that degrades them good and hard, makes money. Or anything that hurts them."

So the movies in San Francisco's Tenderloin, Mission, North Beach, along Market Street, and even—now—reaching into better districts if they can, show women being gang-raped, knife-cut, and subjected to sex with horses, dogs, goats and monkeys.

For those already sated on sexual "love" involving women, there are in incidents involving young boys. Reliably predicted by those in the production end of the industry are films in planning to be climaxed by scenes of ritual death; exotic importations from countries and cultures where accomplishing such phenomena involves no problems.

AHEAD OF MARKET

After all, production has to stay ahead of the market. A customer already tired of mere copulation, and getting his heart's content of barnyard love, has to be kept lining up at the box offices of the sordid little theaters.

And so the exhibitors—a strange breed of people who were largely involved in other strange businesses until porn became the name of the game—make money at a rate that makes the gold rush seem like penny ante. And spend it on high-powered lawyers who advise them on how to by-pass upcoming laws in advance ("Forget it," one local barrister is said to have told his clients, in reference to a newly-enacted city ordinance), and on lurid advertising.

ADVERTISING

In 1970, the San Francisco smut houses spent more than half a million dollars advertising. The Examiner last year refused to any longer accept such advertising.

With the advance of the promotional sophistication of the smut theaters, code words and phrases replace enticing details in signaling the kind of product within the theater.

A large sign "Adult" on or under the marquee means hard-core sex. "Super-Adult" or "Adult-Plus" means just what it seems to mean.

"Freak Sex" indicates nothing normal will be shown and "Rock-Bottom" and "Total Involvement" clearly promise things far more exciting than just bare ladies and normal love.

PRODUCTION

In another area of the industry, one that is unrepresented in the aforementioned report on gross revenue, San Francisco is also preeminent; the production of the raw product.

Fourteen full-time production units are presently involved in turning out hardcore porno-features that rate so highly throughout the rest of the nation as to be profitably advertisable as "San Francisco Style Sex Films", or "Direct From Frisco."

Financing, promotion and releasing emanates from elsewhere in the nation, according to police and other authoritatively researched sources but some of the most successful product is put together in the Bay Area, with Los Angeles shaping up as a close second in the sex-race.

100 FOR 8

Coming up with a dirty movie print that can gross over \$100,000 in a relatively short time may involve as little as \$8000, according to an experienced local porno-producer.

Talent is numerous and cheap, much of it being recruited from the horde of runaway and dropout youngsters so available in San Francisco.

The professional know-how for the entire industry has its original roots in San Francisco, many of the porno-pros having been pre-experienced in the smutty publication business that preceded dirty pictures in the Bay Area.

LOCAL CONDITIONS

Other peculiarly local conditions are helpful to the new industry.

For instance, a local expert whose expertise is documented by a criminal court conviction, points out that a great many hardcore sex epics are made weekends with the first-class equipment available in the cinema instruction laboratories of San Francisco's several colleges.

The entrepreneurs of these productions—according to this informant—may additionally forgo expenditures for talent. He claims

that fifty dollars worth of pot and speed and the promise of a sex bash brings in a full and voluntary cast of both sexes for these clandestine "production parties."

[From *Success Unlimited Magazine*,
February 1971]

"SMUT ALLEY"

(By Og Mandino)

Is the pollution of our culture with pornography as serious a problem as the pollution of our water?

In October 1967, Congress established an advisory commission to study the traffic in obscenity and pornography and recommended advisable, appropriate, effective, and constitutional means to deal effectively with such traffic.

President Johnson appointed members to the Commission in January 1968 and funds were appropriated in July of that year. Twenty-seven months later, in October 1970, after an expenditure of more than \$2 million, the Commission on Obscenity and Pornography issued its findings. Three Commissioners dissented, calling the report "a Magna Carta for Pornography", but the majority's conclusions and recommendations can perhaps be condensed in one sentence: The Commission recommends that federal, state, and local legislation prohibiting the sale, exhibition, or distribution of sexual materials to consenting adults should be repealed.

Although it recommended legislative regulations upon the sale of sexual materials to young persons "who do not have the consent of their parents," the Commission pointed out that "even where materials are legally available to them, young adults and older adolescents do not constitute an important portion of the purchases of such materials."

From that position, the Commission went on to make the following judgment:

"In sum, empirical research designed to clarify the question has found no evidence that exposure to explicit sexual materials plays a significant role in the causation of delinquent or criminal behavior among youth or adults."

Manipulated Statistics?

Six months have passed since the issuance of the report, and one of the most serious and provocative questions raised by the Commission is yet to be answered. That question deals with how you, an average American, feel about pornography. The Commission's position is that you don't really care, one way or another, as follows:

"Public opinion in America does not support the imposition of legal prohibitions upon the right of adults to read or see explicit sexual materials. While a minority of Americans favor such prohibitions, a majority of the American people presently are of the view that adults should be legally able to read or see explicit sexual materials if they wish to do so."

The Commission's findings, that only 2% of United States citizens viewed pornography as a serious national problem is in puzzling contradiction to the 1969 Harris Poll (76% want pornographic literature outlawed) and the 1969 Gallup Poll (85% favor stricter laws on pornography). However, Morton A. Hill, one of the Commission's dissenting members, argues that it is not difficult to see how the Commission study came up with such a low percentage of concerned citizens when one hears the question asked in the poll:

"Would you please tell me what you think are the two or three most serious problems facing the country today?"

As the Commission's dissenting members points out, "It's doubtful that even the most concerned citizen would list 'pornography' as among the first two or three most serious problems facing the country when the country is faced with the problems of war,

racial conflict, youth rebellion, law and order disruption, drugs, pollution, etc." Thus, pornography was listed among the top two or three serious problems facing our country in only 2% of the responses. Manipulated statistics . . . or are Harris and Gallup both wrong?

Perhaps the answer lies in another area . . . that the average American citizen, since he has never been confronted with the blatant sale of pornography at his shopping center, has no conception of what it means to have obscene sexual and pornographic materials available in his own home town. Without this first-hand experience and with his ingrained belief that freedom of the press is one of our most important rights, it is not difficult to comprehend the apathy that exists.

With this premise as our starting point, *Success Unlimited* decided to investigate the dissemination of pornography at its own largest base, New York City. Inasmuch as our nation's largest metropolis has become nearly an "open city" for the purveyors of smut, it was not illogical to assume that whatever was occurring there would gradually extend throughout the rest of the country if the recommendations of the Commission were followed regarding the repeal of all obscenity statutes.

Both photographer Bob Genny and I spent two days and nights on this investigation, working separately so that we would attract as little attention as possible. We visited more than fifty smut shops, arcades, peep-shows, live shows and movie houses. Bob photographing as surreptitiously as possible and I made only quick and brief notations on a small note pad as we visited the shops.

If you are ready, let us begin. Let me take you on a guided tour of New York City's "smut alley." Let's look at the materials which the majority of the Commission states "are sought as a source of entertainment and information by substantial numbers of American adults" and which (according to the Commission's majority report) "at times, appear to serve to increase and facilitate constructive communication about sexual matters within marriage."

Forty-second Street conjures up a whimsical and nostalgic melange of images to the non-New Yorker. If one is old enough, memories of a 1933 Warner Brothers musical with Dick Powell and Ruby Keeler flicker out of yesteryear. It was the street of entertainment world giants, the street of first nights, Ziegfeld, George and Ira Gershwin, parades, excitement, music . . . and the mecca for every would-be entertainer from Portland to San Diego. It was America's "dream street."

Now, it has descended so far in character that only one appellation seems to fit its long blocks of pornographic shops, skin flicks, and hash houses . . . "smut alley."

Silent witness to the street's transition from debutante to prostitute is the New York Public Library on the corner of Fifth Avenue and Forty-second Street. Containing nearly five million books, each day the library is visited by more than nine thousand visitors, many of them students researching high school and college projects. Unfortunately, many students engage in another type of "research" only a short distance away. They leave the building through its Forty-second Street exit, turn left and walk one block. Then, they cross the Avenue of the Americas, still on Forty-second Street, and enter "smut alley," perhaps the most concentrated and varied collection of pornographic shops, arcades and sex shows (live and film) this side of Copenhagen or Hamburg.

Let's walk in the first one we come to. Inside the grimy, unswept cubicle, a male clerk sits near the doorway on an elevated chair behind a counter which displays packages of black and white photographs, sealed in plastic. Each set, usually a collection of eight poses, shows a disrobed female model

with camera angles concentrated on her genitals. Also, for sale are 8 millimeter movie films, each carton promoting, through an attached color photograph, the contents of that particular reel usually the sexual manipulations of one or more females or males. Price per reel, \$15.

Above the clerk's head nailed to a post, is a scrawled sign which says, "You must be 21 . . . and prove it." In two days of investigation, I saw no one asked to show any credentials proving their age.

Along one wall of the shop, on racks, magazines were for sale from \$3 to \$5 each. In full color, and with titles like "Big Bust" and "Low Down", these magazines featured full color poses of females of all sizes and colors, again with the accent on genitalia. Another section, for the "male homosexual trade" featured magazines with such titles as "Gay Life" and "Male Liberation." The "cover boys" on these all displayed genitalia, with bored expressions.

Along the other wall were paperbacks, selling in price from \$1.50 to \$3.50, with titles like "Three In The Hay", "Make It Big", "The Lollipop Kid" and "Black Baby."

Many of these books, featuring every form of perversion and sexual deviation, are illustrated, and the story line, if there is one at all, only exists to hold together the sexual acts described on nearly every page. Oral-genital contact occurs far more often than the usual form of intercourse and four-letter words abound . . . except for one, *love*.

At the rear of this dingy palace of pornography are "peepshows." Drop your quarter in one of these, place your eyes close to the dingy glass, and watch three minutes of sexual acrobatics involving either a single performer or as many as can perform on one bed. When the three minutes are up, you drop in another quarter and watch the orgy continue. Each of these machines are capable of earning \$5 per hour . . . and from my observations, many do.

The clerk nods unsmilingly as I leave.

Next door, the fare is different. A sign says, "Live Models Upstairs" and so I climb. I turn right at the top of the stairs, walk past deserted offices, and find myself confronted by an old man behind a desk laden with quarters. I give him a dollar, he drops four quarters in my hand and points silently to the large contraption at his right.

A green cloth curtain surrounds what seems to be a room within a room. Circling around the top are lights and a small sign informs me that I can enter directly under any portion of the curtain flashing a green light. I push the curtain aside and step into blackness.

With my cigarette lighter, I finally locate a receptacle for my quarter, drop it in, and wait. Soon, a panel slowly moves down before me and I am peering down at a small revolving stage on which a tired-looking model is reclining in the nude. After the stage has made several rotations she begins to move, arching her back until her genitals are facing the silent circle of faces staring at her from the many peep holes. Soon, the panel in my booth snapped shut and I was in darkness again, until I dropped in another quarter. I tried to study the faces staring intently down at the "model" from the other peep holes and for the first time, I began to wonder about our sanity.

When I had returned to the sidewalk, I crossed Forty-second Street and stopped before a store front displaying Wurlitzer organs plus a giant size parchment proclaiming the significant events in the history of Wurlitzer since 1856. To its left is an entrance to an arcade and as I walked into the lobby, I could see and hear a young group within the Wurlitzer store apparently rehearsing for a recital. Brahms seemed so out of place in this environment.

At the end of the lobby is an elevator with a sign indicating that a "live show" was being photographed above. I pushed the second floor button, painted red, and stepped off at the second floor to be met by a tall, burly individual telling me that the admission was \$5 and the show was going on. I paid him, pushed aside another dingy curtain, and stopped until I could adjust my vision to the semidarkness.

The room contained wooden benches of the movable variety and although it was exactly 4 o'clock in the afternoon, there were approximately 100 individuals staring intently at the "show." I had to stand at the rear since it was a "full house."

On a stage at the front, surrounded by a thin screening of some sort, a man and woman were performing on a bed, simulating sexual activities in all its varieties accompanied by loud shrieks of feigned pleasure. Standing above them, with a movie camera which looked like a reject from the Smithsonian Institution, a third individual went through the motions of taking movies. He would pause, now and then, give them instructions which I could not hear, the couple would change their positions, and action would begin again. The "cameraman" would then aim his camera as if he were "shooting" and this would continue until the next pause, the next change of position.

I looked around at my fellow spectators. Most were well-dressed and many had briefcases. Two hours from now, I thought, most of them will be having dinner with their wives and children. What's happening to us?

Even New York City air seemed clean when I was back on the street. I crossed "smut alley" and stepped into what looked like a veritable "supermarket for sex." Magazines, films, photographs, books, were displayed by the thousands along with a special section selling sexual gadgets such as vibrators shaped in the form of male organs. At the rear of this emporium was a separate room devoted to "Peepshows" and the heavy beat of rock music was punctuated only by the ring of three cash registers placed strategically in various sections of the store. I picked up a paperback but concentrated my attention on one cash register. As accurately as I could add, more than \$45 was rung up on that one machine in less than twenty minutes. The pornography commission had stated, "Nor is the business (pornography) an especially profitable one; profit levels are, on the average, either normal as compared with other businesses or distinctly below average." I wondered how many cash registers in Macy's rang up nearly fifty dollars in twenty minutes.

In the next pornography shop, I tried something different. I walked in but instead of browsing through the store, I stayed close to the clerk and studied the photographs on the 8 millimeter movie films that were for sale. Finally the clerk asked me if I was looking for something special and I shrugged. He reached under his counter and produced four or five magazines.

"These are real action, right from Denmark," he muttered under his breath.

He began to flip the pages of this special collection which featured oral-genital contact, both fellatio and cunnilingus.

"How much?" I asked.

"Only six dollars each. You can have the five for twenty-five bucks."

I shrugged and he tried another pitch. "How about movies. I've got some great stuff."

"How much?"

"Twenty bucks, black and white, thirty bucks in color."

I tried to show interest and said, "I've got a super-eight projector. Do you have any films for that?"

His face soured and he replied, "No, Mac, just regular eight."

Trying to look disappointed, I left the gentleman and his store. I headed toward Broadway, still on Forty-second Street. Three prostitutes approached me within a few hundred yards, reasoning perhaps that if a man is on "smut alley" he must be a hot prospect.

I crossed Broadway and Seventh Avenue, still on Forty-second Street. Now, the pornographic shops were dispersed between movie houses displaying titles such as "Obscene House," "Anomalies," and even "live all male burlesque!"

I walked as far as Eighth Avenue and turned north on Eighth.

Halfway up the block, in the shadow of the staid New York Times Building, a barker was on the sidewalk shouting his spiel about the live sex show now going on. I went in and this time found a seat. On the stage was a bed on which a young male and female, billed as Bunny and Claude, were amateurishly ad-libbing their way through what became a rape scene. After 10 minutes, I departed and headed north.

Like all other forms of pollution, "smut alley" is now beginning to extend its cancerous growth beyond Forty-second Street. Small stores are being converted to "sixteen-millimeter" houses (hard-core pornography) throughout the Times Square area. These small theaters are found as far north as Forty-ninth and Fiftieth Street near some of the city's finest hotels.

I walked into one of these "theaters" which was advertising daily in New York's most widely read newspaper. During the next hour, I watched, in technicolor, as eight different couples performed the sex act in all its forms and deviations and this was followed by a "feature" movie concerning a young man who rented out sleeping quarters in his apartment to a large parade of women who hurriedly disrobed after being shown their room and engaged in various sex acts with their new landlord as an advance on their rent. This film was followed by a live stripper who stepped on a small stage, disrobed hurriedly and completely, and danced in "gogo" style until the next film began. Price of admission at this particular cinema . . . \$5.00, and the house was full!

As a writer and editor, I believe very strongly that freedom of speech and freedom of the press are rights without which this country cannot survive and I conducted this investigation with what I hope was an impartial and objective point of view. It did not remain that way very long. I would never want my two sons to be exposed to this type of filth on a regular and legal basis anymore than I would want them to be able to buy Pot or Heroin or LSD from a dispensing machine in their school lunchroom. Furthermore, I am convinced that any of our readers who had accompanied me in my two days on "smut alley" would be in complete agreement.

As Hill, Link, and Keating so aptly put it in their dissent to the Pornography Commission's report:

"Children cannot grow in love if they are trained with pornography. Pornography is loveless; it degrades the human being, reduces him to the level of animal."

So what about "freedom of speech and freedom of the press?" President Nixon had the best answer regarding this sincere concern on the part of many when he replied, "As free men are willing to restrain a measure of their freedom to prevent anarchy, so must we draw the line against pornography to protect freedom of expression."

Nearly every big city in our country already has a "smut alley" with its accompanying problems of dope, venereal disease, muggings, and murder. Its siren's song is an inevitable attraction to all our youth but the Commission's majority report states that it won't hurt them.

In rebuttal, the dissenting Commission members say:

"The 'burden of proof' or demonstration of no harm in a situation such as this, is ordinarily considered to be on the shoulders of he who wishes to introduce change or innovation. It might be noted that in areas where health and welfare are at issue, most government agencies take extremely conservative measures in their efforts to protect the public. In the case of monosodium glutamate which was recently removed from all baby food by government order, the evidence against it, in animal studies was quite weak. However, because the remote possibility of harm existed, measures were immediately taken to protect children from consuming it."

No such steps are recommended against pornography! How so?

To those mayors and police chiefs who throw up their hands in helplessness, may we suggest they study the procedures followed by a New York City mayor of another era, Fiorello LaGuardia. Success (as we say as often as possible in this magazine) is achieved by those who try . . . and keep trying.

Smut Alley.

Let's get rid of it now . . . before the pollution spreads to your neighborhood . . . and mine!

EPISCOPAL CHURCH PARTICIPATES IN COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT IN JACKSONVILLE, FLA.

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 23, 1971

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, one of the best examples of Christian-inspired work for community development is taking place in Jacksonville, Fla. The St. John's Cathedral of the Diocese of Florida of the Episcopal Church has been a leader in the Nation in tackling the problems of urban decay, housing for the aged, and needed health services.

Recently it was my pleasure and privilege to participate in the dedication of the new \$2.5 million Cathedral Health and Rehabilitation Center, sponsored by the St. John's Cathedral, along with Dr. Howard A. Rusk, director of the Institute of Rehabilitative Medicine at New York University Medical Center.

This was an inspiring event in one of the series of developments sponsored by the church, involving a revitalization of downtown Jacksonville, a senior citizens home, a health research center, and the new rehabilitation center, all of which have had support from Federal programs. I have been honored to assist in these worthy projects for the benefit of our citizens, and I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD two news articles concerning the most recent projects sponsored by St. John's Cathedral and its brilliant leadership—Rt. Rev. Hamilton West, bishop of the diocese of Florida of the Episcopal Church, the Very Rev. Robert R. Parks, dean of St. John's Cathedral, and Charles Pruitt, the executive for the nonprofit sponsoring corporation, and other members of the church. The following published articles tell the story in part:

[From Florida Times-Union, Mar. 7, 1971]
BENNETT LAUDS LEADERSHIP OF REHABILITATION CENTER

The new \$2.5 million Cathedral Health and Rehabilitation Center is an example of "how one church with brilliant leadership has tackled the gigantic problems of today," according to Rep. Charles Bennett.

Bennett made the address at the dedication ceremonies for the 128-bed facility at 333 E. Ashley St. Sunday.

He said "a portion of human kindness," has gone into the center, which is "the newest community effort by Cathedral Foundation of Jacksonville, a non-profit, charitable corporation sponsored by St. John's Cathedral."

Robert C. Davidge, administrator for the new center, said the facility is needed to provide "restorative, rehabilitative, medical and surgical extended care" for many people. The center opened on March 16, 1970.

Dr. Howard A. Rusk, a well-known researcher in the field of rehabilitative medicine, spoke at the Cathedral services preceding the dedication.

Then, the Rt. Rev. Hamilton West, bishop of the Diocese of Florida of the Episcopal Church, and the Very Rev. Robert R. Parks, dean of St. John's Cathedral, led a procession from the cathedral to the center.

Rusk is the Director of the Institute of Rehabilitative Medicine at New York University Medical Center.

On behalf of the United Nations and other professional organizations, he has studied rehabilitative medicine in 48 nations throughout the world, and he has received numerous professional awards for his work.

"All of what the Cathedral Foundation has done so far, and I have been an active participant in its efforts for federal assistance, has been to help lift our city and its people to greater goals so they can live productive lives," said Bennett. The center was partially financed with a \$768,000 federal grant.

"They are making a better life for our older citizens, they are contributing to a revitalization of downtown Jacksonville and providing for medical research and education," continued Bennett.

"The latter effort, I hope, will stimulate efforts to build a medical school and a Veterans' Administration Hospital in Jacksonville."

Bennett said the foundation's volunteer efforts were ten years ahead of President Nixon's recent request for "a new measure of reliance on voluntary efforts."

[From the New York Times, Mar. 14, 1971]

HOPE FOR STROKE VICTIMS

NEW TECHNIQUES AND TREATMENTS ARE DESCRIBED AT A CONFERENCE IN FLORIDA

(By Howard A. Rusk, M.D.)

A new aura of hope for stroke victims was evidenced earlier this month at the second annual stroke conference held in Jacksonville under the sponsorship of the Florida Regional Medicine Program.

The conference was devoted to a disease that has affected an estimated total of two million patients in the United States. Those attending included specialists in the fields of medicine, neurology, vascular surgery and rehabilitation.

Discussions centered on the evaluation and interpretation of ongoing basic and clinical research. It was generally agreed that the stroke syndrome should not be considered as a final, sudden event, as it has been viewed in the past, but rather as a continuum of disease processes that are distinct, recognizable and separable into three phases.

This modern concept has evolved through multiple research efforts. The idea of total management of strokes has changed greatly during the last five days and hopefully will continue to change as new knowledge accumulates.

IN THREE STAGES

Strokes are caused by either thrombosis (blood clots) or hemorrhage. The first stage is the convert or incubating phase of the disease; the second is the overt phase known as transient ischemic attacks (little strokes), and the third phase is the completed stroke with paralysis.

The treatment of the first stage is dependent on recognition of the fact that, (a) the disease has a long incubation period (as much as 30 to 40 years), and (b) it is merely a manifestation of many underlying factors that finally culminate in stroke. Diabetes mellitus, hypertension, gout (elevated uric acid) and positive family history are primary offenders.

Specific treatment of these medical problems will delay or often prevent the disease from progressing to stage two, which is evidenced by transient dizziness or limb weakness, aphasia (inability to link words to objects), visual disturbances and other neurologic symptoms.

USING ANTICOAGULANTS

Treatment in this phase incorporates all the principles described under the first phase with the addition of the judicious use of anticoagulants.

A number of new and hopeful research projects were also reported. It was pointed out that one of the specific and distressing problems with a stroke patient is communication. Five patients with dysarthria (a speech defect resulting from paralysis of the throat muscles) were reported to have been greatly helped by pharyngeal flap surgical procedures, a new approach to this problem.

One experiment reported was the development of an instrument that decodes Morse Code input. It requires at most three physical movements and very little motor power. In essence, these movements are translated into a record of the patient's message, typed by an electric typewriter actuated by the patient's minimal physical movements—even motions of the eyelids.

RETRAINING PROGRAM

There were a number of extremely interesting new findings in the field of psychological research. For example, 30 to 40 per cent of left hemiplegics have certain problems in their left field of vision. These patients also neglect stimuli on the left side and are accident prone.

To treat this condition, a novel retaining program that is most encouraging was reported. It is a simple apparatus with a speed control moving target mounted over a panel of lights that the patient follows visually.

The visual display is so compelling that the patient is forced to turn his head to track the target or identify the lights. After as few as 12 training sessions the patients were able to read from a newspaper and solve arithmetic problems.

New techniques have also been developed in which the wife of an aphasia patient is taught on the basis of principles of learning theory to improve the talking behavior of her husband. 19 couples have undergone this treatment and the results are encouraging.

The seminar weekend culminated with the dedication of a new Cathedral Health and Rehabilitation Center, a 128-bed health facility for persons needing rehabilitation and restorative services, medical-surgical extended care and long-term care, sponsored by St. John's Cathedral of the Diocese of Florida (Episcopal).

THE IMPENDING CRISIS IN OUR NATIONAL ELECTIONS—ADDRESS BY DR. RICHARD G. SMOLKA

HON. MIKE GRAVEL

OF ALASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 23, 1971

Mr. GRAVEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address by Dr. Richard G. Smolka of the School of Government and Public Administration, the American University, entitled "The Impending Crisis in Our National Elections."

Fair and honest elections are vital to our representative form of government, and the Senate has been rightfully concerned with preserving and enhancing the equity of our national elective processes in its recent deliberations on direct popular election of the President and election campaign reform. Dr. Smolka in his article raises yet another complex of problems which calls into question the basic assumption that all our citizens presently have the right to participate equitably in their own government through the electoral process.

As a direct result of the Voting Rights Act Amendments of 1970 and the Supreme Court decision in Oregon against Mitchell, there are now three classes of American voters. The first class comprises those voters at least 21 years of age who are permitted to vote for everything on the ballot. The second class consists of voters 18 to 21 years of age who are entitled to vote only for national offices. The third class includes people who move between States in the period just prior to elections and who may vote for President and Vice President only.

It is these and attendant problems with the elective process that Dr. Smolka documents and offers solutions in his provocative paper. I commend it to Senators for their consideration as a part of the national dialog on electoral matters.

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

THE IMPENDING CRISIS IN OUR NATIONAL ELECTIONS

(Address by Dr. Richard G. Smolka)

INTRODUCTION

In the wee hours of the morning after Election Day 1968, television commentators speculated on an impending "crisis," because it was not yet apparent that Richard Nixon had achieved a clear majority of the electoral college vote. In a way, it was a crisis. But it was a crisis for which the Constitution had provided a remedy. We may no longer approve the procedure of the electoral college, but we know what it is. And we know if the electoral college fails to produce a winner, the Constitution provides another solution: election of the President by the House of Representatives with each state delegation casting one vote. Again, we may not prefer this provision but it is clearly stated and understandable.

This crisis of 1972 is likely to arise from another type of situation for which the Constitution makes no provision. As a result of

The Voting Rights Act Amendments of 1970 and the Supreme Court decision in *Oregon vs. Mitchell*, there are now three classes of American voters. Members of at least one of these classes—about 10 to 11 million people between the ages of 18 and 21—are not yet certain about the extent of their franchise or where they will be permitted to exercise it.

The cost and administrative implications of this situation will become known on Election Day 1972 should the system fail to identify a winner. We may learn then that our election administration system has broken down.

This is the crisis we face in 1972.

The basic assumption of our system is that all citizens have the right to participate in their own government through the electoral process and that their votes will be counted honestly and accurately. This assumption is not always correct.

To some extent, as long as human beings are fallible, there will be some who are less than completely honest and there will be some who make honest mistakes. It is vital to the health of the democratic order, however, to make the system of elections as foolproof as possible. It is imperative to develop procedure that are easily understood by both the voters and the election officials. It is imperative to secure protection against fraud, without discouraging qualified persons from voting.

Unfortunately, the noble motives of the Congress and the Supreme Court in enlarging the franchise and ensuring the right of every American to vote for President and Vice President have resulted in their imposing a difficult—if not impossible—task upon local election officials. In the words of certain officials, that task will lead to "chaos and confusion" in the next general election.

Let us consider our elections process for a moment. Elections take place one or two days a year at most. They are administered and financed locally. Although many jurisdictions have at least one full-time person employed exclusively to register voters and administer elections, many jurisdictions have no full-time workers at all. Every jurisdiction depends heavily upon numerous temporary election-day employees, most of whom are instructed poorly, if at all, in elections procedures. When elections are relatively simple and procedures repetitive, and when there is no change in the type of ballot or the voting method, the system works. Introduction of new laws, new procedures, new types of voting methods, new classes of voters, a multiplicity of ballots, or other such complication invariably raises difficulties.

V. Lance Tarrance, Jr., the author of *Texas Precinct Votes '68*, identified a total of 2,097 vote misabulations in 1968 for the three statewide Texas elections—approximately the same number as the total misabulations found in the 1966 elections in that state. Several counties reported precinct results containing more votes than there were registered voters.

In 1970, when Detroit, Michigan, tried a new electronic system of voting, the procedures for vote-counting broke down completely. A subsequent report by the National Scientific Corporation for the Michigan State Senate identified wholesale violations of the law. These stemmed not from dishonesty but merely from the failure to establish procedures in conformity with the law and from poor training of officials. Failure to protect the ballots adequately was another deficiency of the process.

Administrative errors in Baltimore during the Democratic Congressional primary of 1970 created a tense situation. Ultimately, a black candidate, Parrin Mitchell, was declared the victor over incumbent Samuel Friedel, but not before confidence in the system was badly shaken.

Other cities which had serious difficulties with recent vote counts include Atlanta, Dallas, Los Angeles, and San Francisco.

In 1972, far greater responsibilities will be placed on local election offices than ever before. If these offices are not fully prepared, we may not be able to determine who had won the Presidential election.

The 1972 election is likely to be by far the most costly and complicated election in our history—the result of Congressional and Judicial action. Congress has required all states to provide absentee registration and voting procedures for persons who move into or out of the state in the period preceding an election. It has also attempted to give those between the ages of 18 and 21 the right to vote in all elections. However, the Supreme Court issued a double-barrelled ruling. It upheld the provisions of the Act that permitted such persons to vote in national elections, but it ruled unconstitutional other provisions permitting 18 to 21 year olds to vote in state elections.

These actions greatly increase the size of the potential electorate. They will result in a substantial increase in absentee voting. The combination of these decisions has led to three classes of voters and the consequent need for at least three separate ballots in all jurisdictions in all but three of our 50 states.

The first class comprises voters 21 years of age and older who are permitted to vote for everything on the ballot.

The second class includes voters 18 to 21 years of age who are permitted to vote only for President, Vice President, Senators, and Representatives.

The third class consists of those people who move between states in the period just prior to elections and who are permitted to vote for President and Vice President only.

These classifications of voters and the resulting ballot requirements complicate the election process tremendously.

THE PROBLEMS INVOLVED

The most pressing problems that will complicate the 1972 elections process are these:

1. Definition of the limits of a national election.
2. Definition of residence, especially for college students.
3. The cost of elections.
4. Possibilities of fraud attributable to absentee registration and voting privileges.
5. Administrative complications.

I should like to discuss each of these five problems separately.

Definition of a national election

One of the first issues that will confront state and party officials—and, shortly thereafter, the courts—is the definition of what constitutes a national election. It is generally assumed that primary elections for President and Members of Congress are a part of the national elections process. In many states, however—Virginia being one example—the selection of some nominees for Congress is not determined by a primary election but by delegates to a district or a state convention. Therefore, will 18- to 21-year-olds be eligible to vote for such delegates? Of even more importance for 1972: are such persons eligible to vote for the delegates to State Conventions when such delegates, among their other duties, also select some delegates to the national nominating conventions? It appears likely that any primary election or political process involving either the President or Congress is subject to legal challenge by persons 18 to 21 who are excluded. This is not to say that the challenging interpretation will be upheld by either State or Federal courts. It does mean that we can expect court tests, delays, and confusion until the issue is resolved.

Definition of residence

At one time, an individual's legal residence was more easily and clearly defined

than it is today. Mobility of the population, dual home ownership, jurisdictional location of occupation, and other factors make residence difficult to determine. In 1970, for example, Sargent Shriver was reported to be a potential candidate for public office in Illinois, Maryland, and New York; and he might have been able to stake a claim to residence in each, if it had come to that.

The largest group affected by residence definition are college students who now have the franchise. These students are not easily classified. They include graduate students, research fellows, married students with families, young people independent of their parents, and students who have no residence other than the college community. The determination of residence for any of these people may be affected by a number of factors: out-of-state tuition provisions, draft board locations, marriage and divorce laws, driver's licenses, and many other laws and regulations, aside from voting considerations. At present, it is unclear whether college students have an option to vote at their permanent home address or in their university community. Some legislators fear that Congressional districts will be dominated by college communities if all students in huge state universities are considered eligible to vote in those districts. Others worry less about Congressional elections than they do about elections for Mayor, City Council, or the State legislature. There are those, too, who feel that there may be efforts to encourage college students to vote in marginal states or districts in order to achieve a maximum impact.

The political effect is debatable. The legal situation unclear.

For example, a student recently told me that he thought he could legally vote in the special District of Columbia Congressional election in 1971 because his residence at The American University would qualify him to do so. Yet, in 1972, he plans to register and vote in New York, which he considers his permanent home. Is he eligible to vote in both elections? Today, there is no clear answer.

COST OF ELECTIONS

There is no doubt that the cost of elections will skyrocket in 1972. A growing population, eligibility of 18-year-old voters (resulting in dual age requirements), the expected increase in absentee voting, and the consequent requirement of three forms of ballots will add to the total expense.

Even if there had been no 18-year-old voting provision, costs would have increased. Many more voting machines, at \$2,000 each, would have been required merely to keep pace with population growth—the potential 10 million additional voters too young to exercise the franchise in 1968.

Another nine to 10 million potential voters have become eligible by the reduction in voting age. Even greater costs are incurred with this group. Senator Birch Bayh of Indiana, as Chairman of the Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments, conducted a 50-state survey of the costs created by the dual age provision. Identified were such factors as additional machines, separate ballots, separate registration lists and subsequent transfer to permanent lists, separate tallying of the vote and other procedural details. Senator Bayh concluded that the dual age provision alone may add 10 to 12 million dollars to the cost of elections.

An even more costly factor is the absentee ballot. Processing an absentee ballot is both time-consuming and expensive. Most states have a two-step procedure: an application for a ballot and the actual ballot itself. The application form, when returned to the voting district, must be verified to ascertain the eligibility of the voter and to determine the appropriate ballot to be sent. When the ballot is returned, the elections office must

handle two envelopes per voter. The outer envelope, identifying the voter, usually by name, address, and precinct number, must be checked against the application list. The inner envelope, which is unmarked and contains the actual ballot, is then separated for counting at the proper time. Both envelopes must be protected, from the time they are received until some time after the election, to ensure secrecy of the ballot as well as an honest count. The legal procedure usually requires that at least two persons be present at every stage of handling each absentee ballot.

How many people will use this expensive process in 1972? The *President's Commission on Registration and Voting Participation* estimated that about eight million persons were ineligible to vote in the 1960 Presidential election because they did not meet residence requirements. Thus, with more relaxed interpretation of absentee voting requirements, eight million can be considered a conservative estimate of the number of new potential absentee voters for President in 1972, even excluding college students and military personnel, 18 to 21 years old. Many of these can be expected to vote absentee as well. There is also an undetermined number of voters who currently fail to meet certain state requirements for absentee voting other than residence requirements, and this group will now be able to vote absentee for President only.

All in all, there will be about 25 to 30 million potential new voters in 1972. A large proportion of these will apply for an absentee ballot, with the resulting increase in costs of administration in the local communities.

The Federal Act also requires a provision for an absentee registration, if such registration is required by the home district for Presidential elections. This is one more complication with attendant costs.

If we consider the expense of legal services that may be required by local boards of elections to establish their procedures and even to defend these procedures if they are challenged in the courts, the financial burden will be even greater.

Undoubtedly, the additional cost of elections to local governments in 1972 will be in the tens of millions of dollars. And this, at a time when local budgets are being stretched to the breaking point.

Fraud possibilities

I have already pointed out how the new absentee registration and voting procedures will result in a greatly increased absentee vote potential in 1972. This vote must be processed within a very short period of time. Large suburban communities will be affected most by this provision. As many as 10 to 20 thousand absentee votes may be cast in some local jurisdictions in 1972.

Processing each of these ballots requires time. Identity of the voter must be verified, secrecy of the ballot must be maintained, and the ballot itself must be protected physically from alteration between the time it is received and the time it is counted.

Suppose an individual intent on fraud were to rent a room and establish an apparently *bona fide* temporary residence. He might then apply for absentee registration and voting privileges to, say, 100 of the largest elections offices in the United States. It would be physically impossible for any election official to determine whether the applicant had made other applications, nor would he have any reason to suspect it. The fraudulent voter could then disappear from his rented room any time after he had received his last ballot, with little risk of being caught.

Indeed, the integrity of the absentee voting procedure relies almost entirely on the honesty of the electorate and the fact that a single vote for a national office is likely to have minimal impact. It is only one of 75 million or so cast. The smaller the jurisdiction

and the closer the election, however, the greater the effect of a single vote. In a closely contested Congressional primary, for example, the absentee vote may be critical.

The absentee vote procedure itself is the one most susceptible to fraud. It has the deficiencies of being a paper ballot, subject to physical alteration, theft, substitution, or ballot-stuffing. The scope of all these possibilities increase if the number of absentee ballots is large and if the election staff is overworked or undertrained.

The integrity of our present elections system depends, in part, on the two-party system, with each major party providing workers and watchers to verify every step of the process. This is not always a satisfactory process. It does not always work well in primary elections, and minority and third parties frequently feel disadvantaged by the process. In many ways, processing a large number of absentee ballots during a short period of time invites manipulation.

Administrative complications

Confusion in the administration of elections is almost certain to arise as a result of the dual age provision and multiple ballot requirements. Difficulties can be expected in the registration process, as well as in the actual voting process and in the count.

Voters must be separated into three classes as they register. This creates problems in transferring individuals from one list to another as they become 21 years of age because most lists do not identify registrants by birthdate. Persons registering to vote for *President only* may or may not be considered permanent registrants for subsequent elections. If they are considered to be registered and eligible for later elections, then they too must be transferred to a permanent registration list after the Presidential election. Because State procedures do not take such transfers into account, they become most difficult to handle within the existing systems. In areas where registration is not required, the exact age, as well as the identity, of each voter must be determined at the polls.

A number of questions arise regarding the 18-year-old voter, who is eligible to vote only in "national" elections. Does he vote on the same machine as the 21-year-old, and if so, is adequate provision made to ensure that the State portion of the ballot is locked out? In primary elections, such a voter is permitted to vote only for the national candidates of the party in which he is registered, an additional complication. Most voting machines can handle this requirement but some older machines may not be able to do so. In this case, does the 18-year-old vote on a paper ballot at the polls while others voters use machines? Is there a special machine for 18- to 21-year-old voters only? Does he vote absentee only? Is a separate polling place established for such voters in order to keep the ballots separate? All these possibilities and more have been suggested by election officials but one thing is certain: Whatever procedure is adopted, it must be well-understood and publicized or people will be in the wrong place or get the wrong ballot. Further, any procedure that makes casting a vote more difficult for an 18-year-old than for anyone else will be subject to legal challenge.

The number of ballots and classes of voters will be confusing enough to inexperienced election day workers, without the additional difficulties imposed by attempting to tally several different categories of ballots.

At what point in the process will the totals of the under-21 votes be combined with the rest? Are procedures that are adequate to handle a few absentee ballots capable of handling the expected increase? For example, some states require that absentee ballots be sent to the precincts from which they were cast and recorded on the machines in that

precinct by election officials. The Texas election code even requires this to be done between 2:00 p.m. and 3:00 p.m. Such procedures make verification difficult and recount of disputed ballots next to impossible.

The vote count will be slower in 1972 than ever before because in many areas there will be separate tallies of each class of voter—additional subcounts which must be checked and rechecked. Further, some states will not count the absentee ballots until the day after election or even later. Maryland begins its absentee count the day following the election, and it expects to have 40,000 absentee ballots cast in 1972.

Some states are beginning to experiment with combinations of automatic voter machines in the precincts and an electronic system for absentee ballots with tabulation by computer. Unless the procedures are clearly determined in advance for every step of the process, it may be almost impossible to recheck the results of computer tabulation.

Simply stated: 1972 imposes extremely complex procedures on inexperienced people—those working at the polls, those at work in the county courthouses, and those in city halls.

Unfortunately, every single local jurisdiction in the country must anticipate and prepare for all these contingencies on its own. There is no agency in most states to guide or help them. And each jurisdiction must pay for whatever it does. The electorate will ultimately pay in one way or another, both for what is done and for what is not done.

POSSIBLE SOLUTIONS

Now, what can be done about this plethora of problems? There are a number of possibilities and it is these I would like to bring to you now.

Pass a constitutional amendment

The most obvious problem, that of maintaining dual lists and separate ballots for 18- to 21-year-olds, lends itself to the simple solution of a Constitutional Amendment. If Congress had passed Title III, reducing the voting age to 18 in Federal, State, and Local Elections, as a Constitutional Amendment in the first place, this confusion would have been avoided.

In theory, such a Constitutional Amendment could still be enacted before the 1972 elections, but it would be most unusual if it were made effective in time for the primaries that begin early in the year. Therefore, although, it does not appear likely to affect the 1972 elections, such an amendment should be passed as soon as possible.

Although each state has the opportunity to amend its own constitution to lower the voting age, here, too, very few would be able to do so before 1972. The vast majority of states require that amendments to the State Constitution be approved by the voter at the next general election.

CLARIFY THE DEFINITION OF RESIDENCE

State legislatures must enact reasonable and simple definitions of residence for voting purposes. Such definitions must be applicable to all persons and not directed specifically at one class, such as college students. There is no reason to treat a college student differently from any other person for purposes of voting. Whether or not a person is in attendance at a college or university should have no bearing whatever on his right to vote. Thus, a reasonable definition susceptible to a simple test is all that should be required. Presentation of such documentation of residence as a driver's license, automobile registration, personal property tax receipts, income tax receipts, or alternate evidence of intent to maintain or establish residence should be accepted without question. It should be noted that voter registration is a public matter and that everyone who registers is subject to the responsibility

ties, including tax, of the residents of the jurisdiction in which he registers.

In this mobile society, there are many people who by virtue of their occupations, life styles, ownership of property, or other criteria have an option in determining their residence for voting purposes. College students should be treated in the same manner as all other voters, neither feared nor favored.

PROFESSIONALIZE ELECTIONS ADMINISTRATION

Other problems I have discussed can be resolved only by obtaining necessary financing and personnel capable of administering elections honestly and efficiently. What is needed more than anything else is a measure of professionalization in election administration. In too many parts of this country, elections offices are administered by political hacks, overworked and undertrained staffs, with insufficient attention given to details, either by local governments or state legislatures. Archaic procedures are maintained simply because nobody knows enough, or cares enough, to change them for the better. Even when new laws are written, they are often ignored by local administrators, either because the new laws are not called to their attention or, in some cases, merely because they happen not to agree with them.

Joseph Harris has observed: "There is probably no other phase of public administration in the United States which is so badly managed as the conduct of elections. Every investigation or election contest brings to light glaring irregularities, errors, misconduct on the part of precinct officials, disregard of election laws and instructions, slipshod practices and downright frauds . . ."

Harris made that statement in 1934. The situation is little better today—37 years later!

Yet with professionalization, it is possible to reduce costs and to increase ballot security. Money is being wasted and the job is not done well!

For example, the State of Maryland passed a law permitting new residents to vote for President in 1968, even though they did not meet the minimum residence requirements for voting in State elections. In Montgomery County, over 5,000 such new residents voted for President, but four other counties in Maryland made no provisions for voting and new residents there were denied the right to vote.

Examples are numerous of state laws being interpreted differently from county to county because local officials simply are not adequately trained, do not receive adequate instruction from the state, or simply prefer to do things the way they have always done them.

Few local officials know how elections are administered elsewhere in the state, let alone in other states. The cost of elections is high, in part, because information about efficient methods is not disseminated.

There is no reason why the states cannot find a simple and common method of handling the absentee vote for President. The problem is identical in all 50 states because the provision of the Voting Rights Act applies to all. However, no systematic attempt to find a simple solution for this task has been forthcoming.

AU'S PROPOSED SOLUTION

The School of Government and Public Administration of The American University is now undertaking to assist in this effort. The last full-scale study of election practices in the United States was in 1934. The American University is now seeking to mount a new study, to identify the common problems, and to determine the most efficient and inexpensive methods of dealing with them.

At the present time, training of election officials, if it is done at all, is carried on primarily by the manufacturers of voting machines. This summer, The American Univer-

sity expects to launch a pilot institute for local officials, members of boards of elections, and State legislators interested in election laws, that will acquaint them with a variety of efficient and economical practices and procedures.

CONCLUSION

It is clear, then, that this nation, with its long tradition of democratic practice, cannot afford primitive, haphazard, or dishonest election administration. In an honest attempt to make certain that a larger number of our citizens, who are qualified to vote, have the right to vote, we have become entangled in a morass of inadequate procedures and confusion.

Each and every voter must be assured that his vote is counted efficiently and honestly. Without this assurance, he can have no faith in the electoral system. And without faith in elections, there can be no faith in democracy. . . .

MORE ANSWERS ON CBS PROGRAM—"THE SELLING OF THE PENTAGON"

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 23, 1971

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, Daniel Z. Henkin, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Public Affairs, has provided me with answers to a number of additional questions I have asked about the recent CBS program "The Selling of the Pentagon."

This material will supplement that which I placed in the RECORD on March 8:

Question 1: Has any CBS official, in his corporate position or as a private citizen, requested the participation of any military unit at any event during the past five years?

Answer: Yes. For example, Mr. Roger Mudd, in 1969, in his capacity as Chairman, Dinner Committee, Radio & Television Correspondents' Association, requested Armed Forces patriotic musical support for the Association's 25th Annual Dinner on Wednesday, March 12, 1969. The request was approved, and the U.S. Marine Band participated.

Traditionally, media associations have requested and have received the same support granted to other national organizations and groups.

Question 2: CBS says the Department of Defense is spending "ten times what it spent to tell people about itself just 12 years ago." Is this comparison accurate?

Answer: CBS probably justifies the statement by comparing the \$2.8 million estimate of public information costs in Fiscal Year 1959, with the \$30.4 million limitation on public affairs costs in Fiscal Year 1971. The comparison is not valid. The \$30 million figure includes the costs of all community relations activities at all levels of military structure, a substantial figure when one considers that significant share of public contact falls into this category, particularly at base and post level. The \$2.8 million figure specifically exempted community relations activities as well as other costs associated with activities not unique to public information, but common to all staff sections, such as administrative costs, policy, planning, and programming costs.

It should also be noted that on June 30, 1959 the strength of the Armed Forces was 2.5 million while on June 30, 1970 was 3.0 million. In the same eleven years Department of Defense expenditures increased from \$43.5 billion to \$77.8 billion. In Fiscal Year 1959 our Armed Forces were not engaged in com-

bat operations, while in FY 1971 they are. The result of increases in strength, defense costs and our military role in Southeast Asia is a greater demand for information concerning the personnel, operations, and programs of the Department of Defense—a demand reflected in both personnel and costs required to meet the Department's public affairs responsibilities. Furthermore, the comparison does not acknowledge that a substantial portion of the difference results directly from costs inflated by the overall economy of the nation.

Question 3: CBS says that in preparing its program it "looked only at what is being done for the public in public." Was CBS assisted in gaining access to any activities which are not normally open to the general public?

Answer: CBS asked for and was granted access to activities, information and facilities not normally open to the public; the morning Pentagon press briefings, the Hometown News Center, the Defense Information School, files from military film libraries, and statistics on film use, to name a few. This is not to say CBS was granted access to activities not normally available to the press. The inaccuracy is in the claim that CBS had access to and examined only ". . . what is being done for the public in public."

Question 4: CBS says someone told them a firepower demonstration "cost \$2 million." Did it?

Answer: The "Brass Strike" joint training exercise shown in the film is one of the largest firepower and training exercises conducted annually by the U.S. Armed Forces. It presents one of the few training opportunities in which Air Force crews and Army ground troops can practice joint air-ground operations. If one added up the daily salaries of every man participating, directly, or indirectly, included all of the support costs such as subsistence, equipment and weapon use, and related training items, certainly the cost figure would be impressive.

However, to imply that \$2 million was spent to put on a special firepower demonstration for a selected civilian group is certainly misleading. "Brass Strike" is a regular training operation, costs associated with it are budgeted as a part of normal annual training, and are expended to accomplish training objectives, whether public groups are allowed to observe or not.

Question 5: CBS says some weapons were "turned over to children" after a demonstration. Were they?

Answer: Generally speaking, an audience is not allowed to handle weapons that are used in a firing demonstration. However, at some open houses, demonstrations and Armed Forces Day displays spectators are allowed to inspect and physically handle weapons that are placed on static display. These, of course, are carefully cleaned and cleared of ammunition, and are not "turned over" to anybody. They are controlled by Armed Forces representatives nearby who answer any questions that are asked by the public concerning the weapons.

This entire matter is under review.

Question 6: Towards the end of its program, CBS showed a shot where the camera looked down a gun barrel while a child's head was framed in the other end. Was this shot staged by CBS?

Answer: We do not know.

Question 7: CBS states "It is widely known that the Defense Department often helps sympathetic Hollywood producers who need troop support for their war movies." Under what conditions is such assistance provided and who pays for it?

Answer: The Department of Defense assists in the production of commercial motion pictures only when that assistance is not available from private or commercial sources, when it does not interfere with mission responsibilities, when no additional expense accrues to the government as a consequence

of the assistance, and when the production promises to be of benefit to the military services or the nation. In the event assistance requested cannot be provided without additional cost, and the production otherwise qualifies for military participation, the producer is required to reimburse the government or the military agency for all additional costs involved. (See attachment for details.)

GENERAL INFORMATION: MOTION PICTURE PRODUCTIONS

During the last five years the Department of Defense has authorized assistance to the producers of 43 feature motion pictures. Assistance has varied from token to major; from authorizing the sale of stock footage to the use of facilities, equipment and photographing military personnel.

The basic policy, Department of Defense Instruction 5410.15 (Paragraph V. E.), refers to deviations. However, producers are charged for any cost that would be an additional cost to the Government involved in the use of any facility or equipment.

Much of the assistance we render the motion picture production companies is in the same category as the "news access coverage" extended to news media. We authorize the camera crews to visit military installations to film background scenes on military events as they are happening.

Military personnel, whenever they are filmed doing anything above and beyond their normal activities involved in operations or scheduled training, are on a leave status. Personnel are never ordered to take leave, they do so as they desire and are hired by the producer on a voluntary basis on financial terms worked out between them and the company.

There are no requirements for any company to come to the Department of Defense for assistance or even to submit its project for comment. Informational assistance, such as furnishing technical or historical facts, is given to any producer or writer regardless of the story. Likewise, in keeping with the Freedom of Information Act, stock footage is authorized for sale for research and study purposes regardless of the story content. The use of such stock footage, however, in any commercial motion picture is considered a form of assistance and before the sale of footage is authorized established criteria and policies are followed.

As indicated in Department of Defense Instruction 5410.15, the principles which govern assistance to non-government audio-visual media are based on consideration of the following factors:

A. The production, program, project, or assistance will benefit the DoD or otherwise be in the national interest based on consideration of the following factors:

1. Authenticity of the portrayal of military operations, or historical incidents, persons or places depicting a true interpretation of military life.

2. Compliance with accepted standards of dignity and propriety in the industry.

B. There can be no deviation from established DoD safety standards.

C. Operational readiness of the Armed Forces shall not be impaired.

D. Official activities of military personnel in assisting the production must be within the scope of normal military activities, with exceptions being made only in unusual circumstances.

E. Diversion of equipment, personnel and material resources from normal military locations or military operations may be authorized only when circumstances preclude the filming without it, and such diversions shall be held to a minimum and without interference with military operations, and will be on the basis that the production com-

pany will reimburse the Government for expenses incurred in the diversion.

F. DoD materiel and personnel services will not be employed in such a manner as to compete with commercial and private enterprises. The requestor will furnish a noncompetitive certification.

Question 8. CBS stated that "the Pentagon itself spends over \$12 million a year on its own pictures." Is that correct?

Answer: If CBS intended to suggest the cost of public information films, the answer is categorically, NO. If one includes all films made by all Services for all purposes, including those for training, research and development, religious, medical, troop information, recruiting, public information, etc., then the figure is reasonably accurate. However, only a very few of all the films included in the \$12 million estimate are even cleared for public release. Almost none are made specifically for the public. Thus the implication that large sums of money are expended on films for the public is grossly inaccurate and misleading. The information given CBS on film costs is indicated below:

FISCAL YEAR'S 1969 AND 1970 BUDGETS FOR OSD AND SERVICES FOR ALL FILM PRODUCTIONS

Activity	Fiscal year 1969	Fiscal year 1970
OSD (and defense agencies).....	\$659,839	\$478,799
Army.....	6,548,437	6,672,588
Navy.....	2,500,000	2,500,000
Air Force.....	2,564,110	2,655,810
Marine Corps.....	287,210	375,317

OSD AND SERVICE FISCAL YEAR'S 1969 AND 1970 EXPENDITURES FOR FILM PRODUCTIONS MADE SPECIFICALLY FOR PUBLIC RELEASE (EXCLUDING RECRUITING FILMS)

Activity	Fiscal year 1969	Fiscal year 1970
OSD ¹ (and defense agencies)	(0)	(0)
Army.....	None	None
Navy.....	\$28,671	\$17,298
Air Force.....	None	1,946
Marine Corps.....	5,125	10,046

¹ Current year 1969.
² To December 1.
³ OASD (PA) had \$100,000 budgeted for film productions in both fiscal year 1969 and fiscal year 1970, but none of that amount was utilized either year.

Question 9: CBS states that "at least 356 commercial and educational television stations" presented DOD films "during the 1960's." How do the stations get the film, and who decides that they will be aired?

Answer: Stations using Department of Defense films do so at the station's request, as do civic, fraternal and religious organizations. Local station managers and news directors decide, of course, what will be aired on their stations.

Question 10: CBS showed a film of actor Bob Stack, quoting Stack as saying "speaking of guns and far away places, I have just come back from a trip to Vietnam where guns are used for an entirely different purpose." What was the name of the film from which that opening sentence was clipped, and what was it about?

Answer: The clip is from an Air Force Training Film, "Alone, Unarmed and Unafraid—Tactical Reconnaissance in Southeast Asia." The film was originally made to train tactical reconnaissance pilots. It was subsequently cleared for public release. Mr. Robert Stack's original commentary, clipped and inserted into the CBS show out of context, implies that the subject is about weapons involved in the shooting war in Vietnam. In fact, the film is about reconnaissance

pilots, who fly over North Vietnam . . . unarmed.

The actual narration from the film goes as follows: "Hi, I'm Bob Stack. As you may know, one of my hobbies is collecting guns. I've hunted on and off all my life—from California to Mexico, to safaris in Africa. Speaking of guns and far away places, I've just come back from a trip to Vietnam where guns are used for an entirely different purpose. I wanted to visit our men out there . . . talk to some of them . . . which I did . . . foot soldiers, mostly . . . fighting, and dying, too, for what they believe is right. Just before I left Vietnam, I met some men who are fighting a different kind of war . . . Air Force pilots who fly their aircraft without guns or rockets or bombs of any kind. Yet they encounter more enemy ground fire, more surface-to-air missiles and MIGs, and lose more men and aircraft, per mission, than any other air operation in the entire war. In fact, this aircraft we're looking at here—and its crew—were lost to enemy ground fire that same afternoon."

Question 11: Is the number of the military camera teams in Vietnam being reduced as the U.S. military withdrawal from Vietnam progresses?

Answer: Yes. At peak strength there were five teams. One team was deactivated in November 1970 and a second team was deactivated in January 1971. The three remaining teams will be deactivated in June 1971.

Question 12: Mudd says "protective reaction means the U.S. resumed the bombing of North Vietnam." Has the bombing campaign carried out by the former Administration been resumed?

Answer: No. The bombing campaign carried out prior to November, 1968, has not been resumed.

Protective reaction is a description of those actions which involve the inherent right of self-defense for the unarmed reconnaissance missions undertaken over NVN to insure the safety and security of our troops inside SVN. Anti-aircraft artillery and surface to air missile sites, along with their associated radar and support facilities, firing on unarmed reconnaissance planes or their escorts over NVN, or at U.S. aircraft striking targets in Laos, are subject to protective reaction strikes.

There has been no change in American policy with respect to bombing in NVN. At the time of the cessation of our bombing in NVN in November, 1968, the U.S. Government made it clear in private talks with the North Vietnamese and the Soviets, that our reconnaissance flights over NVN would continue. There is no question but that both the NVN and the Soviets clearly understand our position on these flights. We have also made it clear that we would take whatever measures were necessary to protect our reconnaissance planes and their pilots.

Question 13: Mudd says "defoliation means nothing will grow there any more." Is that right? Why is defoliation used around U.S. firebases? Is the current Administration reducing the defoliation program?

Answer: Defoliation does not mean that "nothing will grow there anymore." When one defoliation application occurs, tree leaves fall off; in a few months the leaves grow back again. Where heavy, repeated applications are used, trees can ultimately be damaged or killed, but new plant growth occurs after a short time.

The current Administration has:

1. Prohibited the use of orange defoliant.
2. Reduced the total defoliation effort in 1970 by more than 70%.
3. Further reduced the total defoliation effort in 1971.
4. Placed restrictions on the use of defoliants to around military bases or in remote areas away from the population.

5. Permitted use of herbicides in Vietnam only in conformance with regulations in effect in the U.S. as determined by the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

6. Stopped the crop destruction program.

7. Announced termination of U.S. use of herbicides for the summer.

The use of herbicides has always been stringently controlled at all levels of government, eventually requiring the concurrence of the U.S. Ambassador, COMUSMACV, and the Vietnamese Joint General Staff. Its purpose was to prevent the enemy from using the heavy foliage to launch attacks and to prevent the loss of American and Allied lives. It has succeeded in doing this.

Question 14: Mudd says that the President ordered curtailment of public information activities but that the Pentagon has not cut anything. What cuts have you made in recent years in response to Congressional action and Presidential directive?

Answer: In Fiscal Year 1970, Congressional reductions associated with public affairs activities totaled approximately \$5 million.

In Fiscal Year 1971, Congressional reductions associated with public affairs activities amounted to more than \$7 million.

An additional reduction for these activities of approximately \$5 million, attributable to the reduction directed by the Office of Management and Budget, is reflected in the estimated costs of public affairs activities in Fiscal Year 1972.

Reductions effected among personnel engaged in public affairs activities in Fiscal Year 1970 are reflected in the difference between the end strength in FY 1969 (5,120) and the end strength in FY 1970 (4,430) a difference of 690 positions. This difference is in large part attributable to Congressional reductions during FY 1970.

The difference between personnel estimates submitted to Congress with the Fiscal Year 1971 budget request and those associated with the Fiscal Year 1972 budget request, reflected a reduction of 1,535 public affairs positions. This reduction results from a combination of Congressional action on the Fiscal Year 1971 budget, plus reductions necessary to meet the requirements of the Office of Management and Budget.

Question 15: Mudd says that "each day the press and the Pentagon have a formal confrontation" with the newsmen's "adversary" Deputy Assistant Secretary Friedhelm. Does the Department of Defense regard these daily news briefings as a "confrontation" and the participants as "adversaries"?

Answer: No. The daily news briefings here are regarded as one important way to provide the American people with maximum information about the Department of Defense, consistent with national security. Acting as the sole DoD agency at the seat of government for the release of official information, OASD(PA) representatives regularly meet with newsmen to furnish them information for the public.

It is necessary that information which is classified, for example, must be protected. No DoD spokesman can discuss in public, nor would any reputable media representative knowingly, publish classified information. In general, the press corps realizes this.

The DoD by no means considers the daily briefings as "confrontations," nor does Mr. Friedhelm regard himself as an "adversary" of the media representatives here.

Question 16: Former Sergeant Demitor discusses what he called a "staged" story about South Vietnamese forces. Who was in charge of the film team? Did the fact sheet sent forward from the film team advising the persons in charge of the film team indicate the film was "staged"?

Answer: First Lieutenant John Beeler was in charge of the film team. The fact sheet received with the footage did not say that the film was "staged".

Question 17: Has CBS or the other major networks made use of the film prepared by the military camera team in Vietnam? How much?

Answer: Based on statistical data provided by the networks and newsfilm syndicates, an average of 90 percent of Vietnam originated newsfilm releases made in 1970 were used. This includes Department of Defense Vietnam-originated releases screened on network news programs, or releases that, though not used on network news programs, are passed on by the networks or syndicates to their affiliates for possible use on local news programs. Our records show that CBS used 24 releases in 1970, either on the network or their affiliates. (ABC 13, UPITN 58, NBC 64, Fox Movietone 17)

Question 18: CBS runs a "no comment" answer from the U.S. military briefer at Saigon. How much of the briefer's session did CBS film? How many questions were asked which were not answered "no comment"? Why would a MACV briefer reply "no comment"?

Answer: The briefing officer sequences filmed by CBS in Saigon took place on 21 November 1970. This briefing followed the announced Son Tay search and rescue operation seeking to free American prisoners of war in North Vietnam. The operation had taken place that week end. The MACV briefer opened the U.S. military portion of the briefing by reading a statement by the Secretary of Defense regarding the protective reaction strikes which took place 20 and 21 November. The statement ended with, "To comment further could jeopardize the safety and security of Americans, therefore, I have nothing to add at this time."

The briefer also stated that he could add nothing further to the Secretary of Defense's statement on the subject. Obviously the MACV briefer could not go beyond what the Secretary of Defense felt was a matter of security of U.S. personnel. Nevertheless, the Saigon press corps continued to press for details of the operation.

Although there is no transcript of this particular briefing, notes taken by this office indicate that at least 12 questions were asked regarding protective reaction. The briefer responded six times that he could add nothing to the statement, as he should have. There was one other "no comment" response given on another subject.

On other subjects, the briefer responded to at least 8 questions with answers or explanations. Yet CBS selectively used the "no comment" type answers as an expression of a "typical" Saigon briefing.

Question 19: The Mudd-Tolbert interview discussed the fact that information officers assist broadcast by networks by selecting "articulate" pilots for on-camera interviews. Has CBS ever asked an information officer to arrange an interview for them with an inarticulate pilot not knowledgeable about his job?

Answer: Not necessarily, except that by insisting on a "name" or a well-known interviewee, which is common practice among the Networks, there is no assurance that the MOST articulate and knowledgeable interviewee is requested.

During the time the CBS program, "Air War in the North" was being filmed, there was difficulty in getting any pilots to discuss their flights over North Vietnam, because of harassment many of their families were going through in the U.S. Some pilots formally requested that they get no personal publicity, because it frequently resulted in vicious phone calls and "hate mail" from anti-war groups in the United States. In the case of "Air War in the North," the information office at DaNang attempted to locate and provide pilots who would volunteer for on-camera interviews, and who fitted general qualifications outlined by the CBS producer.

Question 20: The Mudd-Tolbert interview indicates that pilots are "briefed" before appearing on camera. What sort of briefing would be normal in such circumstances?

Answer: Normally, pilots are cautioned prior to interviews that they should not address such security topics as the air order of battle, rules of engagement, route to a target, combat tactics employed, or planned missions for the future.

Question 21: Who was the narrator of the CBS show Mudd and Tolbert talked about?

Answer: Bill Stout was narrator of the 1967 program "Air War in the North." The program was produced by Phil Sheffler, Ed Fouhy (now with the CBS Washington Bureau) was the Bureau Manager in Saigon at the time.

Question 22: CBS describes part of the film as "a demonstration of a massive troop airlift . . . to show that thousands of troops can be transported thousands of miles in just a few hours." Were thousands of troops actually involved in the demonstration?

Answer: Exercise Brass Strike, an excessive planned and executed for military training and study purposes, did itself involve large numbers of troops. However, any implication that thousands of troops were involved in a demonstration for the JCOC is false. The JCOC tour was scheduled to coincide with Exercise Brass Strike, and guests viewed the exercise during one of the three days it was conducted. The exercise would have occurred whether or not JCOC guests were in attendance. Furthermore, although 72 JCOC visitors viewed the one day's activities, actually curtailed severely because of inclement weather, they were only a segment of the audience in attendance. Other groups present included about 200 members of ROTC units from several universities and high schools, about 165 local civilians, and nearly 450 military personnel from the Strike Command, Military Attache posts, and Tactical Air Command operational and training bases.

40TH JOINT CIVILIAN ORIENTATION CONFERENCE SCHEDULED FOR APRIL 19-28

Seventy-two civilian leaders have accepted the invitation of Secretary of Defense Melvin R. Laird to participate in the 40th Joint Civilian Orientation Conference (JCOC), to be held April 19 through April 28, 1970.

The Joint Civilian Orientation Conference is a response by the Secretary of Defense to the desire and need of the American people to be informed about how their Department of Defense is operated. The Conference makes it possible for key professional men, representing a geographic and occupational cross section of the country, to study the accomplishments and problems of the Department of Defense. JCOC objectives are to make as much information as possible available to Americans.

Daily schedule of the Conference is:

April 19. Conference opens with briefings at the Hotel Del Coronado, Coronado, California.

April 20. Group proceeds to USS *Juneau* to observe amphibious demonstrations, then to USS *Oriskany* to observe attack carrier operations.

April 21. Conferees fly to Vandenberg Air Force Base, California, and tour space and missile facilities.

April 22. Conference proceeds to North American Air Defense Command Headquarters, Colorado Springs, Colorado, for NORAD briefing and tour of Cheyenne Mountain complex.

April 23. Group departs Colorado Springs and travels to Fort Hood, Texas, for Army demonstrations and briefings.

April 24. Conferees observe Army demonstrations, then depart for U.S. Marine Corps Air Station, Cherry Point, North Carolina.

April 25. At Camp Lejeune, North Caro-

lina, group observes Marine Corps demonstrations.

April 26. Group proceeds to Fort Bragg, North Carolina.

April 27. Conferees observe U.S. Strike Command Exercise Brass Strike and then depart for Washington, D.C.

April 28. Conference concludes at the Pentagon with briefings and discussions with senior Department of Defense officials.

All demonstrations and exercises to be observed by the group are a part of the regular training programs of the Military Services. None are specifically staged for the sole benefit of the conferees.

Personal expenses during the tour and transportation to and from the Conference are paid by the conferees.

Joint Civilian Orientation Conferences, started in 1948, are conducted one or more times each year.

Question 23: At one point, in discussing the alleged costs of demonstrations, CBS picks up an unidentified speaker saying, "711 tons of ammunition and 308 tons of fuel." Was the speaker in fact talking about ammunition and fuel involved in the demonstration?

Answer: No, he was not, even though the CBS show leads one to believe this is the case. The unidentified voice was that of a briefing officer explaining the tonnage of fuel and ammunition that a USMC battalion landing team takes with them on deployment.

Question 24: CBS states that "war, however, is not fought in front of a grandstand." Why are reviewing stands sometimes placed near field training areas? Who uses the stands?

Answer: These reviewing stands serve the purpose of outdoor classrooms. They are placed at strategic points throughout the training area. They not only are used by the troops themselves, as briefing and debriefing sites, but are also used by recruits who observe a training exercise before taking part in one. Another important use of these stands is for the training of headquarters command personnel. These ranking officers come as a group from our military service colleges to observe scheduled large training exercises as a part of their overall command education. Also, when a civilian group, such as the one shown in the CBS show is invited to observe a scheduled exercise, they share these stands with groups of the type already mentioned.

Question 25: When was the film, "Red Nightmare," produced and cleared for release to the American public?

Answer: "Red Nightmare" is a half-hour adaptation of a 50-minute film called "Freedom and You," which was produced for military use in 1962 by Warner Brothers under contract with the Directorate for Armed Forces Information and Education, OASD-(M&RA). "Freedom and You" was cleared for public non-profit use by OASD(PA) on October 26, 1962. "Red Nightmare," the adaptation which featured the "Nightmare" sequences, was produced by Warner Brothers in 1965, also for the Directorate for Armed Forces Information and Education, now known as the Office of Information for the Armed Forces, OASD(M&RA). OASD(PA) cleared it for public release in October of the same year.

Question 26: Mudd says the film, "Red Nightmare," was made by the Armed Forces Directorate on Information. Is there an Armed Forces Directorate on Information?

Answer: There is no such agency or office, either charged with public information or internal information. The office that was responsible for the film is now known as The Office of Information for the Armed Forces, IAF, known as the Directorate for Armed Forces Information and Education at the time the film was made. IAF is charged with troop information for the Office of the Secretary of Defense. The incorrect name used

by the CBS Show for the organization implies that the film was produced for public information purposes, which is in error. The firm was designed as a troop information vehicle.

Question 27: Mudd quotes Tolbert as saying "it is extremely difficult for a Pentagon reporter, even a regular, to establish sources outside the Public Affairs arm." How many interviews by newsmen with Pentagon officials outside the "public affairs arm" were arranged by your office during the eleven months that CBS worked on its show?

Answer: During the eleven months that CBS worked on its show the "Public Affairs arm" of the Defense Department arranged more than 1100 interviews between newsmen and other media representatives, and Pentagon officials outside the "public affairs arm." Needless to say, Pentagon newsmen have their own independent sources of information developed through their professional skill.

Question 28: Mudd says there are thousands of phone calls and thousands of pieces of mail at the Pentagon daily "but very little of this communication is done with the press." For what reason is the bulk of this communication accomplished with persons other than the press?

Answer: The primary mission of the Department of Defense is defense—not communicating with the press. Thus the bulk of communication concerns defense matters.

Nevertheless, a substantial amount of communicating is also directed toward accommodating requirements by or for the press.

Question 29: Mudd says, "What the press wants to reveal the Department of Defense often wants to conceal!" What does the Defense Department want to conceal?

Answer: Information that might adversely affect the national security, and information that could endanger lives of Americans.

Question 30: CBS states that the Army Home Town News Center "functions as a publicity agency." To what media is information from the Center provided? Do they want it? Do they use it? If they use it, who decides that it is news worth using?

Answer: This information is provided to media in the local area of the individual's home town. These media want this information. Without the Army Home Town News Center and the other Services' Centers, the people back home would get little or no information about the individual serviceman except what he was able to write them on his own. The news media does use the information. The editors of the media decide if the items are newsworthy and whether or not they will be used.

All material is sent out by AHTNC at the request of media who have asked to be sent such information on a regular basis. It is not sent out unsolicited.

Navy has a similar procedure with hometown releases. There are exceptions for Air Force, who will send material unsolicited only if requested by the individual airman concerned.

Question 31: Mudd says the Pentagon uses "sympathetic Congressmen" making "war heroes available" for the back-home district TV reports from "pro-Pentagon politicians." Under what conditions are military personnel available for interviews by or testimony before Congress?

Answer: Personnel are made available for personal interviews, such as Major Rowe's appearance on Representative Hébert's TV Report, if requested by any member of Congress, so long as the interview is voluntary, it can be accomplished without appreciable interference with the subject's military duties, and without additional cost to the Government. As for testimony, a Congressional committee may at any time ask DoD to provide a witness to address a specific subject area.

Question 32: CBS stated that "Pentagon speakers . . . traverse the country, shaping the views of their audiences." Under what conditions do the Department of Defense speakers appear in public? Are they ever requested to appear before newsmedia organizations?

Answer: Department of Defense speakers appear in public as the result of a direct invitation from a sponsoring organization. Such sponsors usually request a specific speaker to cover a specific topic.

As to the second part of your question, the answer is, yes. We receive and honor many such requests to have speakers appear before newsmedia organizations. (Examples: American Newspaper Publishers Association, Midwest Circulation Managers Association, top officials of Associated Press, etc.).

Furthermore, when a distinguished Department of Defense speaker is scheduled for an appearance in a community, it is common practice for the local press—newspapers, television, radio—to ask for and frequently receive special news conferences.

Question 33: CBS used a quotation from a speech by General Lewis Walt. Did General Walt turn down any requests that he speak during the last year?

Answer: General Walt, now retired, turned down 21 requests that he speak during the last year.

Question 34: In discussing the Joint Civilian Orientation Conference, CBS says "the Department of Defense outfits" the participants "in different colors." Who pays for the jackets and caps worn on the tours?

Answer: These jackets and caps are paid for by the participants, as are all their other personal expenses.

Question 35: CBS says "high ranking generals accompanied these civilians." Do any generals travel with the group?

Answer: There were no "high ranking generals" traveling with these civilians. Upon arrival at a military installation, the Commander, be he General or Colonel, would meet such a group, welcome its members and, at his discretion, perhaps accompany them during various phases of their visit at his installation. One case shown in the film, was a scheduled joint training exercise ("Brass Strike") and the group was met by the Commander-in-Chief of the Strike Command and his Deputy who were there because of the joint exercise, not just to greet the civilian group.

Question 36: Mudd states "the Pentagon helped John Wayne make the film 'Green Berets.' John Wayne helped the Pentagon make this film in Vietnam." Is this presentation of cause and effect accurate? Did John Wayne Studios pay the Department of Defense any of the costs of "The Green Berets?"

Answer: No. The two films were completely unrelated, and one had absolutely no bearing on the decision to do the other.

"A Nation Builds Under Fire," designated AFIF 160 and later TV 695, was produced by the Office of Information for the Armed Forces, OASD (M&RA), and originally distributed in 1966. Mr. Wayne's participation in that film was actually a last-minute substitution after another actor became ill and could not narrate the film as planned. To find a replacement, IAF ask Armed Forces Professional Entertainment office for names of other stars scheduled for troop tours in RVN within the time frame of IAF's shooting scheduled. Learning that Mr. Wayne was scheduled to be there, IAF asked him to do the part.

When Mr. Wayne's request for assistance in the proposed production of "Green Berets" came to OASD(PA) in 1966, it was given the same consideration as all other such requests. It qualified for assistance under the provisions of DoD Instructions 5410.15 and 5410.16, which govern assistance for non-government motion picture productions. Actual DoD assistance in "Berets" began in mid-1967 when

photography began at Eglin AFB and Fort Benning. Wayne Productions paid \$18,623.64 for DoD reimbursable assistance associated with "Berets."

Question 37: Mudd says, "Not only movie stars have aided Pentagon propaganda. For patriotic reasons, newsmen have often volunteered their talents. . . ." Why does Mr. Mudd apply the adjective "patriotic" to the newsmen but not to the movie stars?

Answer: We do not know.

COAL RESEARCH EXECUTIVE QUESTIONS WHETHER OR NOT FEDERAL GOVERNMENT IS GUILTY OF "TECHNOLOGICAL FOLLY"

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 23, 1971

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, in an address to the Washington Coal Club last week, James R. Garvey, president of Bituminous Coal Research, Inc., questioned whether or not the Federal Government is guilty of "technological folly." The main question, he declared, is whether or not the Federal Government is spending billions of dollars on kinds of research that should have a low priority.

From the evidence available, Mr. Garvey asserted, it is apparent that past Government energy research policies have been nonproductive and, to a great extent, have been self-defeating. He emphasized:

The fact that, in a country blessed with abundant fuel resources, we are experiencing power blackouts and brownouts, gas companies turning away potential customers, and with some government officials advocating reductions in energy consumption, the illustrations are sufficient. Factors other than government research policies, of course, have been involved too. But we have spent billions of dollars to get a few rocks off the moon and more billions to develop an atomic pot heater, while practically ignoring the nation's need for fossil fuel research—and this is technological folly with the taxpayers' money.

Mr. Garvey, who is executive vice president of the National Coal Association in addition to being president of Bituminous Coal Research, Inc., said Federal research funds should be spent in a manner compatible with the Nation's energy needs and not influenced by the dramatic appeal of what may appear to be revolutionary technology.

He said he did not mean to imply that atomic research should not have been pursued nor that it should be continued. But in the light of total energy needs, he stressed the opinion that the past and current overemphasis on atomic research is regrettable. Mr. Garvey added:

It is apparent now that the most critical fuel need concerns the growing demand for and available resources of natural gas. A realistic government research policy would treat this problem by accelerating the effort already underway to perfect the technology for conversion of our most abundant hydrocarbon, coal, to a synthetic pipe-line gas.

The second most critical area of current and future fuel use is in minimizing its environmental effects, the speaker noted and said that because coal is, and

for some time will continue to be, the principal fuel used in power generation, major emphasis should be placed on the many research opportunities available to permit the use of coal with minimum insult to the environment.

Several research approaches to convert coal to a synthetic residual oil or to clean solid form have been languishing for several years for lack of funding, he asserted in urging research in all areas because of the current "crisis" situation.

Government research expenditures on atomic energy have been about 16 times those on other energy sources over the past decade, which Mr. Garvey described as a deterrent to proper energy supply planning. The electric utilities, under Government pressure, began ordering atomic instead of coal power plants, causing coal producers to defer new mine openings. The predictable result was the present shortage of coal availability and the marginal power producing capability, he said. And this Senator agrees. Also, I join him in the assertion that the need for corrective action now is apparent. The evidence already available is sufficient to justify an immediate increase in Federal research dollars for fossil fuel research.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of Mr. Garvey's March 17, 1971, address be printed in the RECORD.

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

A REALISTIC FEDERAL GOVERNMENT POLICY ON ENERGY RESEARCH

(Address by James R. Garvey)

The subject I have chosen to discuss relates to the Federal government policies on energy research. In pursuing this subject I may very well step on a few toes, but I think it is about time to "tell it like it is" on this matter so vital to the welfare of our country. I do not know who is to blame for the foolhardy policies of the past, but we are all, especially those of us knowledgeable in the total problem, responsible for what actions are taken in the future.

Whether we work for the coal industry, the Federal government, or have an interest only because we are a taxpayer or an energy user, as all of us are, we should be concerned about the energy research policies of the Federal government. It is in everybody's interest, but primarily the user of energy and those concerned with environment, that the direction of energy research and the expenditure of Federal funds in this area be undertaken in a manner compatible with the energy needs of the country and not be influenced by the dramatic appeal of what may appear to be revolutionary technology.

In any discussion of the subject which I have chosen to cover, a number of basic considerations should be kept in mind. These include:

1. We must acknowledge that coal is our most abundant fuel resource. According to U.S. Geological Survey estimates, coal constitutes over 70 per cent of the fuel reserves of the United States—the minimum amount recoverable is more than twice the probable recoverable reserves of all other fuels combined including oil, gas, oil shale and uranium, if the latter is used with current conversion technology.

2. While the growth in use of electricity has been far greater than that of any other energy form, we should not let this fact ob-

scure the far greater demand for fuel *not used* in the production of electricity. We should recognize that despite its tremendous growth, electricity still comprises only 21 per cent of the end-use of all energy.

In the development of our present highly industrialized and mechanized society we have evolved what might be termed a "hydrocarbon economy." We need gasoline for our automobiles, gas for home heating and cooking, oil for space heating, and coal for many industrial operations. Almost 79 per cent of the energy fuels consumed each year is in the end-use form of a solid, gas, or liquid, not as electricity.

3. Unfortunately in this "hydrocarbon economy" the hydrocarbon fuels we have available are not always interchangeable in their natural form; for example, we cannot use our most abundant solid fuel resources to power our automobiles. It is also unfortunate that the demand for some hydrocarbons in their natural form is growing at such a rate that the available source of each may not be sufficient to meet future needs.

4. The production and use of all fuels result in environmental changes. Because of the rapidly expanding demand for fuels such environmental changes are occurring at a rate which, according to the Federal government threatens the health and welfare of man and steps must be taken to control it.

With these four considerations in mind we can consider those actions by government which are needed to stimulate the new technology essential for meeting our growing energy needs in all its end-use forms. With the improvement in hindsight resulting from government research policy errors of the past we are in a better position to do this than we were 10 or 15 years ago.

Certainly no person taking a rational approach would conclude now, as was done then, that the first priority of Federal government energy research should be the production of electricity from the atom. I do not mean to imply that atomic energy research should not have been pursued nor that it should not be continued. All our energy-producing fuels, and surprisingly including atomic, are non-replenishable and every effort to ensure that future generations have adequate fuel is justifiable. But in light of our total energy needs, the availability of other fuel resources and even the long-range needs, that is 100 years from now, the past and current over-emphasis on atomic research is regrettable.

With our commitments to space technology, weapon development, etc., the tax dollars available for energy research are understandably limited and their prudent use in the solutions to the most imperative energy problems is dictated. What then are these imperative energy problems?

It is apparent now that the most critical fuel need concerns the growing demand for, and available resources of, natural gas. In the past 10 years consumption of this fuel has risen from about 13 trillion cubic feet in 1960 to 22.0 trillion cubic feet in 1970. During that same period the ratio of proved reserves to annual consumption declined from about 20 to a little more than 13. But more important is the fact, recognized now by many, that the growth in demand for this versatile fuel, expected to be twice what it is today by the year 2000, will exhaust the total natural resources before that date. A realistic government research policy would treat this problem by accelerating the effort already underway to perfect the technology for conversion of our most abundant hydrocarbon, coal, to a synthetic pipeline gas.

The second most critical area relating to current and future fuel use is the control of environmental damage resulting from fuel production and use; a substantial part of this damage results from power generation. Since coal must play a significant role in such power generation for many years to

come, major emphasis should be placed on the many research opportunities available to enable coal use with minimum insult to the environment.

For the past several years industry and government have been pursuing research directed at control of such pollutants as sulfur oxides from power plant and industrial stacks. Many such control approaches have reached the stage where they are being installed as full-scale demonstration plants, and in 1970 Federal funds were made available for the first time to encourage such trial installations. But processes for cleaning up flue gases after the fact are, at best, a limited solution to the problem. When one considers that, for example, in the case of sulfur oxides, we are attempting to remove a pollutant which comprises only a few tenths of a per cent of the total gas volume, the magnitude of the problems of this approach becomes apparent. Indications from the full-scale installations already made are that the chemical processing plants required at a power plant to remove this pollutant will add around \$40/kw, or 20-25 per cent to the cost of the original power plant. And in many existing plants such flue gas processing is impractical if not impossible, irrespective of the cost. The only answer for these plants is the use of a low-sulfur fuel. And because of the unavailability of natural low-sulfur fluid fuels we must again rely on coal. There have been many who claim that naturally-occurring low-sulfur coals can be used, but those who make such claims ignore the facts.

The substitution of low-sulfur coal for that now being used by power plants is not the answer. Unfortunately the production capability, manpower necessity, and proximity to market involve the high-sulfur coal reserves of our country.

If we assume that by low-sulfur we mean 0.7 sulfur or less, and if we review the Bureau of Mines data we find that 94 per cent of the low-sulfur coals are in the far-western states which account for about 4 per cent of the total annual production. We further find that while production in the states of Alabama, Kentucky, Virginia and West Virginia, in which about 6 per cent of the low-sulfur coals occur, accounts for about 54 per cent of the total production, much of this coal is of metallurgical quality and produced for that market. And more importantly, much of the reserves have been dedicated to that market.

The major production of steam coals, about 42 per cent of the total production, is from the mid-west and northern Appalachian states which account for only 0.2 per cent of the low-sulfur reserves.

There are research opportunities available which will enable development of the technology to desulfurize these high-sulfur reserves. In this regard I am not referring to conventional or even advanced methods of coal cleaning; for most coals the organic sulfur content which cannot be removed by such methods is too high to consider such approaches. What I am referring to is chemical conversion of the coal to either a liquid which might be referred to as a synthetic residual oil, or to a solid produced by a solvent extraction process which removes the mineral constituents and leaves a clean hydrocarbon. Several research approaches to enable such production have been languishing for several years for lack of funding.

Flue gas cleaning processes and the substitution of desulfurized coal products can serve as an intermediate pollution control approach. But we should also be looking forward to the future, say 10 years from now, when entirely different methods for producing electricity from coal could be made available. The research on such approaches would be directed at producing electricity from coal, not only in a pollution-free manner, but also with improved efficiency and availability. Re-

search opportunities from accomplishing this are available, including MHD, the fuel cell, fluidized bed combustion, and the combined cycle. Each of these approaches has its own advocate and I would not attempt to say which is best. Personally, I believe that in the crisis situation which exists today, all approaches should be pursued. In other words, "Do something—don't just stand there debating."

The situation with regard to liquid fuels has not as yet developed to the critical stage such as is the case with natural gas. One reason is that the Federal government has had its hand on the spigot which controls foreign oil imports and it has always been assumed that when the domestic supply gets a little tight, the government will just have to open that spigot a bit wider. But unfortunately in the past year something has happened to make us wonder regarding the dependability of that oil flow. Recent openings of the spigot have not resulted in greater oil flow, because the foreign governments who control the input to the line have refused to cooperate. We "ain't" getting the oil we expected.

As in the case with natural gas the demand for petroleum fuels is expanding rapidly, and also as in the case with natural gas, the domestic resources cannot continue to meet the need indefinitely. We have an option of either developing the technology for using our coal and possibly our oil shale resources to supplement our natural domestic supplies, or of relying on imports. The latter decision would be, in my opinion, disastrous not only because it would place our economy in the hands of unreliable and unfriendly foreign governments, but also because it would commit us to a tremendous drain on our balance of payments. Currently the basic fuel cost for the United States is of the order of \$20 billion per year. It is expanding rapidly and to allow a substantial percentage of these dollars to leave the country could lead to financial chaos.

There are research opportunities which could be pursued for conversion of coal and oil shale to petroleum products. I have already mentioned one of these in connection with the control of environmental pollution, namely the conversion of coal to a residual oil, other approaches could result in the development of technology for the conversion of coal to the lighter weight liquid products. We should pursue them in the national interest.

The least important imperative in connection with our energy fuels is the development of technology to convert the atom into electricity. There is no question that the nation's long-range energy needs—after the next 75 to 100 years—will have to be satisfied from an energy source other than hydrocarbon fuels. Since it is in the national interest to develop such a new energy source, it is reasonable that Federal funds be used for required research.

However, a more important need is to utilize more effectively the energy sources we now have, not to develop a new energy source. In my opinion there has been an overcommitment of Federal research funds for development of electric power from the atom. In their report to the President in 1962, the AEC stated that about 1.3 billion dollars had been spent as of that time. As nearly as we can determine the commitment since that time has been somewhat over 200 million dollars a year, bringing the total atomic power development expenditures to the order of 3 billion dollars.

On the other hand, prior to 1960 when the Office of Coal Research was established in the Department of the Interior, very little Federal funds were expended for fossil fuel research. Since then that office's annual budget has averaged 7.3 million dollars. If we add that to the 6.4 million dollars spent annually by the Bureau of Mines for coal utilization

research, we arrive at a total of 13.7 million dollars each year, or a total of about 140 million dollars during the 10-year period.

In 1967 the Federal Government finally recognized that there was justification for the expenditure of Federal research funds for air pollution control. In the years 1967 through 1970 a total of 45 million dollars was expended.

Combining the research expenditures relating to fossil fuels, we find that the commitment to atomic energy research has been about sixteen times the commitment to improve utilization of other energy sources. My comparative research expenditures may not be entirely accurate, but the difference in total expenditures is so great that a few million dollars errors is not significant. Like everything else about the AEC, factual information on expenditures for research is hard to obtain.

And what results has this overcommitment produced? It certainly has not led to a lower cost means for producing electricity and it has not eliminated environmental damage since it has created pollution problems of its own completely unknown before the advent of this so-called miracle power source. Further, the evidence indicates that the new atomic technology has adversely affected short-term fuel availability and may in the long run prove to be disastrous insofar as future energy needs are concerned.

Over-emphasis on atomic power research in recent years has been deterrent to proper energy supply planning. Several years ago many electric utilities, under government pressure, began ordering atomic instead of coal power plants to meet projected energy needs. This in turn caused coal producers to defer opening new mines. The predictable result was the present shortage of coal availability and power-producing capability.

For the long-term the over-emphasis on development of light-water reactors may prove to be a tragic mistake. Our reserves of low-cost fissionable fuel, that containing fissile material, are very limited. And during the next few years they will be consumed at an alarming rate in light-water reactors. We have attempted to bring this to the attention of those responsible for the over-emphasis on atomic power for at least the last five years.

Recently the "atomic fraternity" has begun to recognize the validity of our arguments. Unless the breeder reactor becomes a commercial reality in the very near future, or unless fantastic quantities of fissionable fuel are discovered the atomic power age may very well be short-lived. As M. King Hubbert pointed out in the National Academy of Sciences publication, *Resources and Man*:

"Taking a view of not less than a century, were electrical power to continue to be produced solely by the present type of light-water reactors, the entire episode of nuclear energy would probably be short-lived. With the growth rates now being experienced, the inexpensive sources of uranium would probably be exhausted within a fraction of a century, and the contained uranium-235 irretrievably lost. With the use of more costly uranium, the cost of power would increase until nuclear power would no longer be economically competitive with that from fuels and water."

Further emphasizing this possibility are recent statements by representatives of the Atomic Energy Commission. For example, Milton Shaw of AEC, in testimony before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, admitted that even if a breeder reactor is available for commercial use by 1986, the consumption of uranium fuel will be 2.1 million tons during the next 50 years, and if the breeder is not perfected, which is certainly a possibility, atomic fuel consumption will be 4.5 million tons during that period. The former is more than four times what the Atomic Energy Commission estimates as reasonably assured to be available at \$30/lb or

less, and the latter is 8½ times the assured availability. Bear in mind that atomic power is barely competitive now at \$8/lb.

From the evidence it is apparent that past government energy research policies have been non-productive and to a great extent self-defeating. The facts that in a country blessed with abundant fuel resources we are experiencing power blackouts and brownouts, gas companies are turning away potential customers and some government officials are even advocating reductions in energy consumption are sufficient illustrations. Factors other than government research policies have, of course, been involved. But to have spent billions of dollars to get a few rocks off the moon and more billions to develop an atomic pot-heater while practically ignoring the nation's needs for fossil-fuel research is technological folly with the taxpayers' money.

It is not likely that the over-all fuels situation will improve unless realistic research policies relating to the production and use of energy fuels are established. Since time will be required to correct the mistakes of the past it is important that, to get our energy economy moving in the proper direction, we embark on a realistic government research program now.

We are not heartened by recent developments in this regard; for example, the programs of the Office of Coal Research are being hamstrung by a recent directive from the Office of Management and Budget. This directive stipulates that government funding for new pilot-plant research on coal research programs will not be funded by government unless at least one-third of the total cost is supplied by industry.

While it certainly is a laudable idea to have industry join with government in financing the fuel research required to sustain the energy economy of our country, it is a little late to establish this now in light of the established precedent in regard to atomic power. To our knowledge, no cost-sharing was required in the Federal government attempt to develop a power generating technique to compete with fossil fuels until the research had reached the large-scale demonstration plant stage. To instigate such a procedure now is to emphasize the obvious total disregard of government for research planning to fit the energy needs of our country.

The need for corrective action is apparent. While energy studies such as those now underway and planned will serve a useful purpose in developing a long-range energy policy, I feel the evidence already available is sufficient to justify an immediate increase in Federal research dollars for fossil-fuel research. Failure to act now is to acknowledge that the energy policy of the nation will continue to be, as it has for the past 15 years, too little too late.

THE TELEPHONE BANK BILL

HON. CHARLES M. TEAGUE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 23, 1971

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, some time this week we will probably be called upon to vote on H.R. 7, the telephone bank bill. This legislation proposes an outrageous raid on the Treasury at a time when our priorities must be reexamined.

A telephone bank would be established with a 10-year investment by the U.S. taxpayers of \$300 million. Interest

would be paid to the U.S. Government at the rate of only 2 percent. The investment would be returned as soon as practicable after June 30, 1984—which could well mean never. Loans could be made to the rural telephone companies at less than 4 percent interest.

We do not question the fact that some rural telephone companies need to be modernized. But consider these facts:

First. No hearings have been held on the proposal for over 2 years.

Second. No report from the executive branch on H.R. 7—92d Congress—was either requested or received by the committee.

Third. At least two-thirds of the rural telephone borrowers are commercial corporations organized for a profit. Most of them appear to be doing very well. Many are family owned, pay good salaries to family members and still make a profit.

Fourth. Some telephone cooperatives would appear to be eligible to borrow from the bank for cooperatives—as other co-ops do. They would have to pay the going rate of interest, which is the cost of money to the Government plus handling charges. This is the principle behind other Federal farm loan programs.

Fifth. The other companies could and should borrow from regular commercial sources or issue debentures.

Sixth. Certainly the public utility regulatory agencies, if necessary, would grant rate increases to accomplish any needed modernization.

For these reasons, I urge you to oppose this unnecessary legislation.

GOLDEN EAGLES END A PROUD YEAR

HON. ELWOOD HILLIS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 23, 1971

Mr. HILLIS. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to take a few moments to pay tribute to Oak Hill High School of North Central Indiana.

This consolidated school, which educates students from both Miami and Grant Counties in Indiana, has an outstanding athletic record. Its basketball team advanced to the final 16 in the recent Indiana State High School Tournament for the last 2 years, its record is 41 wins and nine losses.

The Oak Hill footballers have compiled a record of 18 straight victories over the last 2 seasons.

Following is an editorial from the Peru, Ind., Tribune, praising the Golden Eagles of Oak Hill:

GOLDEN EAGLES END A PROUD YEAR

When State finals-bound Elkhart bumped Oak Hill from the basketball tournament at Fort Wayne last Saturday afternoon, this area lost its lone remaining representative—and a darned good one at that.

Coach Galen Smith's Eagles thrilled their fans during the season by winning the Mid-

Indiana Conference and the Grant County tourney.

They picked up hundreds of supporters by sweeping the Marion sectional for the fourth time in the school's 12-year history, beating the Marion Giants in the final game.

The regional was next and Logansport was the victim in the finals.

Oak Hill played hard against Elkhart, but couldn't stay with the tall Blue Blazers on the boards. Although they were down by nearly 20 points in the fourth quarter, they still battled back like champions and made a game of it.

With the final buzzer a truly "golden era" of major sports at Oak Hill came to an end for another year. In the past two years Eagle football teams won 18 straight and the basketballers had a 41-9 record.

Miami County should be proud of Oak Hill, for many of its athletes live within its boundaries.

The Eagles' accomplishments should provide an incentive to young, prospective athletes from schools of all sizes—because they proved pride, spirit and determination can carry you a long, long way.

CANDIDATE NIXON ENDORSED CANAL

HON. DON FUQUA

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 23, 1971

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, sometimes events puzzle the observer. Sometimes the statements made by political candidates are obscured by the actions of those same men when they hold public office.

Such is the case with the Cross Florida Barge Canal which has now been halted. After an expenditure of some \$50 million, a brusque announcement was made by the White House that work would be terminated.

Now those of us from that area are faced with problems which will be with us for a decade or more—trying to undo what has been done with this incomplete waterway.

I think it appropriate to have reprinted a news story from the Palatka Daily News, Palatka, Fla., of November 1, 1960, in which the Republican presidential candidate expressed his support and endorsement of the project.

This article is worth reprinting:

NIXON IS SECOND CANDIDATE TO ENDORSE FLORIDA BARGE CANAL

The Cross Florida Barge Canal today received the endorsement of Richard M. Nixon, Republican presidential candidate, giving the canal the encouragement of both presidential candidates.

In a telegram to David S. Arthurs, publisher of the Palatka Daily News, Nixon stated that he has "long supported and worked for the continued development of a strong transportation system (and) for this reason I am most interested in the development of projects such as the trans-Florida canal."

A telegraph query of the presidential candidate was made by the Daily News following the recent announcement that Democratic candidate John Kennedy had pledged to Congressman Charles E. Bennett of Jacksonville to assist the backers of the Canal project.

The Florida Barge Canal project was originally designed as a deep draft ship canal to cut across peninsular Florida from a point

twelve miles south of Palatka on the St. Johns River to Port Inglis on the Gulf of Mexico, 70 miles north of Tampa. Construction on the incompleted project ceased shortly before World War II.

Since that time the plans have been changed to the extent of reducing the depth to 12 feet and changing the designation to a barge canal. The Army Corps of Engineers has estimated that the canal is economically feasible for both commercial and military use. The canal would reduce the distances for barges moving from the Atlantic Seaboard to western states and the Mississippi River by about 800 miles. It would also reduce the risk of barge transportation by providing protected routes for barges which must now venture out into open water to navigate the west coast of Florida.

Protected waterways presently extend the entire length of the Atlantic seaboard, and from St. Marks, on the Florida panhandle, westward to the Mississippi and along the Texas coastline. Advocates of the Cross-Florida canal refer to the incomplete canal as the "missing link" in the American waterway system.

The Nixon telegram further stated, "I understand it (the canal) could be an important link in the transportation network that serves Florida and the Southwest, I shall look forward to giving this project careful consideration . . . and if it appears that the canal will strengthen our nation economically, you may be sure it will have my support."

The winner of the presidential election Nov. 8 may be called upon sooner than he probably expects to support the canal. Members of the Florida Barge Canal Authority will attend a meeting in Washington the day following the election, Nov. 9, at which time they will present their case to the Federal Budget Director, Maurice Stans, asking for \$20 million to complete the engineering work and begin final construction.

The Daily News Inquiry followed the Kennedy endorsement of the canal. Additional wires were sent to Florida Democratic leaders asking their impression of the Kennedy pledge. A jubilant response was received from Senator Spessard Holland, Congressman Robert Sikes and Billy Matthews, Governor-nominee Farris Bryant, and State Representative Bill Chappell, speaker of the house. No response has been received from Senator George A. Smathers, southern campaign manager of the Kennedy campaign.

With further reference to this matter, I would like to have an editorial from the Bradford County Telegraph of Starke, Fla., reprinted as additional data on the canal.

I think the editorial speaks for itself:

FLORIDA CANAL SACRIFICED ON THE ALTAR OF POLITICS

Thank heaven for a few elected officials who aren't afraid to speak out and call a spade a spade in President Nixon's shameful and unjustified halt of the Florida barge canal project.

Too many officials, including a majority of the state cabinet, seem content to roll over and play dead when the President delivers an undeserved political punch to Florida's midriff. "The canal's dead," they weep and wail, shedding crocodile tears, if any—and, of course, the canal is dead, just so long as they take this attitude.

In strong contrast is Mayor Hans Tanzler of Jacksonville who proclaims that his people, and those of the rest of the state, have a right to know whether there was justification in the President's dogmatic halting of the project. So far, none has been shown.

The so-called "ecological justification" of the action has been described as "hog wash" with little or no data to support the wild claims of "damaging fishing" (most fishermen in the area say Rodman Dam has im-

proved it) . . . increasing plant growth (even if this happened, it could be controlled) . . . and breeding more mosquitoes (ecologists themselves tell us that mosquitoes are a necessary part of the balance of nature. They are food for the "mosquito fish," who in turn provide food for the bigger fish, who provide food for the fishermen).

Should the canal halt prove to be permanent, Mayor Tanzler said he would do everything possible, including filing suit, to recover the \$6.5 million that Jacksonville has contributed toward the canal from an annual half-mill ad valorem tax levy. Many other towns along the canal route—Palatka, Dunnellon, Ocala, etc.—are in the same boat.

If anyone ever had the idea that the President's decision was based on cold, hard facts, and was not politically-inspired, that idea was dispersed for all time with the publication last week of a document sent to the Whitehouse by Russell F. Train, chairman of the National Council on Environmental Quality, prior to the President's decision.

Two paragraphs in the document were dead give-aways as to the political foundation of Mr. Nixon's action. After setting forth his so-called "justification" for the recommendation to halt the project, Mr. Train said:

"I believe there are probably more political advantages than disadvantages in stopping the project, compared to a partial realignment."

And again:

"I believe that termination of the project would bring maximum political benefits."

All of which proves that the hard-core environmentalists stirred up such a fuss that Mr. Train, and subsequently the White House were led to believe that halting the canal would be the politically popular thing to do.

Score one for the vocal minority. Scratch one for the silent majority.

ciety of Washington, D.C., at a Reception and Buffet held at the French Embassy and hosted by His Excellency Charles Lucet, the French Ambassador, and Madame Lucet. Guests from within the State included Governor Warren E. Hearnes; Mr. Floyd C. Warmann, Executive Assistant to the Governor; Mr. Conn C. Winfrey, Chairman, State Park Board, and Mrs. Winfrey, of Lebanon; Mr. Gerald B. Rowan, Member and former Chairman, State Park Board, and Mrs. Rowan, of Kansas City; Mr. Jack M. Jones, Director, State Tourism Commission; and Mr. Stanley J. Goodman, President of Famous-Barr and Honorary French Consul, and Mrs. Goodman, of St. Louis. Most of Missouri's Congressional Delegation, as well as a number of other persons of prominence, were also present for the occasion.

After the guests had been individually received, Ambassador Lucet expressed warm greetings to all present, and commented upon Missouri's historical ties to France. Later, Dr. James C. Messersmith, immediate Past President of the Missouri Society, gave a résumé of "Missouri's Cultural Heritage From France." Governor Hearnes, following his introduction by Senator Thomas F. Eagleton, addressed the assemblage briefly and then presented appropriate gifts consisting of an engraved silver tray and a matching set of silver Sesquicentennial medallions to Ambassador and Madame Lucet.

The February 18 observance at the French Embassy will undoubtedly be acknowledged as one of the most significant and unique of all Sesquicentennial events to be scheduled throughout the year. One of the first such activities to be held, it is in all probability the first to be held out-of-State. It should constitute an important chapter in the State's Sesquicentennial Annals.

**REMARKS OF DR. JAMES C. MESSERSMITH
PREFATORY REMARKS**

Your Excellency, Madame Lucet, Governor Hearnes, distinguished guests, and fellow-Missourians: Isn't this a momentous occasion? I am certain, a never-to-be-forgotten occasion for all of us.

Some months ago, the Executive Board of The Missouri Society of Washington, D.C., began considering possible events which might be held during the current year to commemorate appropriately this highly significant moment in Missouri history—the Sesquicentennial of her Statehood. As many of you know, there is now in existence the Missouri Sesquicentennial Commission, an agency created by the State Legislature to see that suitable observances of this 150th year of Statehood are held at local, State, and National levels. An important aspect of this function of the Commission is to make certain that contacts are established with prominent persons within the State, the Nation, and from other countries, and the assistance of these persons solicited in planning and holding fitting commemorative activities.

The Missouri Society's Executive Board—in particular, Mr. Cahill, our President—has maintained a close association with the Commission in regard to plans and arrangements for activities of our own organization, especially, the event being held here tonight. In my estimation—and, I am certain, in yours, also—this occasion will stand out as the highlight of the year for our Society, as well as be acknowledged as one of the most significant and unique of all Sesquicentennial observances.

Sesquicentennial activities officially began on February 5 at St. Charles, Missouri, with the dedication of the newly-restored first Capitol Building of the State. Governor Warren E. Hearnes officiated at this ceremony, and Mr. Cahill, our Society's President, participated in the program. We are pleased that our Sesquicentennial observance here tonight ranks among the first of many such

**COMMEMORATION OF THE SES-
QUICENTENNIAL OF MISSOURI'S
STATEHOOD**

**HON. DURWARD G. HALL
OF MISSOURI**

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 23, 1971

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, 1971 marks the Sesquicentennial of Missouri's statehood. To participate in the celebration, this past February 18, the members of the Missouri Society of Washington, D.C., renewed our State's historical ties with the Republic of France, with a reception at the embassy of France hosted by his Excellency Charles Lucet, the French Ambassador and Madame Lucet.

As a part of the program, Dr. James Messersmith, past president of the Missouri society presented a succinct and interesting resume of Missouri's cultural heritage from France, following which, the Governor of the State of Missouri presented sesquicentennial medallions to the Ambassador and Madame Lucet.

A description of the program and the remarks of Dr. Messersmith follow:

**COMMEMORATION OF THE SESQUICENTENNIAL
OF MISSOURI'S STATEHOOD**

THE MISSOURI SOCIETY,
OF WASHINGTON, D.C.,
February 25, 1971.

On Thursday evening, February 18, 1971, the Sesquicentennial of Missouri's Statehood was appropriately observed by approximately 250 members and guests of The Missouri So-

events to be held. It is in all probability the first to be held out-of-State.

As the Commission has well noted, Missouri's Sesquicentennial, properly observed, will be a tangible asset to the State. It will be a vigorous expression of the hope and philosophy of all participating counties, communities, agencies, and organizations. It will also serve as a unifying influence for localities within the State, and will promote the establishment of bonds of friendship between the State and out-of-State associations, such as ours.

Your Excellency, it is a distinct privilege and a high honor for The Missouri Society of Washington, D.C., to be so closely associated with you and Madame Lucet in the culmination of this notable Sesquicentennial observance here tonight—an occasion which must certainly be considered one of the most outstanding in the history of our Society, which dates back to 1900. We are indeed grateful for the warm hospitality which you have extended to us. You are most gracious hosts.

At this time, I should also like to express the gratitude of the Society to Counselor de Warren, Mlle. Fourrier, and other members of your staff who have worked with our Executive Board in planning and coordinating the arrangements for this occasion. It has been a pleasant time indeed for those of us who have been associated with them in this assignment.

MISSOURI'S CULTURAL HERITAGE FROM FRANCE

We Missourians here tonight sense a particular closeness to our hosts, His Excellency and Madame Lucet, and to the great Nation which they have the honor and privilege to represent. Not one of us here is unaware of the tremendous impacts which the French people have made upon this great Country of ours, and, for us in particular, upon that very special part of the midsection of our Country which we affectionately call "Missouri", or, as some are wont to say, "Missourah!"

Prior to being admitted into the Union as a State in 1821, Missouri was a part of the Great Louisiana Purchase obtained by the United States from France in 1803. During the recorded history of this region, the impact and influence of French exploration, settlement, and culture have been both significant and far-reaching. St. Louis, St. Charles, Bonne Terre, Cape Girardeau, Ste. Genevieve, Bois d'Arc, and Versailles are but a few of the Missouri towns and cities which attest to the vast extent of that influence.

Speaking before the Missouri State Historical Society in February 1906, Professor Edward Gaylord Bourne of Yale University observed: "In old Louisiana, the French explorers, *voyageurs*, and priests were the pathbreakers, the forerunners. They first viewed the land and reported that it was good, and we have reaped the fruit of their labors." You and I here tonight at this notable Sesquicentennial observance have a valid and worthy impulse to admire and honor them—to appreciate them to the full.

There will doubtless always be debates as to the actual identity of the first white men to set foot in the Territory now known as Missouri, whether they were remnants of the Conquistadores who explored the Southwest or the Catholic priests from Canada to the North or New Orleans to the South. Probably the first traveled southward from Canada, were French, and representatives of the Church. In 1673, the Governor of Canada, under the authorization of the King of France, sent priest-explorers into the Upper Louisiana (or Missouri) Country: such men of the cloth as Fathers Jacques Marquette, Louis Jolliet, and Robert Cavalier Steu de La Salle.

Nine years later—in 1682—LaSalle took possession of the entire Mississippi River

Valley in the name of France. Naming the Territory after King Louis XIV, he erected a fort at what is now Peoria, Illinois. Other French priests and explorers, such as Montigny, Du Tisne, and Bourmond came into the area at the turn of the 18th Century, and the first settlements in what is now Missouri were established.

Today, Ste. Genevieve stands as the oldest permanent settlement in Missouri. Here the first Catholic Church and the first Masonic Lodge west of the Mississippi River were established. Many of the early settlers in Missouri came from earlier Canadian-French settlements in Illinois. Ste. Genevieve, for example, was largely settled by French migrants from Kaskaskia, just across the Mississippi River.

Then shortly after the establishment of Ste. Genevieve—St. Louis! One December morning in 1763, Pierre Laclède Liguest, who was to become the founder of the settlement of St. Louis, peered through the river mists, then raised a hand as a signal for a boat landing. There were 30 men in this boat, including Auguste Chouteau, 14 years old, who was acting as Laclède's clerk. These men had come from New Orleans to establish a trading post with the Indians. The actual date of the founding of St. Louis was February 15, 1764.

Born in France in 1724 of an aristocratic family, Laclède came to Louisiana in 1755, established a merchandising business, and then secured a permit to trade with the Indians on the upper Mississippi. Although his backers had recommended only the establishment of a trading post, Laclède determined to establish a town, which he would call "St. Louis." He laid out the streets, developed a system of property ownership, and invited settlers to the area. Laclède died in 1778, following his return from a trip to New Orleans, and was buried near the confluence of the Mississippi and Arkansas Rivers. After his death, St. Louis continued to grow and develop, under the dynamic leadership of the young Auguste Chouteau, and by 1800 had a population of several thousand. Other settlements established by the French along the Mississippi included Cape Girardeau and St. Charles.

The Political History of Louisiana prior to the 1803 Purchase falls into three periods: (1) The Period of French Domination, 1673-1762. (2) The Period of Spanish Domination, 1762-1800, following the ceding of the Territory to Spain by secret treaty. (3) The Period of Retrocession, 1800-1803, following the return of the Territory to France. Socially, however, the entire era of 1673-1803 was one of French influence and domination. Commerce, trade, habits, and mores—everything was French. The Governor and all officials spoke French. Settlements, rivers, business establishments carried primarily French designations.

Following the Purchase of Louisiana by the United States in 1803, the influx of Americans from other areas to the Territory began to effect numerous changes, many positive in nature, some, perhaps, negative in character. Among the advantages accruing to the French following the Purchase, Henri Brackenridge, who as a child had lived with a French family in Ste. Genevieve, identified the following: "They (the French) have derived a greater security from the Indians; greater reward for industry and enterprise. Their land has increased in value; mercantile goods are less expensive." Brackenridge was also able to identify certain disadvantages: "They are less content; their anxiety is greater; there is less cordiality, friendship, and harmony."

Despite the many changes which were wrought in great measure during those early years after the Purchase, and which were to continue in ever-extending breadth and depth during the century and a half following President James Monroe's affixing his signa-

ture to the enactment which made Missouri a State, the imprint of the French settlement, language, and culture has remained and shall always remain firm and distinct. And, so, while the name *Messersmith* may be quite difficult to pass off as smacking even remotely of French derivation, yet I am still able, through the aid of that wonderful science, genealogy, to find, among my family forebears from Missouri, that definitely French name, *Routon*. Which should conclusively prove the point just made.

What, then, shall we underscore as the French "whole cloth" legacy to our great State of Missouri? Any of you can, of course, enumerate a lengthy—and valid—list of such heirlooms. To me, however, Amos Stoddard, the first Administrator of Upper Louisiana, spoke to this point most simply, and yet quite forcefully, in these words: "Of all the people on the Globe, the French in Louisiana (or Missouri, if you will) appear to be the happiest. They are honest in their dealings, and punctual in the performance of their contracts."

Thank you.

CHILD PASSES THROUGH THE NIGHTMARE OF RABIES AND LIVES

HON. WILLIAM M. McCULLOCH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 23, 1971

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to bring to the attention of my colleagues in the House a human interest story of great medical significance.

It is a widely known fact that once a person has been bitten by a rabid animal and serum injections not immediately commenced thereafter, such a bite is fatal. Always. However, there was a night last fall, back in my congressional district where a small boy of 6 years was attacked by a rabid bat while he slept.

This courageous young boy is Matthew Winkler, the son of Mr. and Mrs. Nicholas Winkler of Willshire, Ohio, and for the first time in recorded medical history a human being passed through the nightmare of rabies and lived.

I would like to congratulate the Winkler family and those physicians involved for the tremendous effort they put forth. It pleases me to note that Dr. Thomas T. Weis was among the several physicians who was responsible for saving the life of young Matthew. Dr. Thomas Weis, a graduate of Georgetown University Medical School, while attending that school, served in my office in Washington, D.C. as a volunteer. As a matter of fact, if my recollections serve me correctly, it was during this time that young Dr. Weis met his lovely wife, Jean, who was also working in my office.

Mr. Speaker, I am also very proud to note that St. Rita's Hospital in Lima, which has served so many people in western Ohio, has again distinguished itself as the truly great hospital that it is.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to have reprinted into the RECORD immediately following, an account of this dramatic event which appeared in the Cincinnati Enquirer, Sunday, January 3, 1971. I am sure the Members would like to read a

detailed account of such a tremendous human and medical event. The account follows:

BAT BITES, CHILD SCREAMS—BUT RABIES
LOSES

(By John Barbour)

LIMA, OHIO.—The old red brick farm house in Willshire, Ohio, settled down in the crisp evening.

Nick Winkler, tired after a day's plowing under an Indian Summer sun, thumbed through some seed catalogs. His wife, Verna, half-way watched Richard Burton in the movie, "Bramble Bush." The children, Matthew, six, and Valerie, four, were asleep, at last, upstairs. It was 10 o'clock, October 10, 1970.

A medical first was about to begin.

Suddenly a child's scream tore through the house. Matt's room. Verna Winkler flew up the dark staircase, flicking on lights. Matt lay there on the big double bed, in horror. On his left thumb, fastened by frenzied teeth, was a tiny brown creature.

"It's a bat," Verna Winkler screamed.

Nick, his legs weakened by childhood polio, bounded up the stairs. He thought she'd said "rat," but now he saw the tiny rodent, wings limp, its teeth in his son's flesh. He tore it off and told his wife to find a jar. His mind held one thought that would have terrified any parent: rabies.

Nick ordered his wife to cleanse Matt's wound with soap, water and alcohol.

Nick Winkler, 28, had grown up on this farm and knew the dangers.

The animal would have to be sent to the state health department and its brain examined for signs of rabies.

The next morning Nick took the bat to a veterinarian in a nearby town, hoping that Matt would not have to endure the two weeks of rabies shots that he himself had endured after being bitten by a cat years ago. The vet sent the rodent by bus to the state capital, Columbus.

On Wednesday, October 14, four days after Matt had been bitten, the report came back: the bat was rabid.

The U.S. Public Health Service's Communicable Disease Center in Atlanta, Ga., estimates that 100,000 Americans are bitten by animals each year—and 20,000 of these are treated for rabies. Once the symptoms appear, the disease is invariably fatal, invariably that is, until Matt Winkler. But the vaccines are so effective that only three Americans developed rabies in 1970. Matt Winkler and two others. The two died.

Matt's family doctor immediately began daily shots of the newest vaccine. But it was four days since the bite. Too long, by past experience if rabies were the diagnosis.

Matt bravely put up with the daily injections and went about his normal life of first grade classes at the Parkway School, bright fall days on the farm and his preoccupation with television programs.

Nick continued his commuting to a night assembly line job at a General Electric plant in Decatur, Indiana.

Verna Winkler, a tiny, pretty woman of 25, wasn't perturbed that her son began going to bed before his 8:30 p.m. bedtime. Then Friday, October 30, the day before Halloween she noticed that Matt wasn't feeling well.

On Halloween day she took him to the doctor's office. It looked like the flu. He prescribed antibiotics. That night Matt still didn't feel well enough to go "trick or treating."

On Tuesday, November 3, Verna thought her son felt a little warmish. The Winklers didn't have a thermometer so Verna went out and bought one. Matt had a temperature of 104. He was complaining of a stiff neck.

The family doctor was out of town at a medical meeting. The physician standing in for him saw Matt on Tuesday, swore to himself as he examined the boy, and called Dr.

John Stechschulte, a pediatrician in Lima, Ohio, 40 miles away. Dr. Stechschulte arranged to see Matt immediately at the emergency room at St. Rita's Hospital in Lima.

Nick's mother drove dashing along the narrow county roads, passing red lights.

Dr. Stechschulte was waiting when they arrived. He found no evidence of a stiff neck. Good. No involvement of the nervous system. Matt seemed alert. But there was the fever. It looked like it might be a reaction to the rabies vaccine—rare, but not serious.

He admitted Matt for observation. He prescribed antibiotics and other routine care. Then, as if some suspicion gnawed at his mind, he added one line to the written orders: "Although no rabies I would suggest that avoid rare possibility of child bite." By Matt. A rabid bite.

Under medication to bring the fever down, Matt began to improve with each passing day. The case looked more and more manageable—just a vaccine reaction. The word got around the hospital that a blond blue-eyed boy had been admitted on suspicion of rabies but was doing well. Dr. Stechschulte, 40, chief of staff designate of the hospital, saw nothing to prevent him from attending a hospital administration meeting in St. Petersburg, Fla.

He saw Matt the morning of Tuesday, November 10, and turned the case over to his young partner, Dr. Thomas T. Weis, 34. They talked over Matt's case in the pediatrics ward. It was agreed that the boy was progressing. The fever was lower every day. If he continued to improve, Weis could discharge him from the hospital before Stechschulte returned from the medical meeting, about a week later.

Wednesday, November 11, Weis saw Matt again. Fever down. No specific abnormalities—except the child tended to drift into sleep.

It looked though like a normal reaction to the fever—a little malaise, fatigue perhaps even hospital boredom. When he was awake he seemed alert. That morning Matt was eating his breakfast sitting up in bed and talking to his new doctor.

Thursday morning. Fever: almost normal. But there was some increase in the sleep phases. And one significant change. Weis rotated Matt's head. The child had developed a stiff neck. To Weis it meant one thing, irritation in the nervous system.

Rabies? The rabies virus attacks the nervous system and the brain.

He ordered a spinal tap, to examine the fluid in Matt's spinal column. Stechschulte had been ready to make a tap the day Matt was admitted, but found no sign of nervous system involvement and decided against it.

The fluid showed the presence of some white blood cells, changes in protein. That meant nervous system irritation—perhaps allergic, perhaps chemical. Perhaps viral.

Rabies?

Now hard decisions had to be made. Weis called Dr. Robert S. Oyer, the county health commissioner.

Oyer agreed with Weis' suspicions. Rabies or another brain virus. He called Dr. John Ackerman, Ohio's chief of the bureau of preventive medicine in Columbus. Ackerman called Dr. Alan Bronsky at the Communicable Disease Center in Atlanta. It all took less than an hour. Weis entered this report in the progress record, dated Nov. 12.

"Conclusion: Apparently not rabies—all agree as of now.

"May be vaccine reaction—but extremely RARE to this degree, if at all. But MAY BE. If so, reportable.

"May be chance occurrence of another viral infection, i.e., true viral encephalitis such as California strain which attacked child at same time as rabies virus given."

The odds were now that it was a virus infection—either rabies or some other virus attacking Matt's brain and nervous system. But odds against rabies.

Blood samples were taken for shipment to the state department of health. Weis checked Matt two and three times a day.

Friday 13. Little change. Stiffness no worse. No better. Fever nearly normal. But the sleep pattern continued.

Saturday, November 14. Weis had another shock. Matt was sitting up in bed when he made morning rounds. But when Weis asked him a question the words from the child's mouth were an unintelligible garble.

Unlike any previous symptom, this was an indication of a specific, localized effort on the brain. Weis spent an hour checking.

At the end of his examination there was no other way. It was mid-morning. He called the experts at the Communicable Disease Center in Atlanta. They concurred in his diagnosis. The boy could be flown to the National Institutes of Health in Bethesda, Md., by Air Force ambulance plane. There were experimental vaccines and serums available there which might be tried if nothing else worked. Weis would call again at 4 p.m.

For some time, doctors had asked: "Why must rabies always be fatal?"

In a California case, a child suffering from rabies went into cardiac arrest, and was revived. But in the process, due to a lack of oxygen, the patient suffered irreparable brain damage. He lived on in a coma for several months before finally succumbing. Death came from complications, not from rabies.

Public health authorities began to ask if they had been able to prevent the complications would the patient have survived the disease?

The idea caught on, and became more and more refined. Maybe rabies wasn't in itself a killer. Its victims all died, but they died of oxygen insufficiency, or heart failure, or intracranial pressure, or they choked to death by swallowing their tongues during seizures, or they drowned in their own fluids. Individually any one of those fatal instances could be handled medically; if they were predicted, anticipated, they could be forestalled.

After two years of study, by late 1970, U.S. Public Health Service experts were looking for a case of rabies to give the new medical philosophy a try.

Matthew Winkler became that case.

As Saturday morning progressed, Matthew began to fall deeper into a sleep pattern. At 4 p.m. Weis joined a national conference call with other experts on Matthew's condition. It was decided that any attempt to move the boy could endanger his life. Instead the Communicable Disease Center made available its top rabies expert, Dr. Michael Hattwick, only 29, but one of the authors of the new rabies treatment theory.

By 5:30 p.m. Hattwick was on a jet bound for Dayton.

Ohio roads were icy with the year's first snowfall, but Hattwick drove the 75 miles slowly to Lima. He was at Matthew's bedside with Weis by 10 p.m.

Not in a decade had doctors been able to get to a rabies case so early.

They decided that at the slightest hint of any complication, they would order immediate treatment. Matt was moved into intensive care room. A nurse stood at his side constantly. His heart was monitored by electrocardiogram. His respiration was checked constantly. The main areas of concern: heart, lungs and brain.

Matthew by now couldn't talk. When asleep he was almost in semicomatose, although he still looked alert while awake. His mother, Verna, in surgical gown and rubber gloves stood at his side. He tried but could not talk to her. He turned his head away, embarrassed. But he would stick out his tongue when he was told to, or nod his head.

Weis and Hattwick ordered dozens of tests to rule out any other disease. They decided what complications could occur, what symp-

toms would herald their approach, what to do at the first hint of any trouble. It was 4 a.m. before they left Matthew.

They were back at his bedside Sunday morning, 4½ hours later. Diagnosis: still probably rabies.

Weiss and Hattwick decided on a brain biopsy to determine if rabies were present.

By 5 p.m. the State Highway Patrol was rushing brain samples to Dayton, 6:20 p.m. One cubic centimeter of Matthew Winkler's brain was in the hands of a Delta Air Lines stewardess bound for Atlanta.

A doctor from the Communicable Disease Center rushed the sample to the laboratory.

Midnight: the doctors in Lima got the report negative.

That in itself was not a denial of rabies. The virus is often seen in one portion of the brain and not in another. Portions of the brain tissue were injected into laboratory animals to see if they came down with the disease in the two-week incubation period.

Meanwhile, Matthew's condition remained essentially unchanged. Deep sleep continued. Fever returned. But not as high.

Monday November 16: Dr. Stechschulte returned. The patient he had thought would be discharged from St. Rita's was now one of its most critical patients.

That night: respiratory trouble.

About 8 p.m. Hattwick was in the small conference room behind the nurse's desk talking to Nick and Verna Winkler about the breathing problems. It might be necessary to perform a tracheostomy, to cut a small airway into Matthew's throat.

Matthew was beginning to show signs of a lack of oxygen. A nurse reported tersely, "Color very pale, lips bluish."

During one of his sleep phases, Matthew's heart and breathing rate went up.

His breathing rattled. The new airway was established in Matthew's throat.

Midnight Weiss went home. Hattwick ate a lonely spaghetti dinner in a restaurant across from his motel.

It was a turning point. If there was a moment in Matthew Winkler's life when a yes or no decision was all important, it was then, the tracheostomy.

In succeeding days a twitching in the left arm was the signal of coming convulsions. Medication was given early. The convulsions were forestalled.

November 23: Matthew was "more responsive." November 26: he was "holding head up quite well this a.m." November 28: "Will sit up by self." December 2: "Much brighter this A.M. Said 'He's Still some left arm weakness'" December 12: "Continues even more alert today. Will walk alone. Less left arm weakness. Feel Trach can be removed."

Matt Winkler is still in St. Rita's.

Speech therapy has helped erase most of the aberrations in his voice. He is the unofficial mayor of the pediatrics ward. He'll be there for quite a while longer.

His Sunday school class gave him so many Christmas gifts to open one-a-day he still had a two-week supply when New Year's arrived. A woman in Grand Rapids sent him a yarn doll he sleeps with every night.

Life has returned to normal for Doctors John Stechschulte, Thomas Weiss, and Michael Hattwick. Nick and Verna face hospital bills that will approach \$4000, but they have their son.

And to be recorded in the medical annals if the first documented case of a human being who developed rabies and survived—at least so far. For Matthew Winkler, the future will never be absolutely certain for at least a year.

The doctors are still monitoring his condition. Although they are 99.9% sure he had rabies, they will need additional tests to prove completely nothing else was involved. But they are all but sure that Matthew Winkler is the first human to survive rabies.

REPORT FROM CONGRESSMAN ESHLEMAN

HON. EDWIN D. ESHLEMAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 23, 1971

Mr. ESHLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have just recently sent to my constituents a newsletter. I am including the contents of that newsletter in the RECORD at this point:

REPORT FROM CONGRESSMAN ESHLEMAN QUESTIONS BEFORE CONGRESS

There are a record number of important issues facing the 92nd Congress. Therefore, the real job before us is to find the best solutions to this multitude of problems. Just to give you an idea of what we will be sifting through on Capitol Hill during the next two years, below is a list of some of the key problems and alternatives to be considered. The list, I think, makes it pretty clear that Congress has its work cut out for it if we are to meet our responsibilities to the American people. We must press for action on these issues that have piled up during the Sixties. Here, then, are the questions:

(1) *Revenue Sharing*—Return a share of Federal tax revenues to the States with no strings attached? Take over programs now run by States?

(2) *Presidential Elections*—Popular vote? District plan? Proportional plan? Non-electoral plan? No change?

(3) *Sex Discrimination*—Equal rights for women Constitutional Amendment?

(4) *State and Local Voting at 18*—Constitutional Amendment?

(5) *Poverty Program*—Increased? Decreased? Abolished?

(6) *Food Stamps*—For strikers? For students? Work requirements?

(7) *Welfare*—Income floor? State contribution? Work incentive? Training requirement?

(8) *Health Insurance*—Coverage for all? Coverage for poor, regardless of age? Coverage of all catastrophic illnesses? No change?

(9) *Unemployment*—Government jobs for ex-GIs? Deficit spending or higher taxes to finance public works projects? Tax incentives for creation of new jobs in industry?

(10) *Pollution abatement*—Federal standards? Federal penalties? Federal injunctions? Tax incentives for private enterprise?

(11) *SST*—Federal subsidies—Now? Later? Never?

(12) *Population*—Birth control? Education? Migration? Immigration cutback? No Federal involvement?

(13) *Medicine*—Federal scholarships for medical students? Subsidies for rural practice? Rural clinics?

(14) *Foreign Imports*—Quotas? Tariffs? Combination? Free Trade?

(15) *School Desegregation*—Federal subsidies for expenses?

(16) *Nationwide Transportation Strikes*—Binding arbitration?

(17) *Railroads*—Subsidized? Nationalized?

(18) *Campaign Spending*—New limits on TV? Newspaper ads? Overall?

(19) *Congressional Reform*—Abolish seniority? Filibusters? Junkets? Age limit?

(20) *Inflation*—Credit, price and wage ceilings? Guidelines? Higher taxes to eliminate budget deficit? Less governmental spending?

(21) *Consumer Protection*—New Federal agency? Federal standards for size, weight, warranties, guarantees? Class action suits?

(22) *Vietnam*—Withdrawal dates? Executive vs. Legislative prerogatives?

(23) *Space Exploration*—More? Less? Terminate?

(24) *ABM*—Expand? Reduce? Discontinue?

(25) *Troop Deployment Abroad*—Congressional authority? Presidential discretion in emergencies? Declaration of war only?

(26) *Military Draft*—Extend? All volunteer army?

(27) *Crime Control*—New laws? Stricter enforcement of present laws? Harsher or softer penalties? More or less probation and parole? Prevention? Rehabilitation? Police, court and corrections reforms?

(28) *Social Security*—More? Cost of living adjustments? Greater earnings allowance?

LIMITED UNEMPLOYMENT

In any family where the breadwinner has lost a job, the results are tragic. That is why there is so much genuine concern when the unemployment rates begin to rise. An increase in national unemployment is reason for taking quick action to deal with the problem. But even in this most fundamental economic area, it is important to define the problem before attacking it. Some statistics recently compiled by Common Cause interested me because they seemed to indicate that the present unemployment crisis is of limited rather than national scope. There are seven States in which joblessness is disproportionately high—particularly areas where defense-related industries are located—while the other forty-three States show average unemployment below, in most cases well below, the national average of about 6 percent. This fact raises doubts about attacking the present problem with massive national programs. Wouldn't it be better to deal with the unemployment in just those limited areas where more people than normal are out of work? And wouldn't it be better to tell the American people that the unemployment crisis is a concentrated one rather than spreading the fear of joblessness across the land?

CAMPAIGN TALE

There's a story circulating on the House floor about one Congressman's re-election campaign last year. It seems that this veteran of several terms found himself running against a young candidate with a slick television campaign. The TV advertising showed the young man walking with his wife through a green pasture, looking upward toward the sky while cows grazed peacefully in the background. The veteran Representative's answer to that ad was simply: "I may not be as smart as my young opponent, but at least I have sense enough to look down when I'm walking through a cow pasture." He won with his biggest margin ever.

DRIVE AGAINST DRUGS

The drug menace in our society is being attacked on many fronts. In a series of raids recently, Federal agents rounded up 56 of the Nation's top drug peddlers in the biggest drug crackdown in history. A team of doctors from Johns Hopkins have gone after the problem by compiling hard facts about it. Among their findings are these: Hard drug dealers do an \$84 million per year business; addicts steal \$313 million worth of goods to pay for their dependence; and in a specific case, the doctors found an addict who mugged people three nights a week averaging \$150 a night. A more heartening note is the entrance of major corporations into the war against drug abuse. A great deal of their advertising money is being spent to warn Americans about the drug menace. The message on the right particularly caught my eye.

PRESS ON PRESS

Kenneth Crawford, the retired Washington Bureau Chief for *Newsweek* and now a columnist, writes this about press coverage of the Laotian situation: "By part of the press, it is treated as a cunning scheme to inject Americans into an expanded war rather than what it is—a bold attempt to prepare for continued evacuation of American forces. Reporters and editors keep telling themselves

and others that they have been more perceptive about this war than military and political leaders. They may be right. But they have enjoyed the advantage of ultimate irresponsibility. In President Nixon's place, they would probably be doing about what he is doing. And history may be more approving of him than them."

PRESIDENTIAL SCHOLAR

I was visited in Washington recently by James Gerstenlauer who was in the Nation's Capitol attending a Presidential Classroom For Young Americans. Jim is a senior at Ephrata High School, and one of a handful of students from across the Nation who got an opportunity to participate in the Presidential Classroom program.

PERSONAL FREEDOM

What are American's really searching for today? An answer to that question was advanced by President Nixon in 1968. It is an answer which seems just as valid in 1971 and helps explain his New Revolution. "We won our fight for political freedom two centuries ago; we won a battle for human freedom a century ago; today, we are in a fight for our personal freedom. Personal freedom, to me, is at the root of human dignity. Personal freedom is room to turn around in life. It is the right to grow in your own way, to learn what is not yet being taught; it is both the right to privacy and the right to participate. Personal freedom is not a license to disrupt, but it is a liberty to dissent; not a duty to destroy, but an obligation to challenge. Personal freedom will not insure that every man will get all he desires; it will insure that every man will get all he deserves. Those Americans who once had personal freedom and lost it, now want it back; those who never had it at all, want it now. In striving for a worthy goal—security—we have lost a worthy asset/individually, the hallmark of personal freedom. In trying to provide for the material needs of all, we have stolen from the personal freedom of each. . . . Well, what are we going to do about it? We cannot turn back the clock; we must not undo all the good we have done, as we try now to regain the freedom we have lost. Nor can we throw up our hands and say that one man does not count anymore—that we've traded personal freedom away for the security of a big, paternal government. We do have another choice. We must find a way to make government work for all of us without dominating any one of us. We have to establish new respect for the qualities of initiative, personal sacrifice, and readiness to seize opportunity, that made the individual American the wonder of the world."

THREE BASIC OBJECTIVES

The President's thoughts on personal freedom bring to mind some of my own research findings. During the past several weeks, my staff and I have been devoting a good deal of time to studying the welfare crisis. We are hopeful that our studies will lead to the development of some welfare solutions. But, as we accumulated facts and worked with possible answers, one convincing bit of evidence has emerged. It is apparent that the individual must be the central factor in any real solution. That kind of approach will demand programs stressing three basic objectives—self-determination, self-sufficiency and self-respect.

ISRAEL—THE WINNER TAKES NOTHING

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 23, 1971

Mr. ANDERSON, of California. Mr. Speaker, following the Revolutionary

War, what would have been George Washington's reaction to a proposal to return to British rule the States of New York, Massachusetts, and Connecticut?

Following World War II, how would President Truman have reacted to a proposal to return France, Poland, and Hungary to Germany?

Following the Mexican War, how would President Polk have reacted to a proposal to return Texas to the Mexican Government?

In each of these cases, I think most reasoning men would scoff off these suggestions as ridiculous. But, in the Middle East, is that not what we are suggesting to Israel?

By endorsing the Egyptian-Russian suggestion that Israel return the lands she occupies as a result of the lightning war of 1967, Secretary Rogers is asking Israel to trade her security for a promise—for a piece of paper that has been ripped to shreds too many times in the past.

Israel wants peace. Israel has been deceived—has been betrayed—too often in the past to rely on the dictates and the fantasies of other nations. Israel has shed too much blood to give up her security for an I O U which has proven to be baseless.

While the United Arab Republic can lose battle after battle, Israel cannot afford to lose once. For, when Israel loses, there will be no more nation of Israel.

Mr. Speaker, I oppose this policy which may threaten the security of Israel and I am asking Secretary Rogers to reconsider his stand. I feel that our role must be as a true and constant friend of Israel.

We must not ask her to jeopardize her security.

Mr. Speaker, an editorial which appeared in the March 21 edition of the Los Angeles Herald-Examiner, succinctly and accurately states the facts, and I concur with the opinion of Mr. Hearst. I commend this editorial to my colleagues and I urge them to express their views on our Middle East policy to Secretary Rogers.

The editorial follows:

THE WINNER TAKES NOTHING?

(By William Randolph Hearst, Jr.)

NEW YORK.—Just who was it who won that astonishing six-day war between Israel and the Arabs back in June of 1967?

There certainly was no debate at the time. Little Israel, coming on like little David of the Old Testament, with its aerial slingshot thoroughly trounced the bur-noosed Arab Goliath.

Instead of slaying him, though, as in the Biblical tale, the Israelis merely chased him back across the River Nile. Israel could have taken the Suez Canal. It could have razed Cairo, Damascus and Amman. It could have forced Nasser to sign a peace treaty while sitting on a pyramid.

Yet today, almost four years after one of the quickest and most decisive victories in military history, the question of who won seems to have been forgotten by just about everyone except the Israelis.

Today, in fact, the answer to the question is far from clear. In a truly strange reversal of roles, Israel today finds itself on the defensive against an international diplomatic gang-up which demands a return of all lands won in the 1967 blitz.

It is not surprising that Egypt, backed by Russia, should make such an irrational de-

mand in the hope of partial success. It is not even too surprising that the United Nations Security Council, in the hope of achieving a permanent peace pact, should have taken the same position as a prod toward eventual compromises.

What really is surprising—both to me and to the Israelis—is that the United States should have come up this week with a new Mideast policy which stresses the same unrealistic demand on Israel as do its enemies.

It happened when Secretary of State Bill Rogers—who incidentally deserves a lot of credit for achieving the recent ceasefires in the area—declared in a major pronouncement that Israel's security would be better served by treaties and international guarantees than by territorial acquisition to defensible boundaries.

If after all the months of labor the Republican elephant can produce only this mouse of an idea, it does not belong under the same big tent with those professional tight-rope walkers and other trained diplomatic seals. All the U.S. plan does is to reinforce the gangup on Israel and put the whole peace initiative right back where it was with the UN withdrawal resolution of Nov. 22, 1967.

It did even worse than that. Unfortunately, and perhaps dangerously, the Rogers pronouncement also exacerbated longstanding policy differences between the U.S. and our Mideast ally—creating new tensions which the Russians and their Egyptian stooges will surely seek to exploit.

Quite properly, Israeli Prime Minister Golda Meir reacted immediately with a firm declaration that her country is not about to submit to arm twisting by us or by anybody else.

"We cannot trust what Mr. Rogers offers us," she said. "We have paid for what we have won and that is something people don't always remember."

Contrary to what other kibitzers of the 1967 war seem to think today, Israel's leaders are convinced they won it and thus have a perfect right to retain as much as they deem important to their security.

At the risk of saying, "I told you so," I refer you to a column of mine of last Jan. 10 entitled "Mideast Peace Formula."

In it I said flatly that Israel has been sold down the river too often in the past to ever again trust the promises of anybody. This was seen as ruling out the return of any captured territory regarded as vital for Israel's defense.

There is no claim of originality in this. In fact even a child should be able to realize that Israel's leaders have really had it this time, and for mighty good reason.

All you have to do is look at the record. It is a record of broken guarantees.

As far back as 1917 during the first World War Great Britain promised the Jews it would set up Palestine for them as a Jewish state, but later it reneged on that promise.

Eisenhower, in 1956, promised the Suez Canal would be kept open for Israeli shipping—and it wasn't.

The UN promised that the Golan Heights would not be armed again for Arab shelling of Israeli farmlands—and the bombardments resumed.

France promised it would back Israel's right to answer with force any over-t Egyptian threats to its security—then withdrew its support in the 1967 crisis.

More recently, we ourselves did nothing when Russia and Egypt immediately broke U.S.-sponsored truce terms last year by installing SAM-3 missile sites in the canal zone.

Israel, as Mrs. Meir said, did indeed pay for the Syrian Golan Heights it occupied in 1967, just as it paid for the Gaza Strip and for Sharm El-Sheikh, the bastion used by Nasser to seal off Israeli shipping through the Gulf of Aqaba.

It paid in the bloodshed of three wars. Over the last 23 years there have been many more broken promises, so many that it would take a whole column merely to list them in full.

All I have tried to do here is to suggest how off base our Secretary of State was when he told Israel this week that "it is not necessary to acquire territory to make adequate provisions for security . . . a contractual agreement is the most adequate possible guarantee."

That statement, as more than proven by the sorry record, is simply not true. A contractual agreement in the minds of many is just a scrap of paper.

Israel, of course, has no desire or need to retain all the territory it seized in 1967. It stands ready and willing to negotiate as soon as the other side—and ironically now even the U.S.—stops insisting on an unrealistic total withdrawal to its pre-1967 borders.

Eventually, if it ever proves possible to reach an agreement, there is going to have to be some kind of international force to police buffer zones.

Secretary Rogers, in his statement this week, stated that such an international patrol force properly could include U.S. troops—and here, once again, I take sharp issue with his position.

It is my very strong conviction that we should be working overtime to get our troops out of other countries rather than planning to ship more overseas—anywhere.

By this time, it seems to me, we should have had a bellyfull of sending American men out to help solve other people's problems by assigning them to patrols where they risk getting shot.

Peace in the Middle East and reopening of the Suez Canal naturally are matters of importance to us. But they are much more important to the nations of Europe.

To date, by and large, those nations have been sitting around doing little or nothing because of their selfish conviction that good old Uncle Sam will do their dirty work for them.

It is high time they started getting off their duffs and taking steps to protect their own paramount interests.

We do not need the Suez Canal half as much as such countries do. It is their men, not ours, who should be part of any Mideast patrol force.

Our role should be simply that of Israel's most constant and dependable friend.

ADMINISTRATION PROPOSES CUTBACKS IN ELDERLY PROGRAMS WHILE PROMOTING 1971 WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON AGING

HON. SAM GIBBONS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 23, 1971

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I insert in the RECORD a statement by Mr. Nelson H. Cruikshank, president of the National Council of Senior Citizens, which I am sure will be of interest to Members of the House:

ADMINISTRATION PROPOSES CUTBACKS IN ELDERLY PROGRAMS WHILE PROMOTING 1971 WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON AGING

WASHINGTON, D.C.—The Nixon Administration has turned its back on the nation's elderly, Nelson H. Cruikshank, President of the 3,000,000-member National Council of Senior Citizens, charged today.

"While Presidential Aide John B. Martin

is predicting this will be a great year for the elderly because the White House Conference on Aging is scheduled this year, the Administration's actions reveal the low priority the White House places on the needs of the elderly," the 68-year-old spokesman for the senior citizens' organization declared. "The Administration's restrictive actions against aged Americans, as revealed in the President's budget, show he is unwilling to wait for the deliberations of the White House Conference in November."

Cruikshank listed these actions which, he said, were bad medicine for older Americans:

Administration insistence on limiting any further Social Security increase to 6 per cent—even though the Senate voted last year for a 10 per cent Social Security increase and House Ways and Means Chairman Wilbur D. Mills has promised to support a Social Security increase in this amount.

Cruikshank said even a 10 per cent increase is far from what is needed. The National Council of Senior Citizens seeks a 15 per cent increase immediately and a 20 per cent Social Security increase next year and an immediate doubling of the Social Security minimum benefit—now \$64 a month.

Reported Administration plans to make Medicare beneficiaries pay additional out-of-pocket charges so they will bear a larger share of the cost of health services now available to them. Cruikshank called the proposed new out-of-pocket charges required of Medicare beneficiaries "barriers to adequate health care," asserting that "instead of lowering or removing these barriers, the Administration wants to pile them higher and higher."

Severe cuts in funding the U.S. Administration on Aging, Cruikshank said Congress authorized \$30,000,000 in funds for community programs for the elderly but the Administration asked for only \$5,350,000 for these programs in the coming year. This is 40 per cent less than the \$9 million provided for these programs in the current Federal budget and will force the closing of many local senior citizens' centers where isolated, impoverished elderly can participate in social and community programs, Cruikshank declared.

The senior citizens' spokesman said "all this is taking place in the very week in which task force making preparation for the White House Conference on Aging were in session and a meeting of the White House Conference Executive Committee was scheduled (in Washington's exclusive Watergate office and residential complex)."

The one program for the elderly to win favor with the Administration, Cruikshank said, would employ elderly persons who can afford to volunteer their services for community betterment. He noted that the President's budget calls for an outlay of \$5,000,000 for this program next year, which is 10 times the amount in the current budget, to provide care and lunch money for these volunteers (under Retired Senior Volunteer Program).

"Programs to enable the elderly poor to become self-supporting on wages are vetoed," Cruikshank declared in a reference to the President's veto of the Manpower bill which would have, Cruikshank said, financed public and community service jobs for the young, middle aged and elderly."

The senior citizens spokesman recalled that, following the first general meeting of White House Conference planners held last October in Washington, each of those present received along with the minutes of the meeting a political document entitled "What the Nixon Administration Has Done for Older Americans."

Cruikshank observed: "Now, the elderly are learning what the Nixon Administration is trying to do to them."

OVERLOOKED SPACE PROGRAM BENEFITS

HON. JAMES D. (MIKE) McKEVITT

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 23, 1971

Mr. McKEVITT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to share with the House what I consider to be an excellent account of how this Nation is getting its money's worth out of our space program. I refer to an editorial printed in the March 15, 1971, issue of the authoritative and respected Aviation Week and Space Technology.

The article follows:

OVERLOOKED SPACE PROGRAM BENEFITS

Apollo 14's three astronauts passed by a hotel housing welfare families during their tickertape parade welcome to New York last week. Waiting there on the sidewalk were 20 or so demonstrators with signs like one that read: "White astronauts fly to the moon while black children die in welfare hotels."

On the steps of City Hall, where Mayor John V. Lindsay greeted the three crewmen—Alan B. Shepard, Jr., Edgar D. Mitchell, Jr., and Stuart A. Roosa—there were other demonstrators. While the mayor spoke, they chanted, "Crumbs for the children, millions for the moon."

A National Aeronautics and Space Administration spokesman with the astronauts said that the welfare demonstration was not directed at the astronauts. His impression was that they took advantage of the TV and news coverage they knew would follow the parade, whose route had been published, to focus attention on an issue that has been controversial in New York. Similarly, the City Hall demonstration has been planned earlier in the wake of a proposed mass layoff of New York substitute teachers, he said, and the demonstration had been planned earlier in occasion.

This may well be the case. Mayor Lindsay in the past has himself taken the line that space or defense funds ought to be diverted to the cities. On this occasion, however, he talked more in terms that funding for space and for urban programs were not mutually exclusive.

Nevertheless, the incidents—even if the demonstrators were few—brought home again that the U.S. space effort cannot exist on a bed of platitudes. A good example of how to meet a grassroots audience with facts was a recent appearance by J. F. Clayton, general manager at Bendix Aerospace Systems Div., at a Rotary Club meeting in Ann Arbor, Mich. He said in part:

"What are the benefits of the space program? You have all heard of sharper X-ray pictures, the longer lasting paint, the faster dentist drills, small TV cameras, new medical instruments and far better ice cream freezers. These are comparatively trivial and insignificant outputs of the program and certainly are not in themselves ways to justify the expense and energy we have undertaken.

"I believe there are [other] overriding benefits that have already been realized and will continue to have a profound effect on not only this country but the rest of the world.

"The first benefit has to do with finding solutions to overwhelmingly complex problems. The national space program represents a successful management approach to accomplish the almost impossible. The task of going to the moon required a government, industry, and university team which, at its peak, involved organizing 400,000 people, hundreds of universities and 20,000 separate industrial companies to a common goal. This project was done in public and full view of the world. It was done without a military

objective and it was done within the cost and schedule set for it 10 years earlier. These management techniques are available to the country if we ever decide to again use them on what we now consider almost impossible tasks.

"The second benefit is the exploration itself. We obviously cannot forecast what our descendants centuries from now will say about our beginning the exploration of space. But as we look back to earlier centuries it is obvious how tremendous an impact the exploration of our ancestors had on our life today. We can think of Columbus and Marco Polo and Charles Darwin and the voyage of the Beagle and many others. One of the unique aspects of the voyage of the Beagle was that it was the first time that science had ever been involved in exploration.

"Darwin's 'ridiculous' collection of rocks, plants and animal life took ten years to study after he returned. But now we know that the results of this obscure exploration simply revolutionized our understanding of our world and everything in it.

"A third benefit of the national space program is the leadership that it has given us in science and technology.

"At this time someone usually interrupts me, perhaps if they are polite Rotarians they do not jump up and shout, but they say 'how can we justify spending billions exploring the moon when there are so many pressing problems here on earth?' Well then let us look at a comparison of where the taxpayers' money has gone.

"Since 1961, when it started, through last year the space program has cost \$38 billion. Of this, \$24 billion has been involved directly or indirectly on the Apollo program. During the same period the country has spent \$624 billion for military purposes. This, too, is a well known number. But here is a number people have not been made aware of: during the same period we have spent \$340 billion on health and welfare. Do we feel that health and welfare social programs are getting a fair share of the federal budget?

"The ratio of expenditures on the social programs is growing. In 1971, this fiscal year, the country will spend \$77.2 billion on social programs, slightly greater than the defense budget of \$73.5 billion compared to the space expenditure of \$3.265 billion. That is a ratio of 23 to 1 in favor of social programs. We could close down the NASA establishment, let facilities at Cape Kennedy go back to jungle. We could terminate the employment of all aerospace engineers and scientists. We could close the university laboratories. Save the \$3 billion and spend perhaps \$80 billion next year on social programs. Does anyone seriously think that the country's interest would be served. Please do not misunderstand, I do not oppose social welfare programs. But the figures do show that these programs are currently being funded at substantial levels when one looks at the total budget.

"There has been clearly one event in our national life that has caused real frustration and perhaps is responsible for this senseless lashing out against good science and technology. I am referring, of course, to the Vietnam War. Through last year the expenditures for this war during the previous six years have been \$107 billion. During the last three years the war has cost as much per year as the total cost of the lunar exploration program. In 1969 the war cost \$25 billion, 1968—\$28 billion, 1967—\$26 billion. We spend as a nation \$160 million per day for the Vietnam War. The space program has cost you 5 cents per day since 1961.

"I was impressed with something that Mr. [Daniel P.] Moynihan recently said in his farewell address to the Administration. The American people are particularly able to skip their attention from one major problem to another very quickly and in the proc-

ess lose sight of long-term priorities. Just yesterday space exploration was a major concern but today is out of vogue.

"The suggestion of an either/or choice between technological and social advances ignores the fact that without a technology base we will not have the capability to address ourselves effectively to any national problem."

IMPORTS DAMAGE GLASS INDUSTRY

HON. ROBERT H. MOLLOHAN
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 23, 1971

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Speaker, for the past 2 years much of the Congress has been concerned about the future direction of our Nation's trade policies. Particularly, those of us who represent areas where industry has been seriously affected by the unprecedented growth of imports have been most attuned to the direct harm these imports have had on our industry.

But the impact of these trends affect the entire Nation and should be closely examined by all of us. By and large, the industries which have suffered the most are those which have labor intensive operations as contrasted to those which have a high degree of mechanization and automation. The pressure has been twofold on the American economy in this instance. First, nations with low wage costs have drastically increased their imports and in essence through this practice we are subsidizing an amount of labor exploitation through our purchases of goods from nations which pay these low wages.

The second pressure upon the American economy has come from the American corporation which moves its operations abroad to take advantage of this low labor cost and then exports its products back to the United States. This trend is truly disturbing in its growth.

In view of these trends, the Stone, Glass, and Clay Coordinating Committee recently testified before the Tariff Commission on the competitive position of U.S. industries. Their documentation is very revealing of the situation that is now upon us.

Mr. Speaker, the investment of U.S. capital abroad is now substantially in excess of \$100 billion, and the export-import trade of this Nation in 1970 exceeded \$120 billion.

For this reason, I commend the report of this important labor group to the Congress. It should be required reading for every serious student of international trade.

The report follows:

STATEMENT OF THE STONE, GLASS, AND CLAY COORDINATING COMMITTEE

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Commission:

Our Stone, Glass and Clay Coordinating Committee is composed of seven International Unions, all affiliated with the AFL-CIO, who have joined together to cooperate on mutual problems that affect any one, or

all of our seven affiliates. We have a combined membership of 250,000 workers, with active locals in almost all of the fifty states.

We have a direct concern in the competitive position of U.S. Industries, and appreciate this opportunity to express our views on this vital subject. As previously announced, you are considering the impact of imports on U.S. Industries and the effect of this impact on our economy, our communities and our workers.

This statement on behalf of our full Committee addresses the general problems involved with trade and then the specific problems that directly concern the seven International Unions that comprise our Committee.

BALANCE OF TRADE

Contrary to the wide spread opinions and published figures showing trade surplus, to properly figure where we really stand on balance, two considerations must be accounted for: (1) our imports figured on a c.i.f. basis instead of f.o.b., and (2) our exports must exclude U.S. Government subsidies on agricultural exports such as P.L. 480, Food for Peace, AID loans and grants, and military grant aid. *These exports are not competitive exports.*

To emphasize this point, we have excerpted a table placed in the record of the hearings before the Ways and Means Committee by the Secretary of Commerce, Maurice H. Stans, May 12, 1970, page 480. This table clearly shows that the U.S. has sustained sizeable deficits in the trade account in the last four years, \$7.9 billion dollars. This enlightening table further shows that our trade statistics should truly show our position in trade, so that trade policy decisions can be based on accurate figures and not figures that undervalue imports and overvalue exports. (See Appendix—Table A.)

HIGH-TECHNOLOGY VERSUS LOW-TECHNOLOGY MANUFACTURES

In determining the impact of imports on U.S. industries, consideration must be given to labor intensity involved in producing a product. The heavier impact from imports falls on the low-technology manufactures where more workers are employed and where we have moved steadily to a position of substantial deficit. For example, our deficit in 1963 of 1.7 billion has increased to a deficit of 5.5 billion in 1969. This point was clearly illustrated by Secretary of Commerce Stans in testimony before the Ways and Means Committee in May of this year, in response to a question by Congressman Vanik (Report of Hearings, page 472) regarding labor intensity, Secretary Stans placed in the record a study in chart form showing the breakdown of imports and exports in high-technology manufactures compared with low-technology manufactures. (Ways & Means Hearing report, page 473.) (See Appendix—Table B.)

U.S. PRIVATE FOREIGN INVESTMENT

Another important consideration affecting the import-export position of U.S. industries is the astounding growth of U.S. private foreign investment.

Manufacturing leads all other industry investment abroad with 41% of the total or \$26.3 billion and this increased foreign capacity can only serve to decrease our exports and increase our imports, and since capital is mobile and labor is not, the result has been loss of American jobs.

This point was made with great clarity by Deputy Under-Secretary of Labor, George Hildebrand in a speech to the National Foreign Trade Council's, Labor Affairs Committee in September, 1969:

"It has often been assumed that high U.S. wages and better working conditions were largely offset by high U.S. productivity and a strong internal market. Increasingly, how-

ever, the spread of skills and technology, licensing arrangements and heavy investment in new and efficient facilities in foreign lands have all served to increase foreign productivity without comparable increases in wages. The problem we have is to assure that the social and economic gains of the American worker and the purchasing power that goes with it are not undermined by competitive goods produced and exported on the basis of much lower standards which some may view as an exploitation of human resources."

The following Chart "A" will serve to show the astounding increases in our U.S. foreign investments; Chart "B" the area distribution of U.S. direct private foreign investments; Chart "C" the industry distribution of U.S. direct private foreign investments. (The sources of information for Charts A, B, and C were the 1958 Hearings by the Subcommittee on Private Foreign Investment, and the Department of Commerce "Survey of Current Business," September, 1967 and October, 1969.)

CHART A.—U.S. PRIVATE INVESTMENT ABROAD

	[Millions of dollars]			
	1950	1957	1966	1968
Private Investments.....	19,004	36,812	86,235	101,900
Long term.....	17,488	33,588	75,565	88,930
Direct.....	11,788	25,252	54,562	64,756
Portfolio.....	5,700	8,336	21,003	24,174
Short term.....	1,516	3,224	10,670	12,970

In Chart "A" we find that total U.S. private investment abroad in 1968 has increased by 436 percent over the 1950 figure of \$19.0 billion. In all divisions of private foreign investment, comparing 1950-1957-1966-1968, there have been tremendous increases in the holdings of U.S. companies and private investors abroad.

CHART "B"—Area distribution of U.S. Direct private foreign investments

1957		Percent
Latin America.....		35
Canada.....		33
Middle East & Africa.....		9
Western Europe.....		16
Other.....		7
Book values, \$25.3 billion.		
1968:		Percent
Latin America.....		20
Canada.....		30
Western Europe.....		30
All Other.....		20

Book values, \$64.7 billion.

In Chart "B" comparing the area distribution of direct private foreign investment for 1957 with 1968 we find that considerably more investment dollars went into Western Europe, with a 14 percent increase, so the investment flow is to the developed countries, in Western Europe and to Canada, while the less developed and underdeveloped countries in Latin America, Africa and the Middle East dropped considerably in investments to their areas. And this happened despite the emphasis, stated in the 1958 Hearings, on the necessity of changing the private investment pattern to encourage more flow to Latin America, Middle East and Africa to deter the Soviet economic offensive in those areas.

CHART "C"—Industry distribution of U.S. direct private foreign investments

1957:		Percent
Petroleum.....		36
Manufacturing.....		31
Mining.....		11
Public Utilities.....		7
Distribution.....		6
Other.....		9

Book values, \$25.3 billion.

1968:		Percent
Petroleum.....		29
Manufacturing.....		41
Mining.....		8
All Other.....		22

Book values, \$64.7 billion.

Chart "C" compares the industry distribution of U.S. direct private foreign investments in 1957 with 1968. You will note a strong upward thrust in manufacturing investment, a 10 percent increase over 1957, a decline in petroleum and mining. Manufacturing leads all other industry investment with a 1968 foreign total of \$26.3 billion in all areas, while petroleum is in second place with \$18.8 billion.

The three charts which show the increases in U.S. private foreign investment bear out a prediction made by Mr. Robert M. Mitchell, Vice President of the Whirlpool Corporation, in Hearings held on the subject of private foreign investment by the Subcommittee on Foreign Trade Policy, December 1958. After Mr. Mitchell's testimony, questions were asked by Congressman John W. Byrnes:

Mr. BYRNES. As I gather the basis of your concern here, among other things, is the fact that you foresee a necessity as far as American business is concerned to shift from an export business to manufacturing abroad, an investing and going through the manufacturing process abroad; is that right?

Mr. MITCHELL. That is correct, Mr. Byrnes.

Mr. BYRNES. Do you attribute that trend in part to this common market trend, the European Common Market and the proposals for a common market in other areas? Is there any other factor that gives rise to that?

Mr. MITCHELL. Basically that is it, Mr. Byrnes. In many of the Latin American countries at the moment for practical purposes it is impossible to export particularly consumer durable goods. There is a rising nationalism in many of these countries, and they are trying to industrialize, and to raise their standard of living. So that American companies, if they are going to have a part of that market at all, must invest in some form or other.

Mr. BYRNES. You don't see a great future then as far as the export of finished commodities from this country. You see that contracting, I gather, and an increase in manufacturing abroad and with foreign labor?

Mr. MITCHELL. I think that is the way it will happen, yes, sir.

Mr. BYRNES. Great emphasis has been put on the fact of the importance of the trade-agreements program and all of the rest of it, and the increase in our exports, and the developing of this freer trade. I gather that you would suggest at least by your testimony that we may be getting into a period where that is going to be reversed?

Mr. MITCHELL. I think that that is quite right, sir.

Mr. BYRNES. That is all.

This prediction of increasing investment abroad and the decrease in the export of finished commodities from this country has come to pass. This increased foreign capacity can only serve to decrease our exports and increase our imports, and since capital is mobile and labor is not, the result has been loss of American jobs and loss to those American industries that do not choose to move or that do not have the capital to make such a move.

Many of these global corporations are showing their concern against any restriction to their access to the U.S. market. They recognize that free access to U.S. markets is in their corporation interest; they want to invest abroad, enjoy the markets and low-wage labor; and they also want to enjoy the U.S. market from abroad, in some cases in direct competition with their domestic operation

or other domestic producers of the same product.

As stated by former Assistant Secretary of Commerce, William H. Chartener, "Efforts to improve the U.S. foreign trade balance are being hampered by growing competition from U.S. corporate affiliates abroad." (Washington Post, September 26, 1968.)

The time has come for a re-evaluation of this expanded investment program in terms of the U.S. economy, employment, outflow of capital, loss of revenue to the United States and effect of imports on U.S. industry and labor.

IMPACT ON OUR SEVEN UNIONS

Our group of seven International Unions represent members in industries that produce labor-intensive products; the displacement of jobs has been tremendous and certainly points out what happens to labor when imports of manufactured products penetrate to the extent they have in the 1960s. Our seven Unions are concerned with products that are extremely import sensitive, products such as: pottery, ceramic tile, glassware, T.V. tubes, cement, potash, stone and flat glass. We are not alone in our concern, many other industries and unions are showing their concern.

We submit that for labor-intensive industries to compete with the like product produced in foreign countries, who have our technology and production system, plus a lower wage structure, can only be destructive to our U.S. economy.

How destructive? Let's look at the pottery industry where since 1954, twenty-one plants have closed their doors, where employment has dropped from 12,000 workers to 3,600 workers, yet imports have really invaded the domestic market, taking 90% of the chinaware and 40% of the earthenware markets—where foreign value of chinaware and earthenware imports in 1954 was \$19.2 million and has now reached in 1969 the astounding figure of \$93.3 million dollars—with Japan far in the lead as the source of imports. (See Appendix—Table C.)

This is only one striking example; we have glassware plants who have closed their doors, sheet glass plants, cement plants, T.V. tube, potash and ceramic tile plants—with many plants that are still operating, working at greatly reduced capacity and many workers laid off.

In a recent case before the Tariff Commission (TEA-W-11) petitioning the Commission for adjustment assistance for the workers of Cambridge Tile Company, all six Commissioners agreed that imports had increased and that workers at Cambridge Tile were unemployed. However, the majority of the Commission found that the increased imports were not in major part the result of concessions granted under trade agreements, but rather by dumping and other unfair practices; in any case our petition was rejected 4-2.

In the course of the investigation a chart was compiled and published in the report to the President showing the overall penetration of imports of ceramic floor and wall tile, the data clearly show the rising import penetration from 7% of consumption in 1955 to 38% in 1969. (See Table D.)

In December 1969 the Tariff Commission reported to the President on an escape clause investigation on flat glass, the report covered the various segments of the industry, namely rolled glass, sheet glass, plate and float glass and tempered glass. The findings were negative on all segments with the exception of sheet glass where the Commission split 3-3. The President continued the modified rates until January 31, 1972, followed by a two year phase out of the modified rates. Sheet glass imports have been steadily increasing and in 1968 show a ratio of imports to consumption of 31.8%. Plants have closed and reduced capacity, in three of the plants; Arnold and Jeanette, Pennsylvania

and Henryetta. Oklahoma the workers are drawing adjustment assistance—which provision was proclaimed by President Nixon, on February 27 together with the two-year continuance of the modified rates.

T.V. tubes and the manufacture of the glass envelope for such tubes, in which two of our affiliates are involved, have been seriously affected by rapidly rising imports of T.V. sets. Imports have risen from 128 thousand sets in 1962 to over 4 million sets in 1969 and show a further increase in January–May 1970 over January–May 1969. (T.C. report to the President, TEA-W-21, July 1970)

In addition to the tubes imported within the T.V. sets, direct imports of tubes as such amounted to 95 thousand tubes in 1964, increasing to 387 thousand in 1967.

In 1969, 210 thousand tubes were imported, added to the 4,034,000 sets or a total of 4,244,000 tubes imported in 1969 which amounted to 31% of domestic consumption.

What is the employment situation with respect to the employees engaged in the manufacture of the glass envelope used for the T.V. tube? The employment figures from the Union, which are current and dated October 7, 1970, show that within three companies, Corning Glass, Owens-Illinois and Lancaster Glass Corporation, in their T.V. tube manufacturing operations only, the employment has dropped from 6,116 workers in 1966 to 4,466 workers in 1970 for a loss of 1,650 workers or 27% of the entire work force involved in T.V. tube manufacture. The outlook is very bleak for being called back to these plants, or getting work within another industry, especially in light of our present unemployment rate nationally. The hardship on these unemployed workers, their families and their communities can not be minimized.

Other Unions who represent employees engaged in the production of T.V. sets and components, other than the glass envelope, are vitally concerned. The IUE, IBEW, and the IAM have suffered a tremendous loss of jobs in the last four years.

Members of our Committee will be testifying on other import sensitive products such as glassware, potash and stone products. One of our affiliated Unions will be unable to be present, the United Cement, Lime & Gypsum Workers, so I would like to briefly cover one of the industries they are concerned with, the cement industry.

The cement industry has long been plagued with foreign countries "dumping" cement into the U.S. Over a period of years, this industry has been seriously damaged by the unfair competition of "dumping" and with this damage, the man-hours worked and the wages paid to the workers has been seriously affected.

Table I is a list of the antidumping proceedings filed by the domestic cement industry against imports from no less than 15 foreign countries during the years 1958–1967. Table II records the amount of foreign cement imported from these "dumpers" during the same period. Table III shows how much this unfair competition has hurt our critical balance of payments position. Using the latest Bureau of Labor Statistics figures on productivity in the domestic cement industry (5.97 barrels per man hour in 1966 and 6.27 barrels per man hour in 1967), Table IV translates these unfairly lost sales into man hours lost for domestic workers. Finally, using average domestic cement industry wage rates (\$3.97 per hour in 1966 and \$4.27 per hour in 1967), Table V shows the amounts of wages by which American labor has been unfairly deprived as a result of the dumped and tainted imports.

We would like to call the Committee's attention particularly to the figures in Tables IV and V. These tables show that American labor has lost well over 7 million man hours

during the 1958–1967 period, an average of more than 700,000 man hours per year. Similarly, the equivalent wages lost have amounted to over \$24,000,000, an average of almost \$2.5 million a year. Surely American labor should not have to sustain such drastic injury from an importing practice that has been condemned as an unfair method of competition not only by the United States Congress but also by Article VI of GATT.

SUMMARY

The American people have for many years been misled, with regard to our balance of trade figures, into believing the United States has been enjoying large surplus in our trade account, when in fact we are not. Reporting imports on a cif basis, withdrawing Government subsidies when reporting agricultural exports, would give a true picture of our balance of trade.

Accurate and realistic trade statistics on our imports and exports would make possible more responsible and responsive decisions on our Nation's foreign trade policy. It is imperative for the Congress to have the accurate facts at their disposal so they can regulate foreign commerce and preserve this Nation's economic well-being. Secretary of Commerce Stans clarified this point before the Ways & Means Committee with a chart showing how the U.S. has been in deficit the last four years in the amount of \$7.9 billion dollars. (Appendix—Table A.)

In a comparison of our trade in high-technology vs. low-technology manufacturers we find that the heavier impact from imports falls on the low-technology manufacturers, where more workers are employed producing products containing more labor input.

It is clear, from a chart placed in the record of the Ways & Means hearings by Secretary Stans that our deficit in low-technology manufactures is rapidly rising. In 1963 our deficit was \$1.7 billion dollars and in 1969 had increased to \$5.5 billion dollars, in contrast our high-technology manufactures have maintained a surplus during this period 1963–1969.

With National unemployment rising, the area where most of our labor force is employed, the low-technology manufactures area, has been the hardest hit by unemployment and is suffering from the highest penetration of imports. The serious loss of employment in this import-sensitive area must be halted and reversed if we are to provide employment for American workers and help our unemployed.

American jobs are being exported to other countries by the astounding increase in U.S. private foreign investment. Direct investment abroad in 1950 was \$11.7 billion and increased to \$64.7 billion in 1968 the latest figures available.

Sixty percent of this investment has gone to the developed countries in Western Europe and to Canada. Manufacturing leads all other industry investment with a 1968 foreign total of \$26.3 billion in all areas, or 41% of the total.

United States foreign manufacturing affiliates' sales in 1965 were \$42.4 billion compared to \$18.3 billion in 1957, for an increase of 132 percent.

In 1965, \$34.7 billion of such sales were within the area of plant location, however, \$7.7 billion represented export sales to other countries, including the United States. The products shipped to the U.S. amounted to 24 percent of total export sales of manufacturing affiliates, or \$1,856 billion.

This figure does not include exports to the U.S. of foreign mining affiliates of U.S. firms in the amount of \$1.225 billion, nor does it include exports to the U.S. of petroleum and petroleum products by U.S. foreign petroleum affiliates, estimated at \$2,052 billion.

Combining manufacturing, mining and petroleum export sales to the U.S., by U.S. foreign affiliates in 1965, the total would be an astounding \$5.133 billion.

The time has come for a re-evaluation of this expanded investment program in terms of the U.S. economy, employment, outflow of capital, loss of revenue to the United States and effect of imports on U.S. industry and labor.

To further illustrate the immense problem for labor flowing from the multi-national corporation, I would like to quote from a speech given by Mr. George W. Ball before the British National Committee of the International Chamber of Commerce, London, 1968:

"It is a fact of great import, therefore, that, at a time when politicians have been moving to create regional markets to supersede national markets, businessmen have been making quiet progress on an even larger scale. The great industrial enterprises of the world are moving to recast their plans and design their activities according to the vision of a total world economy. Today a large and rapidly expanding roster of companies is engaged in taking the raw materials produced in one group of countries, transforming these into manufactured goods with the labor and plant facilities of another group, and selling the products in still a third group. And, with the benefit of instant communications, quick transport, computers and modern managerial techniques, they are re-deploying resources and altering patterns of production and distribution month by month in response to changes in price and availability of labor and materials."

This plan in operation avoids a very sensitive area, social responsibility. It is becoming more apparent that labor is the loser in this plan, especially U.S. labor in light of the fact that so many U.S. multi-national corporations are moving to lower wage areas to exploit to their advantage lower wage costs to the serious detriment of the U.S. worker and the U.S. economy, and doing so without penalty or and sense of social responsibility. Ideally we would have world labor unions to deal with the powerful multi-national corporations to extract social justice.

The impact of imports on the industries in which many of the members of our seven Unions work has been devastating. The penetration of imports has been excessive and has caused considerable job loss, over 25% of the work force has been lost in pottery, sheet glass, ceramic tile. T.V. tubes, glassware, potash and stone. In addition to these losses, dumping of cement has eroded employment in the cement industry.

The job losses of these industries, as well as many other adversely affected industries, must be stopped. With unemployment growing and less purchasing power available the entire economy is threatened. Our nation must have a trade policy geared to maximum employment and healthy industries instead of the present policy geared to "freer" trade and the foreign policy illusion that we can remake continents.

We endorse H.R. 18970, the new trade bill as it was reported from the Senate Finance Committee and attached to the Social Security bill.

In addition we would recommend a legal remedy open to us as a member of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT), and that is to invoke Article XII of the Agreement, which authorizes a contracting party to impose restrictions on imports when necessary to prevent a serious decline in its foreign-exchange reserves and maintain equilibrium in its balance of payments.

Also, we should proceed to regulate U.S. private foreign investment, and repeal Tariff

Code 807, to prevent further exportation of American jobs.

Moving on the above three priority items together with responsible attention to our

public debt and our serious balance of payments deficit could put the United States back in a strong economic position so necessary in our world today.

On behalf of the Stone, Glass and Clay Coordinating Committee, I want to thank you for this opportunity to express our convictions before this Commission.

APPENDIX

TABLE A.—ESTIMATED U.S. TRADE BALANCE, 1966-69

[In millions of dollars]

Year	U.S. exports				U.S. imports		U.S. trade balance, based on estimated c.i.f.-valued imports and exports excluding military grant-aid, AID, Law 480 shipments
	Total, including reexports	Military grant-aid	AID loans and grants	Public Law 480 shipments	FOB value	Estimated c.i.f. value	
1966	31,430	940	1,186	1,306	26,998	25,618	27,745
1967	31,622	592	1,300	1,237	28,493	26,889	28,745
1968	34,636	573	1,056	1,178	31,829	33,226	35,519
1969 ¹	37,988	674	994	1,018	35,302	36,052	38,539

¹ Preliminary data.

TABLE B.—U.S. FOREIGN TRADE, 1963, 1965, 1967 and 1969

[Millions of dollars]

	1963	1965	1967	1969
U.S. foreign trade total:				
Domestic exports	23,102	27,187	31,238	37,444
General imports	17,207	21,429	26,889	36,052
High-technology manufactures:				
Exports	10,586	13,030	16,002	20,553
Imports	2,637	3,895	6,988	11,334
Low-technology manufactures:				
Exports	3,710	4,410	4,841	6,212
Imports	5,428	7,350	8,678	11,688
Minerals, fuels and other non-manufactured and non-agricultural products:				
Exports	3,222	3,518	4,015	4,743
Imports	5,122	6,012	6,661	8,076
Agricultural products:				
Exports	5,584	6,229	6,380	5,936
Imports	4,020	4,082	4,472	4,954

WEST MIFFLIN GI KILLED IN WAR

HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 23, 1971

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep regret that I announce the death of another of our brave fightingmen, Army Sp4c. Robert T. Kiser, of West Mifflin, Pa., who was killed in Vietnam.

We owe a profound debt of gratitude and appreciation to our dedicated servicemen who sacrificed their lives for this great country. In tribute to Pvt. Robert Kiser for his heroic action, I wish to honor his memory and commend his courage and valor, by placing in the Record the following article:

W. MIFFLIN GI KILLED IN WAR

A West Mifflin soldier has been killed in action in Indochina, the Defense Department announced yesterday.

He was Army Spec. 4 Robert T. Kiser, 20, son of Mr. and Mrs. Robert E. Kiser, of 2406 Homestead-Duquesne Road.

The Defense Department reported he was killed when a helicopter was hit by enemy anti-aircraft fire and exploded in the air.

A graduate of West Mifflin North High School, Kiser was sent to South Vietnam 20 months ago.

Besides his parents, he is survived by a sister, Lou Anne.

CONGRESSMAN WHALEN REPORTS ON HIS ANNUAL OPINION SURVEY OF THE THIRD OHIO DISTRICT

HON. CHARLES W. WHALEN, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 23, 1971

Mr. WHALEN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce that my annual survey of constituents in the Third Ohio District has been tabulated.

Slightly more than 21,000 replies have been received, a response which indicates a continuing high level of interest in my district in the major national questions. Approximately 157,000 questionnaires were distributed to residents of the Greater Dayton area.

Perhaps the most significant opinion reflected in the poll relates to the Vietnam war and our rate of withdrawal. Sentiment for withdrawal has increased over last year with the majority favoring either the present rate or greater. I believe the statistics speak for themselves.

For the information of my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, I insert herewith the final tabulation of my survey with replies expressed as percentages rounded to the nearest tenth:

SUMMARY OF RESULTS

(By Congressman CHARLES W. WHALEN, Jr.)

1. Which of the following Vietnam alternatives would you prefer (select one)?

a. Maintain the present rate of withdrawal (with 284,000 troops remaining as of June 30, 1971)—33.6.

b. Increase the rate of withdrawal to remove all U.S. troops by December 31, 1971—58.2.

c. Halt the withdrawal and step up the level of U.S. military activity in Vietnam—7.3.

2. What is your position concerning the present draft law—which permits conscription—which will expire June 30, 1971?

a. It should be continued—48.3.

b. It should be terminated in favor of an all-volunteer military force—48.1.

3. What is your position regarding proposed plans (legislation) for a national health insurance program?

a. For—41.1.

b. Against—31.1.

c. Undecided—26.4.

4. If Congress imposes campaign expenditure limitations, which one of the following would you prefer (select one)?

a. A maximum dollar spending limitation—83.1.

b. Limit expenditures for radio and television advertising only—13.8.

5. Should Communist China be admitted to the United Nations?

a. Yes—45.4.

b. No—38.7.

c. Undecided—15.0.

6. Which FIVE of the following would receive your highest priority for funding and federal action?

a. Agriculture—14.6.

b. Aid to Cities—30.8.

c. Air and Water Pollution—82.0.

d. Anti-Crime Programs—65.6.

e. Beautification—3.2.

f. Civil Rights Enforcement—19.7.

g. Defense—44.3.

h. Education—64.1.

i. Foreign Air—1.8.

j. Health—47.0.

k. Highways—10.0.

l. Housing—27.6.

m. Poverty Program—34.5.

n. Public Works—11.8.

o. Space Exploration—15.9.

p. Supersonic Transport—5.8.

(Answers are rounded to the nearest tenth.

Not all answers total 10 percent since some respondents did not reply to all questions.)

THE "CHICAGO"

HON. THOMAS M. REES

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 23, 1971

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, March 26, at the Shoreham Hotel Regency Ballroom, seven of my constituents will present "the Salute to Young America" at the final evening of the 1971 secondary high school program of a Presidential Classroom for Young Americans. My constituents are the world famous group "Chicago," and are favorites among this generation of youth.

Individually the men of "Chicago" are Daniel Seraphine, drummer; James Pan-kow, trombonist; Terry Kath, guitarist; Lee Loughnane, trumpeter; Walt Para-

zaid, flute and reeds; Lamm, pianist-organist; and Peter Cetera, bass.

The alumni of Presidential Classroom for Young Americans—currently on 312 American college campuses—were polled and asked which they felt was the musical group most popular among today's young people. The results came out overwhelming favoring "Chicago", and subsequently the group was invited to present "The Salute to Young America" at the final evening of the 1971 secondary high school program.

The group became known first in 1967 as the "Chicago Transit Authority." They were joined by Mr. James William Guercio, the record producer who was to bring them out West and eventually change their name to "Chicago."

As the men were inspired by other musicians, they began to inspire each other. Rehearsing every day, Chicago began making increasingly frequent visits to small clubs. They became a local phenomenon that has gained them international prominence on all levels of music and performance; Chicago is now the biggest American act on the international market. "Chicago has made this commitment—the best vocabulary between cultures is music."

Most importantly, Chicago is an idea that continues to work. Serving as an umbrella for seven highly accomplished musicians with different musical tastes, Chicago as a unit, an entity, has brought these resources together within the contextual framework of growth through freedom, Chicago, in all its forms, works not only for the musicians, but for its audiences. Between the two stands a mutual mirror, reflecting the band and its listeners.

HOW TO BRING THE POW'S HOME ALONG WITH THE REST OF THE TROOPS

HON. DONALD W. RIEGLE, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 23, 1971

Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. Speaker, I have joined with my distinguished colleague from California, ROBERT L. LEGGETT, in introducing House Concurrent Resolution 212 which calls for the simultaneous withdrawal of our troops in Southeast Asia and the release of American POW's held by the opposition forces. I believe Congressman LEGGETT's development of this idea is one of the most attractive plans to end the war and bring the POW's home in time for Christmas with their families. A recent explanation of this plan, called "proportional repatriation," has been published in the most recent issue of the Nation and I am pleased to share this article, by Mr. LEGGETT, with my fellow colleagues:

HOW TO BRING ALL THE POW'S HOME ALONG WITH THE REST OF THE TROOPS

(By Congressman ROBERT L. LEGGETT)

"As long as there are American POWs in North Vietnam we will have to maintain a residual force in South Vietnam. That is the least we can negotiate for."—President Richard Nixon, March 4, 1971.

"We are going to maintain a United States presence until a satisfactory solution can be worked out for the prisoners of war."—Melvin Laird, Secretary of Defense, December 15, 1970.

"In case the United States Government declares it will withdraw from South Vietnam all its troops . . . by June 30, 1971, the people's liberation forces will refrain from attacking the withdrawing troops of the United States . . . and the parties will engage at once in discussions on . . . the question of releasing captured military men."—Mrs. Nguyen Thi Binh, Viet Cong chief negotiator, September 17, 1970.

We won't get out until we're sure they'll give the POWs back. They won't settle the POW question until they're sure we're getting out.

So why not do both once?

We want our prisoners back, and have no use for a permanent military presence in Southeast Asia. The other side wants us out of Southeast Asia, and has no long-term use for its American prisoners.

So let us accommodate each other.

Together with my colleague Don Riegle (R-Mich.), I have developed a plan, called "proportional repatriation," that would enable us to withdraw all of our troops and simultaneously recover all of our POWs. The plan is fair to both sides. It is feasible, and as nearly foolproof and cheatproof as a settlement of this kind of war can be. It is more favorable to our national interest than any other settlement we are likely to get, in that it brings a prompt end to our part of the war and a prompt return of the POWs.

Its basic provisions have been endorsed by 25 Members of Congress and were sent to President Nixon on January 2. He has not responded as of the time of this writing. This article is the first public discussion of the details of the plan.

PROPORTIONAL REPATRIATION

The crux of the plan is an agreement between the United States and the three forces that comprise the other side (North Vietnam, the NLF, and the Pathet Lao) to repatriate all American POWs and withdraw all American troops in equal percentage installments.

Let's take an example. Suppose the other side holds a total of 700 American POWs. Suppose, at the time the plan were put into effect, there were 300,000 American troops in Southeast Asia. Every time the other side returned 10% of the POWs it held, which would be 70 prisoners, we would withdraw 10% of our troops, which would be 30,000 men.

North Vietnam, the NLF, and/or the Pathet Lao would turn 70 POWs over to an intermediary, which would be an international agency or a neutral nation that both sides found acceptable. The intermediary would hold the men until it verified that 30,000 American military personnel had actually left Vietnam. Then it would release the POWs to American hands.

This process would be repeated at regular intervals, perhaps every two weeks or every month, until all POWs were returned and all American troops were out of Southeast Asia. The exact schedule to be followed, to which both sides would make a public commitment, would be decided at the Paris negotiating table. The schedule would have to end with a date by which the last prisoner would be returned and the last soldier withdrawn. There is no reason why the completion date should be later than Christmas Day of this year.

The importance of an explicit commitment to withdrawal by a specified date cannot be overemphasized. The other side has repeatedly indicated nothing else will induce it to release the POWs.

Offers to exchange North Vietnamese prisoners for American prisoners are futile, no matter how favorable the exchange ratio.

The other side doesn't want its men back badly enough to trade the only bargaining card it holds. The American POWs are North Vietnam's only assurance we won't adopt Curtis LeMay's strategy of "bombing them back to the stone age;" it has repeatedly indicated it won't give them up unless it gets American withdrawal in return.

Letters-to-Hanoi campaigns, Ross Perot's airplane trips, and so forth may secure better treatment and improve the mail flow, although the bombing halt has probably made the greatest contribution in this regard. But all the letters and Veterans' Day speeches in the world won't get the men back.

Nor should we deceive ourselves that partial withdrawal will get us anywhere. The other side is most unlikely to trade half the POWs for a 50% withdrawal, or even 95% withdrawal; a partial withdrawal does not alter our basic commitment to determine who will govern South Vietnam. The American military presence in Vietnam is an all-or-nothing proposition. If we leave even a thousand men in Vietnam, concern for their safety commits us to support them, in the event of an ARVN collapse, with whatever reinforcements would be necessary to prevent their being overrun by enemy troops. Current experience in Cambodia suggests these reinforcements would be used to save not only the American troops, but the Saigon government as well.

In North Vietnamese and NLF eyes, such a reversible withdrawal would probably constitute no significant change from our present policy. The North Vietnamese and the NLF consider themselves badly burned by the 1954 settlement. As they see it, at that time they allowed themselves to be negotiated out of their battle-won right to rid Vietnam of foreign control. They have repeatedly demonstrated their determination not to let this happen again and to fight on, indefinitely if need be, until all foreign forces have gone home.

So the only meaningful withdrawal is a complete withdrawal. We can continue to supply Saigon with military aid, just as China and the Soviet Union supply the other side. But if we are serious about getting the POWs back, we must withdraw all American military personnel of all kinds from Southeast Asia. No more combat troops, no more support troops, no more advisers, no more air or artillery strikes, no more looking toward a "Korean solution." In short, we must put the Saigon government on a sink or swim basis.

There seems no reason why this shouldn't be done immediately in any case. The Saigon government has had the benefit of sixteen years of American training, more than 130 billion American dollars, and more than forty-five thousand American lives. Its army outnumbers the combined forces of the NLF and North Vietnam by more than 5 to 1, and the ratio of dollar value of military equipment is even more favorable. If we are to believe the advocates of Vietnamization, the other side is debilitated, demoralized, and decimated, and its fighting forces consist primarily of pre-teenagers and old men. If, after we have done so much for it, the Saigon government's popular support remains so weak that it is unable to hold its own, further effort on our part would be wasted.

But above all, we are faced with a choice between saving our POWs and continuing to protect Thieu and Ky from their moment of truth. We cannot do both.

In order to demonstrate good faith, and to safeguard against the possibility of cheating, each side would have to take certain steps, openly and publicly, before proportional repatriation could begin.

The other side would:

(1) Publish a complete list of all the prisoners it held, including a description of each man's physical conditions. (The list the North Vietnamese recently gave Senator Ken-

nedy did not include descriptions of condition, there is some question of its completeness, and of course it could not include men captured after the list was compiled. No lists at all have been released by the NLF or the Pathet Lao.)

(2) Publish a list of men who died in captivity, including date and cause of death.

(3) Agree to allow the intermediary to run unannounced checks and inspections to satisfy itself that there were not more POWs than publicly admitted.

(4) Agree to repatriate prisoners in order of length of their captivity, with the exception that those in serious need of medical attention be returned first.

(5) Agree to send all Chinese and Russian military advisers out of North Vietnam, and permit the intermediary to verify that this had been done. If we are going to require the Saigon government to do without foreign advisers, it is equitable that the other side do the same.

(6) Agree to refrain from initiating military action against departing American troops. (This merely calls for a reaffirmation of Madame Binh's September 17 statement.)

In return, the United States would:

(1) Agree to continue to publicize the number of American troops in Vietnam, as we have in the past.

(2) Agree to publicize the number of American troops in Thailand, in order that they could be included in the proportional withdrawal schedules.

(3) Agree to allow the intermediary to inspect our books and run whatever other checks it felt were necessary to verify that we did not have more troops in Southeast Asia than publicly admitted, and that we were not rotating in more men than we were taking out.

Both sides would agree to accept the intermediary as final judge of alleged violations of the agreement.

Now let's consider some of the questions that come to mind concerning proportional repatriation:

What do we do if they offer to release all the POWs immediately? We accept. We get our men out as fast as we can load them onto the planes. All the POWs will be immediately turned over to the intermediary, and we'll have no further worries about their medical care or living conditions. It might take us a month to fly all the troops out of Southeast Asia; the difference between this and a year of continued fighting will be more than 2500 American lives. We'll have to abandon several billion dollars worth of equipment we'd prefer to dismantle and evacuate, but lives are more important than computers and aluminum runways.

What do we do if they don't offer to release any POWs? If they reject proportional repatriation because of a specific detail, such as the date for total withdrawal, we'll at last have a basis for meaningful negotiations.

It's inconceivable to me that they'd reject the entire plan. But if they did we'd simply be back where we are now.

Isn't it possible that the other side could keep unacknowledged prisoners hidden in remote camos where the inspectors might never find them? This is possible no matter what course we follow. Even if we were to invade and occupy all of Southeast Asia, the opposition might still keep a number of American prisoners hidden away deep in the jungle. Proportional repatriation minimizes this possibility by providing the strongest possible incentive not to cheat.

The Vietnamese who hold our men prisoner have been fighting almost continuously for thirty years to drive foreigners out of their country. Agreement on proportional repatriation would set the date of final success only months away. No matter how carefully they hid the prisoners, the possibility of being found out could never be completely eliminated. The last thing in the

world they would want to do would be to jeopardize the withdrawal of American troops by violating the proportional repatriation agreement.

What do we do if they attack us as we're leaving, creating another Dunkirk? Attacks on withdrawing American troops would violate the proportional repatriation agreement, as well as the present stated policy of North Vietnam and the NLF. It is always implicit that we will do whatever is necessary to protect our troops. It would be incredibly stupid of the North Vietnamese or the Viet Cong to jeopardize our withdrawal in this way, and they know it.

How do we know they won't play along with us for awhile, then abrogate the agreement before they've returned all the POWs? We know they won't do this because if they did we'd come out ahead. Partial repatriation is of considerable value to us but, to reiterate, partial American withdrawal is of very little value to them.

How do they know we won't play along with them for awhile, then abrogate the agreement before we've pulled out all our troops? They know the domestic political penalties against a President who did this would be prohibitive. Current polls show the American people favoring, by margins ranging between 2 to 1 and 3 to 1, legislation to compel total withdrawal within one year, even if we don't get the POWs back. Once the withdrawal date was set, public support for ending the war would become even greater. Nothing could persuade the American people to re-elect a President who then reversed course and plunged us back into the quagmire we had almost escaped.

Don't we have an obligation to stay in order to prevent the bloodbath that might follow a communist victory?

First, the behavior of the Thieu-Ky government has given no reason for confidence that the bloodbath which might follow a communist victory would be any greater than that which might follow an anti-communist victory. The post-civil war bloodbath in Asia is hardly peculiar to communism, as the victorious Indonesian anti-communists demonstrated a few years ago when they put nearly a half-million communists and alleged communists to the sword.

Second, the worst bloodbath of all is that which we create by staying and prolonging a war the Vietnamese would have settled among themselves years ago.

Third, the South Vietnamese people themselves expressed their feelings on this matter last summer in a poll, conducted by the Pentagon East, which found 65% wanting all Americans out of their country, 5% wanting the Americans to stay, and 30% undecided. (Despite attempts to suppress the poll, the Irrepressible Sen. Stephen Young of Ohio, now unfortunately retired, found out and read the results into the Congressional Record.)

We don't recognize either the National Liberation Front or the Pathet Lao as independent agents. What do we do if they refuse to negotiate through the North Vietnamese, and instead insist on separate settlements? If we can get our men back by separate settlements, then let's make separate settlements. Between them, the NLF and the Pathet Lao hold 82 known American prisoners, and may hold up to 700 more. The freedom of even 82 men is more important than whatever debating points can be gained by refusing to concede the independence of these groups.

How about a military solution to the POW problem? Why don't we resume heavy bombing or perhaps conduct more raids such as the one on Sontay? The North Vietnamese have already demonstrated they respond to heavy bombing in the same way as did the citizens of London and Berlin during World War II. Bombing doesn't make them give in; it makes them dig in and fight harder.

As for the Sontay raid, its results speak for

themselves. We can expect similar operations to meet with similar success in the future.

Why must we withdraw from all of Southeast Asia, rather than just Vietnam and Laos? Under the Nixon Administration, the sole official mission of all American military operations in Southeast Asia, including the carrier task forces and the air bases in Thailand, has been the protection of American troops in Vietnam. Once these troops are withdrawn, the forces outside of Vietnam will no longer have a reason for staying, unless we envision continued air strikes in support of the Thieu-Ky regime. We can be sure that such continued air support would not fit the other side's definition of American withdrawal, and would prevent the release of POWs.

What about the North Vietnamese and Viet Cong prisoners held by our side? We hold no prisoners ourselves; all those we capture are turned over to the Saigon army. The question of these men, along with that of the South Vietnamese prisoners held by the other side, is a matter to be decided among Hanoi, Saigon, and the Viet Cong. What I am proposing is a settlement of the American part of the war.

Do the Australians, Koreans, and New Zealanders have to pull out with us? They can stay if they want to.

How is proportional repatriation better than Vietnamization? Vietnamization provides no incentive to the other side to return the POWs, and no guarantee they will be returned; proportional repatriation provides both. Vietnamization ties withdrawal to progress by the Saigon government, giving Thieu and Ky an incentive to make no progress and thereby prolong our sugar-daddy presence forever; proportional repatriation sets a firm date for complete withdrawal, thereby putting Thieu and Ky on notice they'd better shape up because we're shipping out.

What will our allies think if we pull out? Our most important and most reliable allies—Japan, Israel, Canada, the West European democracies—will breathe sighs of relief. They've demonstrated their belief in our Southeast Asia effort by the number of troops they've sent to help us.

Is return of the POWs a fair price for withdrawal? Shouldn't we ask for more? To ask a stiff price for withdrawing from Vietnam would be like demanding that a surgeon pay us a stiff price for taking out our inflamed appendix. The war is not an asset to us; it is a colossal liability. It has torn our country in two, plunged our economy into recession, forced us to neglect urgent domestic needs, and exacerbated the cold war. It has cost us the position of world moral leadership we once held. Nothing could serve our national interest more than a simple, quick, and total withdrawal, even if we received no concessions from the other side in return. If we can get out and at the same time get the POWs back, as it appears we can, we're fools if we don't seize the opportunity.

JAYCEE SCHOLARSHIP FUND

HON. TIM LEE CARTER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 23, 1971

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, you will recall that on February 23, I informed the House of plans being formulated by the Clay County and Kentucky Jaycees to raise money for a scholarship fund. It is to be used for those children left fatherless by the Hyden mine disaster on

December 30, 1970. Today, it is my pleasure to inform you of the success derived from the tireless efforts of these groups.

On March 1, 1971, the Loretta Lynn Benefit Show was held in Louisville, Ky. Portions of the show were carried on radio and television throughout the Nation and the public responded with gifts exceeding \$270,000 and pledges for more assistance. This is testimony to the sympathy and kindness of citizens across the Nation and illustrates, once more, the willingness of Americans to respond to unknown friends' needs in a time of tragedy.

Alice Lloyd College at Pippa Pass, Ky., and Lee's Junior College at Jackson, Ky., have offered all of these children 2 years of college free of charge. Other colleges, such as Cumberland College, Union College, Midway Junior College, Eastern Kentucky University, University of Kentucky extensions, University of Kentucky extensions, Southeast Community College, and Somerset College, are doing what they can to be of assistance also.

These successful results would have never been possible had there not been many interested persons who were willing to give unselfishly of their time and energy. To list all of them would be impossible, but all, with whom I have talked, give special praise to Mr. Joe Swafford of Manchester, Ky., a member of the Clay County Jaycees.

Those who participated in the Loretta Lynn Benefit Show should also be singled out for their contributions. They are as follows:

Roy Acuff, Loretta Lynn, Conway Twitty, Wilburns Grandpa Jones, Webb Pierce, Charlie Louvin, Del Reeves, Jimmy Martin, Peggy Sue and Sonny Wright, Bobby Lewis, and Jay Lee Webb.

Loretta Lynn's Band, Charlie Louvin's Band, M.C.'s Bud McCain, Doyle Wilburn, Larry Scott, Gus Thomas, and Randy Atcher.

Tex Ritter, Stu Phillips, Tom T. Hall, Bill Monroe, Osborne Brothers, George IV, Billy Ed Wheeler, Pee Wee and Redd Hagers, Colonel Sanders, Lonzo and Oscar, George Morgan, and Hugh X Lewis.

Glaser Brothers, Jim Ed Brown, Ray Pillow, Connie Smith, Billy Grammar, Stu Phillips, Jim and Jesse Skeeter Davis, and Charlie Walker.

To these individuals and thousands of others, I offer my congratulations for making the scholarship fund a success and for reaffirming those principles which have made our country the great Nation it is.

**THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
BUDGET—URGENTLY NEEDED**

HON. GILBERT GUDE

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 23, 1971

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to see that a member of the Republican National Committee, Carl L. Shipley, has joined me in endorsing a higher Federal payment to the District of Columbia as a means of keeping abreast of the great financial needs of the city. Mr. Shipley notes that the proposed budget is only fair because of the tremendous demands for services of the Federal Government.

The enormous amount of tax exempt property occupied by the Government here, both justifies and necessitates, Mayor Washington's proposed budget for fiscal year 1972.

Mr. Shipley's statement follows:

MAYOR WALTER WASHINGTON AND THE
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA BUDGET

(By Carl L. Shipley)

D.C. Republican National Committeeman Carl Shipley said today: "Residents of the metropolitan area should rally around and support Mayor Walter E. Washington in his current effort to persuade Congress to adopt the proposed District of Columbia budget of \$885 million for fiscal year 1972.

"Of this budget, \$200 million is for capital improvements that will in some measure serve the entire metropolitan area. Public safety in the District affects the whole area—it will cost \$173 million in 1972. Education has an impact on the entire region—it will cost \$285 million next year. Transportation requires \$100 million, and housing and community development \$105 million. The District's human resources program—to develop individual economic independence and protect the helpless—will cost \$308 million.

"These are not only District problems, but metropolitan area and national problems. Washington is the city of the Nation, not the city of its local residents.

"Since metropolitan area residents oppose a commuter tax, they should urge Congress to increase the Federal payment from its current \$126 million to \$243 million next year. This would represent only 27½% of the 1972 budget—while the Federal Government owns 43% of the land.

"Mayor Walter E. Washington is doing his best in a most difficult job. He deserves the support and understanding of everyone in Congress and in the metropolitan area. The District is on the verge of bankruptcy. Local tax increases cannot meet the District's needs—they are regressive and drive business and taxpayers to the suburbs. A vastly increased Federal payment is the only answer".

**EAGLETON ESSAY CONTEST
WINNERS**

HON. THOMAS F. EAGLETON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 23, 1971

Mr. EAGLETON. Mr. President, this morning I have the privilege of presenting to Senators the winning entries in an essay contest I sponsored this year for Missouri high school seniors. The topic of the contest was "The Role of Youth in Setting the Goals of America in the 1970's." I was pleased at the quality of the essays I received. The young people who entered the contest have shown keen perception and interest in the problems which we face in this decade. The winner of the contest was Miss Cindi Lewis of Columbia, Mo. The runners-up were: Miss Jan Chrisman of Springfield, Mo., Mr. James D. Everett of Bethany, Mo., Mr. John W. Head of Palmyra, Mo., Mr. Edward C. Holland III of Chesterfield, Mo., Mr. Ron Jarvis of Kansas City, Mo., Miss Linda Kettlewell of Independence, Mo., Miss Darcy Tuma of Poplar Bluff, Mo., and Miss Kathy Witt of Kansas City, Mo.

I ask unanimous consent that the complete text of the winning essay and the eight runners-up be printed in the RECORD.

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

**THE ROLE OF YOUTH IN SETTING THE GOALS
OF AMERICA IN THE SEVENTIES**

(By Cindi Lewis, Senior at Hickman High School, Columbia, Mo.)

Idealistic young fools! No sense of responsibility! Think they can run the world!

Do these words sound familiar? They should. They have all been used to describe today's American youth. These descriptions apply, however, to only a small percentage of the country's young people, and most thinking people realize this. What, then, of the others? What role should they play in setting America's goals during the coming decade?

Practically speaking, young people are not in a position to assume the full responsibility of leading the nation and making its decisions. Most are still in high school, college, or vocational school, preparing themselves to accept this responsibility in the future. The additional education provided by experience has barely begun; thus, it is often difficult to make wise and realistic decisions. Nor is it desirable for a young person to shoulder the responsibilities of an adult too early. Rushing into adulthood generally deprives a person of the feelings and experiences that happen only to the young.

Today's younger generation, however, does have several advantages which make some sort of involvement in the decision-making processes quite desirable. They are receiving one of the best educations that has ever been given to any generation in the world. The mass media brings news of national and international events to their attention daily. They have at their disposal a great deal of youthful energy and enthusiasm with which they will work tirelessly for a cause they believe in. Finally, and most importantly, idealism is a virtually inherent characteristic of youth.

It is through the expression of this idealism that young people can best serve a purpose in setting their country's goals. Although many realities prevent the immediate attainment of most of our nation's ideals, few people hold that it is wrong to try to achieve them. It seems, however, that as people grow older and become hardened by their experiences, they tend to subordinate ideals to more practical considerations. This should not be taken to mean that the older generation has forgotten the principles the nation was founded upon. However, constant repetition of these principles can be quite beneficial. Youth can therefore serve as a conscience—a reminder to their elders of these ideals—and can attempt to insure that the goals of a given action support the ideals of liberty and equality.

This can be done in several ways. Besides exercising their freedoms of speech, assembly and the press, young people can participate in political campaigns, circulate petitions, and take part in peaceful demonstrations. All of these methods can be utilized without age, a great deal of experience, or the right to vote.

Those descriptions again? Young people are—and should be—idealistic, but they are not fools. They have a sense of responsibility although it may be different than that of their elders. And they don't think they can run the world. They simply want—and deserve—to take an active role in setting the goals of their country.

FOR THE TOMB OF THE UNKNOWN CITIZEN

(By Jan Chrisman)

He was found by the Bureau of Statistics to be
One against whom there was no official complaint . . .

For in everything he did he served the Greater Community . . .
When there was peace, he was for peace, when there was war he went . . .
Was he free? Was he happy? The question is absurd:

Had anything been wrong, we should certainly have heard.

W. H. AUDEN, "The Unknown Citizen."

In the forties and fifties, we were content with our ignorance. We were blind and deaf and dumb, but happy. We followed the flag without question or doubt as to where it led. So, we found ourselves in Vietnam, involved in a war we thought we had no business being in. But, most of us remained silent. For ours was not to reason why . . .

Forty thousand dead men later, we opened our eyes and saw young bodies, yellow and white torn apart. We opened our ears and heard the cries of starving children, not in Saigon ghettos, but in Harlem slums. We opened our minds and felt a hate and shame and love that ignited both hope and destruction. And, most importantly, we opened our mouths. We alienated, in some cases let off hot air, and exposed a species, old as mankind, and long overdue for extinction—the unknown citizen.

If nothing else, we learned from the 1960's just exactly what we didn't know.

We didn't know, said the congregation singing a hymn in their church of white. The outside agitators came—
To set our colored people aflame.
And maybe some of our boys got hot
And a couple of niggers and reds got shot.
The preacher would have told us if we'd done wrong.

We didn't know, said the puzzled voter, Watching the president on T.V.
I guess we got to drop those bombs
If we're going to keep south Asia free
The president is such a peaceful man
I guess he's got some kind of plan.

TOM PAXTON, "We Didn't Know."

Forty thousand dead in Vietnam, four dead at Kent State, and six dead at Jackson is a high price to learn the extent of our ignorance. But, perhaps they will not have died in vain if their deaths move just one unknown citizen to crawl out of their middle America hole and speak up for what he believes, if he believes. And, perhaps they will not have died in vain if we, the American youth, learn that ignorance is the murderer and the chief obstacle to peace. This is our responsibility in setting the goals of America and ourselves in the 1970's, to avoid the trap of ignorance and passive acceptance.

The initial goals of America, as the nation's founding fathers proposed, are good, strong, ambitious ones, and not beyond our grasp. America as a land where all are equal, and where the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness is respected as inalienable is not beyond our grasp if we are willing to work together and cast off the bonds of our ignorance.

Johns Adams, second president of the United States, thus rating him, I suppose, a founding father, said, "Liberty cannot be preserved without a general knowledge among the people". In remembrance of our fathers and for the sake of our children, we must open our eyes and ears and minds. We must stand, alone or together, but, we must stand. For if we don't who will know we gave a damn?

For the tomb of the unknown citizen, the epitaph reads, "I didn't know, I didn't stand". God, I hope mine, my peers', and my children's read, "I knew, and stood for what I knew".

THE ROLE OF THE YOUTH IN SETTING THE GOALS OF AMERICA IN THE 1970'S

(James D. Everett, South Harrison High School)

Many times I have dreamed of hiking trails that were worn down under moccasins hun-

dreds of years ago. I have followed with my mind the covered wagons on the trek across our continent. I have thought much on the determination and devotion of the men and women who built our country, and I have the honor to be a descendant of those people. I am the guardian of what they built. I am a youth, on whom the future of America will ride. It is my hope and my prayer that the actions I take will help bring to America a goal: This goal is one that should be at the front of every America's mind. And that is that the universal peace and harmony we so desperately need now will soon exist among all nations.

I know I must be realistic for the world is real. I know I must be patient for the world will not and cannot change by the flick of a finger. Change takes time, and if we are realistic we will take heed and help others with the change. This is and can be the only way change will come. Shouting, drawing sides and fighting will only forestall a change. Tradition is much more of an argument in some people's mind than all the reason and logic in the world. This is sad, but it is true. However if reformers learn to act through people's mind, not against them, everyone will gain much more.

I also know I must be loyal to my convictions, for the world is already too full of hypocrites. One of the hardest things in the world to do is to be honest with oneself when under pressure. But, unless we live with the world, and not against it, we will be sapped up and flung apart tearing at the seams. The worst type of hypocrisy, the same type that is seriously crippling the United States, is the silent voice. The silent voice is possessed by someone who may care but hasn't "got-the-guts" to say anything to anyone's face. This person will agree with another anytime, until that person's back is turned. This is why the "silent majority" is the most destructive force in this country today.

"And in that naked light I saw ten thousand people, maybe more. People talking without speaking, people hearing without listening, people writing songs that voices never shared; no one dared disturb the sounds-of-silence. (Paul Simon and Arthur Garfunkel.)" This is what I see when looking at my country: people talking, hearing, and thinking, but no one speaking, listening, or trying to help others with their ideas.

When the separate people realize that they are not each one entities, but rather only a thread of a fine, closely woven garment, our world will be able to advance unboundedly. If the youth of the '70's can but start this country on the road to better understanding, our job will be accomplished and accomplished well.

THE ROLE OF YOUTH IN SETTING THE GOALS OF AMERICA IN THE '70'S

(By John W. Head)

John Kennedy declared that "the torch has been passed to a new generation of Americans." Not to our grandparents, not to our parents, but to us, the youth of America, has it been passed. It is a torch that beckons us to action for a cause rarely, if ever, assumed by young people, but which now seems too unimportant for an ever-increasingly materialistic society to concern itself with. For it is our challenge to relieve the despair bred by hunger and poverty, to reduce the apathy encouraged by depersonalization and apparent individual unimportance, and to combat the ignorance that prevents Americans from fulfilling their responsibilities to our society.

How can we meet this challenge? What weapons do we have on our side to help us combat ignorance, apathy, and despair? What means do we have through which to set the goals of America in the '70's?

First, we have political leverage. It has been shown in the last two elections that young politicians have wielded considerable, and in many cases, determining power in as-

sisting or defeating either candidates for office or referendums and amendments. Lately, a reactionary pulse has registered on the nation's electrocardiogram, in response to the usually liberal and sometimes radical contentions and methods of young campaigners, indicating a misuse or perhaps even an abuse of this precious leverage. We cannot afford such reaction to be produced by our involvement in national and local concerns, for as soon as we lose the respect held by adults for us, we lose our influence. Therefore, let us first protect and utilize our political leverage.

Secondly, we have opportunities for a personal role in determining policies and providing service to others. Despite the cries from the reactionary right, our nation's governmental structure is becoming more democratic, not less democratic; more responsive to popular opinion and need, not less responsive; more dependent on personal initiative and volunteer work, not independently controlled by a band of socialistic sovereigns. We are able to materially change conditions on a personal level by assisting with such programs as VISTA or Job Corps. Through such action we can instill hope, dignity, and love in thousands, even millions of Americans. Secondly, then, let us recognize and take advantage of our opportunities for personal service.

And finally, we have vigor. Older people have believed since the time of Cain and Abel that "the young people are tearing down the society." If we can tear down, why can we not also build up? We lack not for energy. We lack not for time. We lack not for opportunities. So thirdly, let us direct our youthful vigor toward the challenge.

Through these means, young Americans truly have the tools with which to set the goals of America in the '70's. Therefore let us use our political leverage, our personal opportunities, and our vigor to help educate the ignorant, help invigorate the apathetic, and help relieve the desperate. After all, the torch we carry will soon light our nation. We must accept its challenge.

THE ROLE OF YOUTH IN SETTING THE GOALS OF AMERICA IN THE 70'S

(By Edward Charles Holland III)

The youth of today are more strongly motivated toward identifying goals for America than any group of youth since our country's founding. This group, because they were fortunate enough to be born at this time in our nation's history, has been given more and better formal education than any age group in the country today. It is ironic that this group also finds itself ineffective in helping set the nation's goals because of its age. Some are too young to vote; most are considered by their elders to be too young to have any worthwhile ideas.

To be effective in helping with America's goals, the youth of today must first find a way of communicating their ideas to those who have the responsibility of solving the nation's problems and directing its course of action. Overcoming the publicity and reputation caused by the illegal actions of a few will be a necessary and difficult task. Positive acts of help and a demonstration of good faith will heal wounds made to the nation's society and prove to the nation that the youth are willing to earn their right to be heard. Prevention of further irresponsible acts of violence and lawlessness will create an environment in which the youth can participate. Such prevention will be accomplished by support of the legal authorities and willingness to put down the rabble-rousing leaders who are establishing the reputation for the whole group.

Once the youth of the nation have earned the right to be heard, they must make certain they are prepared to say something of value. Such preparation must include an intelligent pursuit of the academic oppor-

tunities, a serious effort to be physically healthy, including avoidance of those things known to be detrimental to one's health, and the development of a realistic feeling for the nation's problems.

Setting our nation's goals requires an acceptance of our nation's problems as a challenge to find an improved way of solving the problems. Destroying the source of the problem or completely ignoring it only leads to more problems. Improved methods of solving these problems must be found and the youth is very capable of helping the nation in this task.

Our youth must accept its individual place of responsibility in the society and put its talents and strength to improving what exists today. This responsibility includes a contribution by proper academic preparation to later earn a salary and pay taxes, supporting of community activities such as the Boy Scouts, P.T.A., etc., and living a moral personal life. From this base, the goals can first be defined and then the course of action identified and followed.

In many fields the youth has made a good start toward setting America's goals. Each election year many political candidates find themselves backed by the youth who, although they cannot vote, do have a helpful influence upon his campaign. The youth has also been instrumental in bringing public attention to the ecology problems of the United States.

Today's youth will become participants in setting America's goals in the '70's only by earning the right to be heard and demonstrating they have the maturity to contribute in a practical, realistic way as they have done in some cases. They must keep in mind that the goals for the '70's will determine the economic health and world position of the country in the '80's and '90's when they will have the responsibility of running the nation.

THE ROLE OF YOUTH IN SETTING THE GOALS OF AMERICA IN THE 1970'S

(By Ronald J. Jarvis)

From the depths there arises a mighty roar, prodigious in its shuddering force as the earth screams her death agony—a wall of sadness and pain unequalled in the mind of man. Polluted, lifeless tears wash over the time-furrowed brow as mud streak rivers flow to poison seas. Shrieking, pounding metal insects sting the grayish sky-haze with black tails of noxious smoke. Subterranean mushroom clouds entrench their radioactive by-products in the innocent soil while levels of strontium-90 and DDT in the blood-streams of the populace struggle for supremacy. Terrorism and death reign supreme in the gore-stained hands of Machiavellian political extremists on every side, and rising crime is the watchword on the quivering lips of a frightened society. And in the midst of all the gathering clamor can be observed an apathetic citizenry, searching desperately for some person or persons upon which to blame the mediocrity of its existence.

Pollution, crime, apathy, hunger—it is clear to see that the die is cast for this and upcoming generations. Society has long been treading water on important issues, hampered by its distorted set of priorities. Commercialism has triumphed over human values—capitalism, long considered a political panacea, can no longer rightfully assume first place in the crown of social glory. Through single-minded expansion of monetary interests, our coffers have been filled to surfeit—but at what cost?

The cries of undernourished Negro children, of the once noble but now depreciated American Indian, facing the hollow reality of poverty contrast dissonantly at best with the mellifluous tones of the American horn of plenty. The granaries of our central lands overflow with wealth while emaciated throngs all over the globe grapple daily with the grim business of their own survival.

It is the responsibility of this area's youth

to re-order the decadent and irresponsible priorities that have been followed. A civilization which values its own comfort over the very survival of less fortunates cannot expect popular applause or even longevity.

It is doubtful whether any significant changes might result from the actions of America's all too evident "silent majority." When an increasingly large portion of eligible voters on any given election day fail to exercise the least bothersome of their responsibilities as citizens, it speaks eloquently of the tragedy before us. The apathy and indifference permeating society need to be overcome by some sharply-pointed prodding. This, then, is a major role of youth—to prompt constructive reform of society by appropriate activism.

The most pressing concern of today's youth, therefore, is concern itself. That is to say, if a proportionately greater number of persons in the younger camp can be prevented from falling into the miasma of inactivity, then long-needed improvements might be made in government and in society. A reassertion of the responsibilities and duties of citizenship, hand-in-hand with social consciousness should lead youth directly to the accomplishment of the formidable tasks offered by this decade.

THE ROLE OF YOUTH IN SETTING THE GOALS OF AMERICA IN THE '70'S

(By Linda Kettlewell)

The challenging '70's are upon us and the youth should accept this opportunity by striving for higher goals than ever before. In looking at this challenge, one must first look at that word G-O-A-L-S:

Government plays an important part in accomplishing goals and in keeping the people of the land organized as well as informed about our "rush rush" society and world affairs. Only through successful cooperation and political endeavors by the people this can be accomplished. James Clarke had a revealing opinion when he said, that a politician frequently thinks of the next election, while a true statesman thinks of the next generation.

Out-reach for youth is imperative if we're to create a secure future. All men must have a purpose: to keep the minds and bodies of the youth busy, to better the environment of our society, to improve our world economy. It has been said, by Robert Ingersoll, that "free bodies and free minds, along with free labor and free thought, will lead us to wealth and truth."

Ambition should be on many fronts. One example is the People to People Program. It has been and is being supported by interested students on the secondary level, who help the foreign exchange students meet with American boys and girls of their own age group. If we're ambitious enough to discuss, openmindedly, the problems in our society, we can help bring the nations together. The Peace Corps volunteers also help people help themselves, by showing less fortunate people how to use what they have. By providing education, they help lessen the growth of ignorance and poverty. Both organizations, by their ambitions, stimulate others in creating more productive lives.

Love is the key to fewer slums and less poverty in our nations. Love towards one's fellowman would not cause war, but peace. If true love was more evident today, Herbert Hoover's statement would be a reality. "We shall soon, with the help of God, be in sight of the day when poverty will be banished from this nation."* While we're concerned with poverty, we're also concerned for Peace. Harry Truman once commented, "Our goal must be—not peace in our time—but peace for all time."* Love is the key in unlocking the doors of poverty and peace.

*The Great Quotations, G. Seldes, pp. 743, 721.

Sacrifice is the hardest of all goals to attain. Who among us is willing to sacrifice personal gain, without that "what's in it for me" attitude? Sacrificing one self for others requires strict discipline. By sacrificing we're often forced to reach far beyond our grasp.

These goals: government involvement, outreach in community concern, coupled with ambition, love, and sacrifice for a nations people, can meet the challenge of the '70's. We're no longer content to watch the world go by. There's always something to be done to help others and unborn generations. At this time thirty percent of the United States' population is composed of youth, ranging from fifteen years of age and under. If this thirty percent could be motivated and challenged in this "rush rush" world, the youth in the '70's would become a dynamic force. The youth, by the G-O-A-L-S we set in the '70's, can keep the bells of freedom ringing not only for America, but for all the world.

THE ROLE OF YOUTH IN SETTING THE GOALS OF AMERICA IN THE '70'S

(By Darcy Tuma)

In America today, the average child lives a carefree life with little ambition beyond a dream of growing up to be a cowboy or a ballerina. Adults have the responsibility and freedom to vote. Because of this, their opinions are of prime importance in determining the goals of America. The bridge between childhood and maturity is characterized by the freshness, vigor, inexperience, and precipitancy found in youth. Their future and the future of their country rest on the success of their attempt to cross this unstable bridge.

The inexperience and precipitancy of youth guide some youth to display their shortcomings. These leave many adults with the conception that American youth have no goals beyond the satisfaction of their immediate needs. Youth wear the label of being influenced and deluded easily. They appear to the public as uncompromising children throwing tantrums in the forms of riots and bombs. Adults often associate youth with abuse of drugs and escape from reality. If all of America's youth are aimless, uncompromising escapists, they are obviously not ready to play an active role in the decisions of society and government.

There exists another group of Young Americans not found in the news associated with acts of lawlessness and of violence. They display the freshness of youth in their dream of peace: a peace with everyone as an equal brother, a peace with all of God's creations, and a peace within each man that he is an individual free to be himself. This group is full of vigor and spirit directed toward making their dream come true. They work for candidates of their choice. They are active in discussion and debate on important issues in and out of their classrooms. They speak out against what they believe hinders the fulfillment of their dream.

Young Americans feel frustration from the injustices in their country of "liberty and justice for all". They find inconsistency in the fact that young citizens are asked to risk their lives for a country before they are considered mature enough to help decide the actions of that country. Because they cannot vote, no one listens to their ideas. These frustrations shatter their belief in their country and lead many to search elsewhere for ways to achieve their goals.

Young and old, America's dreams are the same. The youth see possible improvements on the past. They ask for changes. Will anyone listen to their ideas? As a country, America must progress, and progress comes from change. Together we must act expeditiously. Since all Americans have basically the same goals, we can work together, listen together, and learn together.

TO BE HUMAN AGAIN

(By Kathy Witt)

There has been a great deal of talk these past few years about the youth of our country. A "generation gap" has been declared, across which the New Generation and the Establishment eye each other warily. Despite the cries of a few courageous optimists, there seems to be a general feeling among the over-35 group that our country will fall into chaos if left in the hands of a generation whose hair covers its ears. "What do these kids think they want?" is a question often heard. "What have they contributed?" is another. Wasn't it a sixteen-year-old girl who, in 1968, carried a sign imploring President Nixon to "bring us together?"

America is and always has been, a rapidly-growing, constantly-expanding nation, and the inhabitants of this nation come from a long line of people who have been married, harried, pressurized, mechanized, computerized, and psychoanalyzed. They have lived through imperialism, prejudice, depression, war, secession, materialism, isolationism, and capitalism. What presently exists is a group of people who hurry too much, run too fast, and are afraid to trust the other fellow because they haven't had time to know him. Fathers spend as much as twelve hours a day at work, and then bring their troubles home. Not only does this tend to bring on migraine headaches for the father; the family suffers, too. The TV-camera's-eye-view of the typical American working man is one showing the office worker coming home from a hard day, yelling at the children to be quiet, and growling at his wife.

People are so preoccupied with what they should be, they often forget what they are—human. They don't realize that when they spend so much time working, they lose track of life. They don't have time to enjoy their children; to build any kind of permanent relationships. This can harm the child as well as the parent.

Oddly enough, it is usually the Establishment person who runs himself ragged in this way. The younger person hasn't learned yet how it's done, and hopefully never will. People, being human, need time to relax. Then they can smile at their neighbors, pass the man in the other car without cursing at him, and maybe, just maybe, close the "generation gap."

What do these kids want? They want time for people, all people, to be human again.

COMMUNIST-STYLE POLLUTION

HON. WILLIAM LLOYD SCOTT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 23, 1971

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, apparently, throughout the world people are concerned about the problem of pollution but an editorial in the Herald Progress, a newspaper published in Ashland, Va., gives an interesting slant on the response of government-owned industry in Russia to the concerns of environmentalists. You may be interested in reading the entire editorial:

COMMUNIST-STYLE POLLUTION

Once again, government has been proven a poor self-regulator—this time in the area of pollution control. While many have believed that environmental problems are peculiarly the property of capitalist countries, an item in The New York Times reveals that the Soviet Union has its environmental problems too. But, there is no one to blame in

the U.S.S.R. for industrial pollution except the government, since government under the communist system owns and runs all industry. Now, Soviet conservationists appear to be having little success in persuading state-run industries to curb pollution.

It is said that ordinary Soviet citizens are appalled by the worsening conditions of major rivers in European Russia. The New York Times comments, "What is disappointing is the fact that the Soviet Government has evidently taken umbrage at suggestions that pollution is a problem cutting across ideological and political divisions. Insistent rumors in Moscow . . . have told of official efforts to clamp down on exposure of Soviet polluters, presumably for fear of providing anti-Soviet propaganda material."

This is a far cry from the United States where under our system of private enterprise the state, as an advocate of the public interest, can move without fear of hurting its "image" to impose pollution-control standards, U.S. industry, by the same token, that lives by the virtue of customer goodwill is inspired to do everything within its power and technological ability to improve the environment.

CONGRESSMAN THOMAS L. ASHLEY
CALLS FOR REALIZATION OF
HOUSING GOALS

HON. JOHN BRADEMAs

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 23, 1971

Mr. BRADEMAs. Mr. Speaker, there is great concern over the urban crisis in our country and one of the most informed individuals on this subject in Congress and the country is our distinguished colleague from Ohio, Congressman THOMAS L. ASHLEY.

On March 10, 1971, Congressman ASHLEY addressed the National Service to Regional Councils in New Orleans. He outlined the problems facing our cities and discussed programs in housing and land use planning which would serve to correct many of these problems.

Mr. Speaker, because I believe Congressman ASHLEY's message is a valuable contribution in our consideration of this important issue, I insert the address in the RECORD.

The text of Congressman ASHLEY's address follows:

ADDRESS BY CONGRESSMAN THOMAS L. ASHLEY

I am very pleased to participate in this annual conference because I consider the work of your National Service to Regional Councils to be highly important, for the simple reason that I consider continued development of regional councils to be one of the most important ingredients in the future growth of our country.

This year's Conference is aimed at developing a statement of "Goals for Action" and I congratulate you for the courage that this requires.

One of the strange things about the United States is that we are very goal oriented in our private undertakings but traditionally we have been very much against the establishment of goals by the government sector, local, state or national. One of the reasons for this, I suppose, is that such goals represent political risk: If we don't set goals to be achieved for the good of society, there is no way to measure failure; on the other

hand, if goals are established but not fulfilled, the gap between promise and performance is very measurable, especially by the alert political opposition.

ESTABLISHING GOALS

There is also little artistry that can enter into the establishment of goals, as we saw in the State of the Union Message a month or so ago. This involved the defining of six National major goals by the President, each of which requires Congressional action for implementation. There are those who are cynical enough to suggest that this puts the President in the position of being able to claim credit for proposing goals which win popular support, and at the same time damning the Congress for blotching its legislative task in areas which incur public disfavor.

In any event, it's clear that we need national goals and strategies to achieve these goals. This Conference is especially timely because DHUD's internal reorganization and current legislative proposals are aimed at enlarging both the geographical and administrative scope of its planning assistance and physical development programs. Obviously the success of this effort depends on the willingness and ability of metropolitan and other regional councils of government to establish planning objectives within the broader framework and upon their success in establishing development priorities that are bound to favor some local jurisdictions more heavily in the short term but which on balance achieve the objectives established for the entire area.

LAND USE PLANNING

At this juncture, there doesn't appear to be any quarrel with the Administration's effort to initiate statewide land use planning and the proposal of DHUD to route 70I and other planning assistance through the States to regional and local planning agencies in order to assure more active State participation in the planning process. Congress and the Administration are also in substantial agreement on the need to revise and consolidate the existing categorical aid programs to facilitate both central city and suburban development programs. The major difference is that the administration's block grant development assistance would have no strings attached while the majority view in Congress is that the use of block grant funds should be governed by broadly-stated, congressionally-established goals, to be implemented by specific operating mechanisms. This view is predicated on the notion that our growth patterns are a matter of national concern because they determine the extent to which we can fulfill the promise of a suitable living environment for every American. If this national goal is to be achieved, we argue, then we must insist—as a condition of receiving block grant funds—that the money be used to carry out a regional or area-wide development strategy consistent with stated national objectives.

HOUSING

Housing represents a second area where Congress and the administration may be out of step—particularly with respect to its regional application and consequences.

Inasmuch as the administration thru H.U.D. is proposing to regionalize both planning and development, consistency would seem to require that housing be treated on the same broader jurisdiction basis. NOT SO.

In fact, very much the contrary. It was the President himself, only a few weeks ago, who stated that his administration would abide by the law with respect to open housing but would not use Federal funds to achieve forced integration in the suburbs.

This sounds fine to some but it produces weird results.

The Census defines suburbs as any area in any standard metropolitan statistical

area outside a central city with a population of 50,000.

If Federal funds can't be used to achieve integrated housing in the suburbs, this means such funds can only be used in the center city itself where generally speaking, the density of poor and black is already dangerously high.

Most certainly the Congress is going to challenge the efficacy of regional approaches to planning and development in the absence of a similar approach to housing.

Housing aside, it's clear that Congress and the administration are directed toward—if not committed to—a much more positive public role in the development process than ever before. Both are on record in stating that a continuation of established patterns of urban and rural growth will waste land; destroy resources and increase pollution; reduce the prospect of meeting our shelter needs; limit options as to where and how people may live; further erode central city areas; further separate homes from places of work and recreation while further separating people by income and race.

URBAN DEVELOPMENT

Congress and the Administration are agreed upon the further premise, also contained in legislation that has been signed into law, that "better patterns of urban development and revitalization are essential to accommodate further population growth, prevent further deterioration of the physical and social environment, and improve the overall quality of life."

So despite specific areas that may be in dispute, there are much broader bases of agreement that already have begun to produce legislation charting new directions in the development of our country.

One example is the Urban Growth and New Community Title of last year's Housing Act.

One part of this legislation which for the first time provides for a national urban growth policy, was based on a number of findings that have been written directly into law. Among these is that achievement of satisfactory living standards depends upon sound, orderly and more balanced development in all areas of the Nation; that existing and future Federal programs must be interrelated and coordinated within a system of orderly development and established priorities consistent with a national urban growth policy; and that the Federal Government . . . "Must assume responsibility for the development of a national urban policy which shall incorporate social, economic, and other appropriate factors, such policy to serve as a guide in making specific decisions at the national level which affect the pattern of urban growth and which provide a framework for development of interstate, state and local growth and stabilization policy."

To assist in the development of a national urban growth policy, the law provides that the President—through his domestic council—shall make regular reports to the Congress, including information with respect to population and growth trends; specific urban growth problems and efforts designed to meet these problems; a review of state, local and private policies and actions; current and foreseeable needs—both public and private—for implementing national growth objectives and recommendations for specific legislation and administrative action.

EIGHT GUIDELINES

In short, the Congress by legislative mandate has directed the President to evolve a national urban growth strategy. While recognizing that growth policy must be an evolving policy, flexible rather than static, the act is specific with respect to eight guidelines that must be followed and which

represent sharp departures from current growth and development patterns. In other words, the Congress—while deliberately fastening responsibility on the White House to delineate a national urban growth policy—has stated that such policy should—

Favor patterns of urbanization and economic development which offer a range of alternative locations in metropolitan and urban regions as well as in smaller regions which have a potential for accelerated growth;

Foster the economic strength of all parts of the country—central cities, suburbs, smaller communities and rural areas;

Reverse trends of migration and physical growth which reinforce disparities among states and among regions and cities;

Treat comprehensively the problems of poverty and employment which are associated with disorderly urbanization and rural decline;

Encourage good housing without regard to race or creed;

Define the role of the Federal Government in revitalizing existing communities and encouraging planned, new community development;

Strengthen the capacity of general governmental institutions, and

Facilitate better coordination in the administration of Federal programs so as to encourage desirable patterns of urban growth, the prudent use of resources, and the protection of the physical environment.

Just a final comment on this phase of the new legislation.

Our country has never had a growth policy. Residential construction—home building—has in large measure taken place where, when and how the speculative developer has decreed, it would be built and industrial and commercial location also have been determined exclusively by market forces.

ABSENCE OF PLANNING

In short, where people live and how they live largely have been considered the special domain of private enterprise and only inferentially a matter of public policy.

This has begun to change—not because officialdom in Washington has become suddenly enlightened (that day hasn't come!) but because burgeoning population growth in the absence of planning has resulted in chaotic growth patterns which threaten to rip asunder the very social, economic and ecological fabric of our country.

At the time of the American Revolution, we were a fledgling nation of 3 million with a whole continent to settle. No need then for a growth policy.

It took about 130 years—until the turn of this century—for the U.S. population to reach 100 million—and still no pressing need for planning rational patterns of growth.

But it took only 70 years—until just last year—to add the next 100 million population and demographers tell us we'll jump from 200 million to 300 million by the year 2000—just 30 years from now.

It's at this juncture—on this awesome threshold—that we have finally acknowledged that there is sufficient public interest in a rational, coherent development process—that respects human and environmental values as much as the market mechanism—to at least begin to forge a whole new development concept.

PLANNING ON A REGIONAL BASIS

At the heart of this concept is the notion that the process of growth must be determined by planning and development decisions on a regional basis—through public officials appointed or elected by the people who live there—rather than by Congressional enactments which cater to home builders—as FHA has done since the end of WW II or

to the automobile industry—witness the impact of turnpikes and interstate highways on industrial location in just the last decade.

Nor is this emerging National growth policy without new means of implementation.

The second part of the Act adopted last year establishes a new Community Development Corporation to provide a whole range of assistance for the planning, construction and preliminary operation of new, carefully planned communities.

FEDERAL ASSISTANCE

For the first time, Federal assistance will be available to State or local bodies authorized to engage in development, as well as to private sector developers. For the first time funds will be available to help cover the costs of planning, land acquisition and development, for essential public services—sewer, water, roads, school, hospitals, police, and fire facilities—and for their operation during the early years of the new community.

What kind of a new community am I talking about? There is no stereotype. Generally they are expected to fall into four categories—

New communities with metropolitan areas;
New towns—in town;

Existing smaller communities with good growth capability, and

New free standing communities such as Reston, Columbia, Jonathon, etc.

In my view, new communities will become a cornerstone of our development process in the immediate years ahead.

HIGH PRIORITY

Already there have been scores of inquiries from potential new town developers—both public and private—interested in applying under the new legislation. And honesty compels me to say that the Administration—especially HUD—is now wholehearted in favor of the programs and is giving it high priority—both with respect to personnel and to funding. Personally, I think a major reason for this is the Administration's conviction that rich, white suburbia will never allow acquiescence to the intrusion of the poor and the black—and therefore new communities—with racial and income balance built in—represent the only suburban alternative which promises a thoroughly decent, well planned living environment.

I also think the Administration is beginning to share my view that new communities in proximity to major urban centers will be essential as relocation resources to permit the reduction of ghetto density and rehabilitation of the core city. In other words, rational metropolitan development is a must if our major cities are to be saved.

So there are some of the directions and activities that are taking shape in Washington but which are sure to have a direct major impact throughout the country: Heavy emphasis on a more regional approach to physical development as well as planning—with housing not quite included; and emerging national urban growth policy which for the first time acknowledges and defines public responsibility for how and where people live; and lastly a new community program for public and private developers alike with a wide range of financial assistance available for those willing to combine public interest with private profit.

A PRODUCT OF PLANNING

If I were to add a final thought, it would be that development must be the product of planning; planning must reflect a deliberate strategy; and strategy must be designed to achieve established goals.

When these relationships are understood and respected, it will be possible to undo some of the great damage that has been wrought by the selfish, insensitive development process that has served us so poorly at such enormous expense.

In short, the President was right when he said we must develop a national urban growth policy before our problems become insolvable.

The Congress has forged the mechanism to produce such a policy; its effectiveness will determine the shape of America in the decades to come.

MR. NIXON AND THE WAR TO END
ALL WARS

HON. JAMES H. SCHEUER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 23, 1971

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, last night, in what has been termed an unprecedented personal interview, Mr. Nixon clearly and articulately set forth his view of the American role in the world in general and in Vietnam in particular.

Mr. Nixon apparently believes that there are countries in the world which are hostile to freedom and the freedom-loving peoples of the world. These forces are ready and willing to spring upon unsuspecting and/or weak countries at a moment's notice and to subject them to an unfree and undemocratic way of life.

These hostile countries are deterred from gobbling up the world, however, by the force and power of the United States. Whenever any hostile country shows an inclination to attack a weak neighbor, the United States roars up and bares its teeth. If, in fact, the hostile country engages in combat and/or guerrilla-type actions, the United States will counter by sending combat troops to the threatened country or, under the Nixon doctrine, it will help the threatened government defend itself by sending aid, advisers, or supporting air power.

Thus, it is the United States, and for all practical purposes, the United States alone, which deters the aggressive impulses of the hostile countries. If, for whatever reason, the United States fails to counter one of the hostile probes for weakness, the hostile power will learn that aggression does in fact pay and will experience a whetting of its appetite.

Mr. Speaker, this view of the world is perfectly consistent and coherent given its premises. But, I think that it betrays a view of the world that is outdated and inappropriate.

First, at risk of being labeled a "new isolationist," the world view I have described is undesirable in view of America's priorities. The theory that the United States is the world's policeman may have been acceptable at a time when the United States was unaware or unwilling to attack its problems at home, but, we have now come to realize that urban decay, mass transportation system, racial injustice, and the many other problems of our times cannot be solved without money. And, the necessary money is simply not available as long as we continue to support and maintain a swollen defense budget. We must cut this

budget if we are to have the funds which are required to solve our problems at home and we cannot do this if we are going to remain the world's policeman.

Mr. Nixon's theory, as I have outlined it, is based upon the view that the United States cannot survive as a free society unless it functions in a world environment which contains a large and undetermined number of other free countries. If the free world is gradually swallowed up by aggressive nations, the theory goes, the United States will be turned into a fortress, no longer free and democratic, by the very need to defend itself. Ultimately, without allies, it might be overrun itself and subjugated.

What the theory does not take into account is the fact that by attempting to act as the world's policeman, the very thing we are attempting to prevent is already occurring.

Our defense requirements, based upon Mr. Nixon's theory, have given rise to a military-industrial-labor union complex which is threatening our freedom and the livability of our cities. Senator ERVIN has already conducted hearings about the role of the Defense Department in civilian surveillance activities. The large defense budget prevents us from allocating funds to the very activities which would enable our citizens to enjoy a free and full life. What benefit will we have gained if our society collapses in an attempt to save "free" countries everywhere?

The Nixon doctrine does not change these facts very much. True, under this doctrine we will, presumably, no longer shed American blood in the remote countries of the world. But, we will be spending our treasure—money we can ill afford—and we will still be contributing to the growth of the Defense Department and its allied industries.

Second, the Nixon doctrine will continue to involve the United States in the support of undemocratic but non-Communist governments. Prior to the Nixon doctrine our foreign policy involved the defense or the pledge to defend many undemocratic governments as long as they pledged to remain non-Communist. The Nixon doctrine, in effect, continues this policy. Whether we support a government of this type with a pledge to send men or whether we send material the result is the same—we will continue to support status quo governments, including dictatorships, in the alleged cause of defending the "free world."

Third, Mr. Nixon's theory appears to be a rather simplistic explanation of the war in Vietnam. If the North Vietnamese were merely probing U.S. willingness to defend South Vietnam, why, after so many years have they failed to learn that aggression will not pay in the South? Why would the North Vietnamese be willing to see their society and their land virtually destroyed, if they were simply probing for American weaknesses?

Given the historical aversion of Vietnamese to Chinese domination, would the North Vietnamese be willing to suffer

destruction in order to act as tools of Chinese aggression? Does anyone believe that the North Vietnamese are acting as tools of the Soviet Union?

We must reexamine all of our commitments in the light of our true national interests. Is it true that we must intervene with either men or material everywhere in the world in order to deter aggression?

Why have aggressors failed to learn that aggression does not pay as a result of World War I? World War II? Korea? Is the war in Indochina or the Nixon doctrine really in our national interest viewed in light of our problems here at home?

Has Mr. Nixon, in enunciating the Nixon doctrine, actually committed the sin of which he accused the Democrats—promising much more than he can deliver?

Mr. Speaker, the President prides himself on being a realist. He does not, however, appear willing to allow this luxury to be enjoyed by others. If others attempt to examine our foreign policy in light of our true national interest but reach conclusions which differ from those of the President, they are met not with arguments but with pejorative characterization as "new isolationists."

Mr. Speaker, the rhetoric of the 1950's modified only slightly will not serve as a substitute for carefully conceived foreign policy. We must reexamine our foreign policy in light of our problems at home, our national ideals of freedom and democracy, and our true national self-interests. If we do not, what has now become Mr. Nixon's "war to end all wars" will suffer the same fate as Mr. Wilson's.

PASTOR EMERITUS MONSIGNOR
SOCHA

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I was deeply saddened by the recent passing of an old and dear friend of mine, Rt. Rev. Msgr. Bronislaus A. Socha, first pastor emeritus of St. Valentine's Church in Bloomfield, N.J., where he had served for 40 years as pastor. Monsignor Socha was a native of Poland who came to the United States at age 7, in 1895 and settled in Newark.

He was a man whose lofty ideals provided me with a great source of inspiration over the years, and whose wise counsel was gratefully taken. He was a person who cared deeply for his fellow man as so many know who have felt his compassion, his warmth, and generosity.

Words cannot possibly convey the sense of loss of those who knew him, for Monsignor Socha's contributions to spiritual, educational, and community development were immeasurable. He was a gentle man whose dedicated service touched all who knew him and made our lives more meaningful.