venerable House Ways and Means Committee, I am not just paying tribute to a great legislator from the neighboring State of Rhode Island nor a great representative for New England on that important committee. In rising to pay tribute to former Representative Aime J. Forand I am rising to pay tribute to a great American, a man who has left his indelible imprint on the legislative history of this country, in the area where it probably matters most, in the annals of social legislation.

It is not all that uncommon in Congress for a Congressman to become closely identified with a particular bill and to the extent that he works at it and pushes for it, the man and the bill become inseparable and inextricably linked as one. This happens quite frequently to no one's great surprise in a body such as this. Such was the case with Aime Forand. Only in his case, because of his foresight and singular persistence, one of the great landmark bills passed into law and has become part of our national scene today.

I am referring, of course, to medicare and its father, Aime Forand. In fact, when medicare legislation became law in 1965, Congressman Forand was already retired 5 years from this House. Yet so hard and so long had he fought for the concept behind such legislation that there was no doubt in anyone's mind as to whom the victory belonged that day. All thoughts were with our former colleague. His crusade, and that is what it was, was not an easy one. He ran headlong into some of the fiercest opposition any legislative proposal has ever encountered. And yet the Congressman persisted, taking comfort in the knowledge that millions of senior citizens, a novel concept at that time, were behind him and were counting on him to help them meet one of old age's greatest problems, adequate health care and insurance.

In his retirement, he was not inactive. As national chairman of the National Council of Senior Citizens for Health Care Through Social Security, he was in fact very much in the battle. In some senses, more involved in the struggle for medicare than when he was in Congress, free from the details and other concerns of representing a congressional district, Aime Forand could devote his full attention and energy to what by then had become uppermost in the minds of himself and the senior citizens of the Nation.

In a real sense, Aime Forand came well-equipped to do the job. His whole life was the story of a self-made man. From a large family he was in fact forced to drop out of school at the seventh grade. Why? Because of his father's illness and the staggering burden it placed on the family's limited resources. The rest of his education came the hard way, in between jobs and working and sleeping. Before he came to Washington he had been in administrative positions dealing with the problems of the aged firsthand, which gave him tremendous practical insight into the problems facing the elderly. When he introduced his medicare bill in 1957, he said something which I think would be difficult to surpass, for it's compassion in a nutshell—

The needy will never again be just statistics to anybody who has to deal with their personal problems.

When Congressman Forand retired from Congress in 1960, he had served 24 continuous years. During much of that time, he served with another great congressman, John Fogarty. I do not think I am overstating the facts in saying that at that time it would have been difficult to find another State that had a delegation of higher caliber, of greater dedication to the problems of the sick and the elderly, of greater compassion and with greater respect from their colleagues than the State of Rhode Island. The quality of service of both these congressmen will long serve as an inspiration to students of our Nation's history as a model of what one small state can contribute in talent and human resources to the national leadership at a time when the Nation needed such qualities the most. When he retired from Congress, Aime Forand was the second-ranking Democrat on the House Ways and Means Committee and the acknowledged expert in Congress on legislation affecting the social security system. If any man in recent legislative history was the father of an idea whose time had come, and I am thankful to God Almighty that he was granted the years to see his idea through to fruition, it was our dear departed former colleague, the Honorable Aime J. Forand.

SENATE—*Friday, February 4, 1972*

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by Hon. JAMES B. ALLEN, a Senator from the State of Alabama.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

O Lord whose mercies are without end and whose grace is sufficient for all our need, as Thou hast been the guide of past generations be to us our guide in the perilous and demanding days in which we live. Strengthen all who bear the responsibilities of public office in this land. Enlighten them by Thy spirit.

Make us a people strong in character, in virtue and morality, in piety and patriotism, in material and spiritual resources that we may guard faithfully the values entrusted to us, employing our might only for the extension of Thy kingdom and in the service of mankind. Lift our vision to behold the world that is yet to be and hasten the coming of Thy kingdom.

We pray in the Redeemer's name. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF THE ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. ELLENDER).

The assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D.C., February 4, 1972.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate on official duties, I appoint Hon. JAMES B. ALLEN, a Senator from the State of Alabama, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
President pro tempore.

Mr. ALLEN thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, February 3, 1972, be dispensed with.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all committees may be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

INDEFINITE POSTPONEMENT, SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 21

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that calendar No. 105, Senate Concurrent Resolution 21, a concurrent resolution calling for suspension of military assistance to Pakistan, and so forth, be indefinitely postponed.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, FEBRUARY 7, 1972

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today it stand in adjournment until 11 a.m. on Monday next.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(Later this order was changed to provide for the Senate to convene at 10 a.m. on Monday.)

THEN AND NOW

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, during the 1968 election campaign, when Mr. Nixon was a candidate, he was repeatedly asked on the platform, by the press, and on television to comment on the conduct of the war and of the negotiations in Paris un-

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

der President Johnson. Mr. Nixon consistently said, although it might have been to his interest to argue otherwise:

I will not comment on any negotiations which in any manner might impede the success of those negotiations.

Period, paragraph.

What a contrast with today's candidates.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. At this time, in accordance with the previous order, the Chair recognizes the distinguished junior Senator from Illinois (Mr. STEVENSON) for not to exceed 15 minutes.

U.S. POLICY ON BANGLADESH

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. President, I returned this week from a brief visit to the new nation of Bangladesh. I saw there the results of almost a year of conflict and a month of outright war. The results can be described, but scarcely comprehended: Hundreds of thousands murdered, tortured, orphaned, hungry, and homeless.

It is impossible to enumerate the casualties in that war. Among these, however, we must count one: The prestige and good name of the United States. For the Nixon administration, as the Anderson papers have clearly demonstrated, cast its lot with the military regime of Yahya Khan; uttered no public criticism when its ally launched a campaign of torture and repression, and allowed itself to sink into a futile, ugly controversy with both India and the people of East Pakistan.

Now the war is over. India and Bangladesh have triumphed. The people of Bangladesh have won their freedom; they are now the eighth largest nation in the world; six hundred and twenty-five million people in India and Bangladesh no longer see as their ally the United States. They have been pushed by our actions toward the outstretched arms of the Soviet Union. Even Pakistan—what is left of it—is, at best, an ungrateful ally. Its new leader, Ali Bhutto, is seeking solidarity with Turkey, the United Arab Republic, and the People's Republic of China; Yahya Khan, Mr. Nixon's erstwhile ally, is under house arrest.

The damage done is incalculable. But it is not beyond repair; we should remember the philosopher's reminder that those who do not understand the past are condemned to repeat it.

It was a long and bloody year for Bangladesh. In December 1970 the Awami League of East Pakistan, led by Sheikh Mujibur Rahman, won a majority of the seats in the national assembly of Pakistan. But Yahya Khan and his regime decided not to convene the legally elected assembly. Ail Bhutto shared in this decision.

Yayha, Ali Bhutto, and their cohorts first made efforts to undo the results of this fair and open election. In March the Bengalis of East Pakistan rose in protest against the government's failure to recognize the election results; disorders broke out, including a general strike. Yahya Khan, bent upon controlling a people who rejected his control, chose to launch a deliberate campaign of repression; he secretly dispatched thousands of Pakistani troops to the east.

And on March 25, the terror began.

The chemistry was as simple as it was lethal: ancient religious passions inflamed to the boiling point; a calculated government policy of torture and repression; deadly modern weapons, supplied in part by the United States to Pakistan; the revolutionary aspirations of the Bengalis—backed by Indian arms and intensified by the intransigence of Pakistan.

All these elements combined to produce what must go down as one of the most terrible atrocities in the bloody history of man. Sheikh Mujib was arrested and taken to jail in West Pakistan; Pakistani troops, abetted in some cases by the Biharis of East Pakistan, launched a systematic campaign of murder, rape, torture, and pillage.

Within days, the refugees began pouring out of East Pakistan into West Bengal and Assam—at times as many as 100,000 a day streamed into India seeking refuge. Others wandered within East Pakistan, seeking safety from the Pakistani troops. The terror—and the exodus—continued without abating until the war was won by India. All in all, according to the Indians—and we have no reason to doubt their numbers—nearly 10 million people—9.7—sought refuge in India.

None of the headlines about Bangladesh; none of the photographs or news reports, can fully convey the impact of what I saw firsthand.

Last Saturday I talked with Sheikh Mujib. I asked him how many of his people had been murdered by the Pakistanis. He told me that his earlier estimate, 3 million, now appears to have been too low.

And he invited me to see for myself.

I went to the former Pakistani compound of Comilla. There I saw tough Punjabi soldiers holding handkerchiefs to their faces, trying to ward off the stench and the sight of corpses in mass graves. The bodies were mostly those of civilians, some with their wrists still tied behind their backs. More graves wait to be discovered.

I talked with a Bengali barber who had worked within the compound at Comilla. He told me what I was to hear over and over; that Pakistani troops seized people at random, held the women in barracks for the soldiers, then killed the men.

Another witness told me of being rounded up in Comilla in a group of 420 Bengalis. All of them were herded into a squash court where there was only room to stand. Then they were shot. The man who told the story survived and later escaped—by climbing over the corpses in the court. There was one other survivor.

I went to villages which had been leveled, where even the coconut and bamboo trees had been cut down; where the bullocks had been slaughtered in the fields. And I was told that not even the animals in the Dacca Zoo escaped.

Dr. Kissinger, speaking for our Government, made a point of the "amnesty" granted by the Pakistanis to Bengalis not charged with specific crimes. I was told not more than five people were granted amnesty—and two of those were later killed. One recipient of amnesty, an executive of a U.S. corporation, told me he was arrested by our "ally" and charged with working for the CIA. He told me about the subtle form of torture used on him. The Pakistanis beat victims to death in the cell adjoining his. When their screams were over, the bodies were placed in his cell to compel his cooperation.

I talked with Mother Theresa, who is attempting to reach the thousands of women raped and made pregnant by Pakistani soldiers. Under Moslem religious law, they are in disgrace—no longer accepted by their husbands. These victims, she says, are in hiding and many, she fears, are killing themselves. If she reaches them she hopes to care for them and later for their children.

These atrocities, which started on March 25, continued through the summer and fall. When war broke out between India and Pakistan, and defeat for Pakistan was certain, the terror did not abate; it intensified. The Pakistanis, facing military ruin, set out to eliminate businessmen, civil servants, professional men, intellectuals, and students—those capable of building a new nation. Photographs have recorded Pakistani troops murdering students in university dormitories in Dacca; they forced the survivors to drag the bodies into the courtyard, where they, too, were killed.

These atrocities have been documented by many observers. Together, they indict the Yahya Khan regime in Pakistan—and an administration which chose to "tilt" in its favor.

Now, though the violence is vastly diminished, it is not ended. Sheikh Mujib and the dwindling Indian forces are attempting to prevent the Mukti Bahini and others from settling the score with the Biharis. The nights in Dacca are punctuated by gunfire, as the score is settled.

The transportation system, never adequate, is in shambles. Refugees return to devastated villages without shelter or food. International agencies—the U.N., UNICEF, the International Rescue Committee, the International Red Cross—race against the time when the monsoons arrive in late April and it will be too late to build the bridges and deliver the food and the shelter.

I have searched for some evidence to justify the administration's conduct in this tragic affair—and I have searched in vain.

The evidence is that our officials in Washington were well aware of the Pakistani atrocities. Yet the White House apparently ignored these crimes and urged restraint, instead, upon India. With the atrocities mounting daily, Dr. Kissinger sought new ways, as the Anderson papers revealed, to supply more arms to Yahya Khan. He argued that autonomy could come to the east through a process of political evolution. And he called for negotiations—knowing full well that Yahya Khan had jailed, and

would not negotiate with, the one man who could represent East Pakistan: Sheikh Mujib.

Nowhere in the dismal record does it appear that the administration seriously urged restraint upon Pakistan. It condemned India; it called for a cease-fire; it cut off aid development loans to India; and food sales under Public Law 480—while it continued both economic and some military aid to Pakistan. During the war, U.S. naval forces appeared in the Bay of Bengal—prolonging the war by encouraging the Pakistanis to believe that U.S. help was on the way.

India waited 8 months before attacking—8 months while the outrages mounted and the refugees poured across the border. India invaded only after Pakistan had first launched air attacks against it.

One can also search the Anderson papers, the statements of Dr. Kissinger, and all the rest, for some rationale for the decision to side with Yahya Khan. The search is fruitless. One could hope that the administration is guilty only of negligence. But the overwhelming evidence indicates that it knew at every step of the way what was taking place in East Pakistan. If there is an explanation, the President should come forward with it. As yet he has failed to do so. And to make matters worse, he refuses to restore normal economic cooperation with India or to recognize Bangladesh.

And since the administration still refuses to recognize Bangladesh, it has no aid operation in East Pakistan and, indeed, has even instructed its few remaining consular authorities to have no contact with representatives of the Bangladesh Government.

This sorry performance points up deep, tragic flaws in the present administration's method of making policy.

First there is, once again, the fatal tendency of the President to separate policy from principle. In this case the President appears to have made his choice—to "tilt" in favor of Pakistan—without regard to the human tragedy in progress before his very eyes. To read the President's statements, or Dr. Kissinger's background statement of December 7; to review the words of Secretary Rogers, Ambassador Bush, and other administration spokesmen, is to search in vain for any perception that principle and self-interest could coincide. Even after Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia—tragedies in which actual American policy has veered farther and farther away from our stated principles—Bangladesh clearly points up the tragedy and foolhardiness of a nation's divorcing its actions from its own best principles.

Second, this episode reveals an ominous trend in the making of foreign policy: The growing isolation of decisionmaking in the White House. The policy regarding Bangladesh, it seems, emerged full blown from the oval office and the White House basement—without regard for the U.S. Ambassador to India; without regard for the State Department; without regard for the Congress, for the realities of politics in South Asia—or the opinion of mankind. Even the National Security Council in this case was an instrument, not for formulating policy, but for implementing the dictates of isolated men at the pinnacle of power. This trend is dangerous for our democracy—and dangerous for the world.

Much has been lost in this sorry episode; not only U.S. influence and prestige in South Asia, but belief in the United States as a friend of the weak and an upholder of self-determination.

Much has been lost. But certain steps can and should be taken to repair the damage and to restore this Nation to its rightful place in the opinion of the world.

First, the United States should recognize Bangladesh. It serves no useful purpose to pretend that the eighth largest nation on earth does not exist. The failure to grant recognition only makes it more difficult for Mujib to pursue a policy of nonalinement. He should not be forced by our hostility or our indifference to expel our consulate and depend the more upon other countries for the economic cooperation he needs for the reconstruction of Bangladesh. Recognition is a precondition to bilateral economic assistance, which in turn could help Mujib maintain order and fulfill the expectations of his people.

Second, the United States should restore normal relations with India by reinstating aid and Export-Import Bank financing for the purchase of American commodities. We should also resume the sale of food under Public Law 480. The ensuing trade would benefit the United States as well as India. More important, it would be a gesture of good will to which the Indians would respond. The people of the world's largest democracy want to be friends and, like the people of Bangladesh, want to maintain their political neutrality.

One thing the United States should clearly not do is resume military assistance to Pakistan. After supplying equipment used to commit atrocities in Bangladesh, it would be little short of barbaric to send still more. Not only would this have a disastrous effect on our already strained relations with the one great power and democracy of the subcontinent—India—it could also invite an increase in Indian arms, leaving Pakistan and India in the same relative position, but closer to another holocaust.

I was heartened in South Asia, as I have been elsewhere in the world, to find, despite our complicity in this tragedy, a deep reservoir of good feeling toward the American people. People everywhere differentiate between the decencies and good sense of the people of America on the one hand—and the actions of their government on the other. But time is running out.

What is at stake is the influence and good reputation of the United States of America. It is time, therefore, to demonstrate that we are still the nation of good will and generous spirit which millions of the world's people want to believe we are.

There is only one way to demonstrate that fact: To turn aside from the past; to bring our actions into harmony with our rhetoric, our policy into harmony with our high principles.

One place to begin is Bangladesh.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. In accordance with the previous order, the Chair recognizes the distinguished Senator from Delaware (Mr. ROTH) for not to exceed 15 minutes.

(The remarks made by Mr. ROTH when he introduced S. 3123 are printed in the RECORD under Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.)

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. In accordance with the previous order, the Chair recognizes the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. BROOKE) for not to exceed 10 minutes.

ULSTER

Mr. BROOKE. Mr. President, in 1170, England invaded Ireland; and in 1921, there was a partition of Ireland in which the 26 counties in the south became the independent nation of Ireland, and the six counties in the north became the country now known as Ulster, which still has a government connected with Great Britain.

Since 1170 there has been great friction between the Irish people and the English. There have been outbreaks nearly approaching war in Ireland many times in the past. There have been abuses in human rights and of human liberties. In the last 3½ years, the situation has deteriorated rapidly; in the last month, that deterioration has accelerated; and in the last few days the deterioration has accelerated even more.

The United States, of course, has a policy—and rightly so—of not intervening in the internal affairs of another state. Yet many of us here in this Nation and in the U.S. Senate are seriously concerned about the internal problems of Ulster.

There we have a nation with 500,000 Catholics and approximately 1,000,000 Protestants. The elected government, since 1970, has consisted of all Protestants, because of the resignation from the government of the few Catholics who earlier had been able to take part. There have been violations of civil rights and of human rights, with the majority denying to the minority certain basic rights. There has been rampant discrimination in housing, in employment, and in political life. As a result of this, there have been serious uprisings.

In order to protect the minority from the majority, and specifically at one time from what was alleged to be police brutality on the part of the Royal Ulster Constabulary, British troops were sent in, at the request both of the government and of the Catholic minority, as a neutral peacekeeping force. British troops replaced the Constabulary, and the B Specials, or auxiliary police, were disbanded entirely. Previously, the Constabulary and the B Specials had numbered in the neighborhood of 5,000 or 6,000 men each.

Yet the British troops did not succeed in preserving order, and were soon opposed both by the Catholics of Northern Ireland and by the Irish Republican Army, a force of about 6,000 men mustered from the south.

Mr. President, I rise today, with my distinguished colleague from New York (Mr. BUCKLEY), because we are seriously concerned about what is happening in Northern Ireland. Bloodshed and killing have been the order of the day most recently. It is a very serious matter. It preys upon not only us here in the United States, but upon people all over the world.

I for one would like to believe that this is not a religious war. Great strides have been made throughout the world, in the ecumenical spirit, among the various religions. I would like to believe instead that the situation in Northern Ireland is a demand by minority people who are crying out for their basic civil rights, their basic human rights. They have not been able to obtain them under their government, and thus they have marched to show their protest against what they believe to be an oppressive majority.

Then, what is the role of the United States? Well, No. 1, we are very seriously concerned about Ireland and about England. Both England and Ireland have been our allies for centuries. It is estimated by our census that there are over 13,200,000 persons of Irish descent in the United States alone, and I would expect that that figure perhaps does not include second, third, and fourth generation Irish. The actual figure is probably much more than that. So we are concerned, because of the ties of many Americans to their homeland in Ireland.

But we are also concerned, because we believe in human rights, even though we have very serious problems of civil rights and human rights in this Nation. Ironically, we talk at this time when there is a filibuster going on in the U.S. Senate on the question of equal employment opportunities. But, be that as it may, what can the United States do, or what should the United States do?

Our disinguished colleague, Mr. BUCKLEY, has proposed that we offer our good offices. I am sure he will talk about his resolution, which I support, and commend him for having introduced, not today, not yesterday, but nearly 2 months ago, because he, as I, have been seriously concerned as we have seen this situation building up and becoming more serious as it has been.

Then, I would suggest that there may be another recourse. Seventeen Western European nations have what is known as a Commission on Human Rights, established by a convention in 1950, when they determined that they would never go back to the problems which had emanated from World War II. That Commission has the authority to send investigating teams into a country, with the permission of that country, in order to determine whether human rights are being violated, and to make its recommendations to the 17 Western European nations.

Then there is an appellate court which was also established by that convention, which may be able to be of some assistance. I suggest that—and I will elaborate upon it more thoroughly—as a possible course of action.

Some persons have talked about the United Nations getting involved. Of course, under article II, section VII, of the United Nations Charter, the United Nations cannot intervene in domestic matters. There is no prohibition on discussing whether to discuss the matter but, as we all know, the General Assembly is not in session at the present time and will not be in session for several months. The Security Council, which could also discuss this matter, is meeting at Addis Ababa.

It would take nine of the 15 members of the Security Council to put the question on the agenda. So I do not hold out much hope for that. A more productive course of action, therefore, would be to call upon the European Commission on Human Rights and the good offices of the United States by saying to its neighbors, its friends, and its allies, "Look, we do not like to see our friends and allies fighting one another. We do not like to see bloodshed. We want to offer our good offices for the purpose of your getting together so that you can discuss this matter and hopefully resolve it."

We are perilously close to next Sunday, when another demonstration, which has been described as a peaceful march, will take place. The situation is similar to the one in Selma, Ala., under Dr. Martin Luther King, when blacks and whites marched to Selma, Ala., at that time, Mr. President, protesting oppression of minorities by the majorities. It is indicated by the leaders of this march on Sunday in Derry that it will be a peaceful demonstration. The British have asked them not to carry on this demonstration, one which they say will consist of 25,000 or 30,000 marching people. There were 12,000 British troops there. Now it is estimated that there are 15,000 British troops in Northern Ireland.

The stage is set for what could be a very serious confrontation, resulting in more bloodshed, more violence in Northern Ireland and, of course, involving our allies, the British Government and the Government of Ireland. So, Mr. President, these are very serious times. We have no desire to intervene in the domestic affairs of another nation. But we would be remiss in our duty as a friend and as an ally if we did not search for means whereby this conflict could be peacefully resolved.

One of the issues, of course, is internment, which started in August of 1971 and is still going on, and has been extended, whereby the British troops can stop persons and arrest them on suspicion—something which always goes against the grain of our Government and of our people.

There is also a call for the British troops to leave.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. BROOKE. I yield to my friend from New York.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the distinguished Senator from New York (Mr. BUCKLEY) is recognized for not to exceed 10 minutes.

Mr. BUCKLEY. Mr. President, I thank my friend and colleague from Massachusetts for his eloquent summary of the tragedy in Northern Ireland, which is a tragedy of which we have been witnessing the escalation over the last 3 years, culminating in the awful killings last Sunday.

The response, unfortunately, will be more demonstrations and still more killings, and the British have responded by sending still more troops to Northern Ireland. This is a tragedy that weighs heavily on the minds of all the parties in Ireland and also the parties in England who are equally involved in these proceedings which men of good will on both sides thus far seem unable to avert. But unless we can find some way of relieving the tensions and the cycle of killings, the situation is apt to deteriorate further, and the real threat of civil war erupting as the Catholic minority seeks to assert its rights looms on the horizon. And the answer to that situation will not be further troops.

I suggest that we in the United States who are deeply concerned, both as human beings and the historic friends of the two peoples involved, can do something positive at this time, can do something meaningful which is calculated to make it easier for both the British and the Irish to meet together to seek to negotiate their differences, to seek to pave the way for the peaceful reunification of Ireland. The climate is right, I sense. The British people for example, have been polled, and they indicate that the great majority of them would like to see the British presence withdrawn from Ireland. Mr. Harold Wilson, the former Prime Minister, has recognized publicly the need for reunification. Even Mr. Paisley in Ulster has spoken of the possibility of reunification with adjustments of the Constitution of the Irish Republic. So the will is there and the influence is there but the method of bringing the people together has not yet been discovered.

I was interested to read in this morning's newspapers that Secretary of State Rogers met separately with both Foreign Minister Hillery of Ireland and the Ambassador from Great Britain, Lord Cromer. Mr. Hillery asked that we offer our good offices. The response of Secretary Rogers was that the United States could not act effectively unless both parties invited us to participate. He said:

> Good offices to help the achievement of a political settlement cannot be effective unless it is done with the approval of the parties concerned.

But I think we must recognize that we should not take merely a passive role, and that it is not interference in British affairs if we offer the hand of friendship.

Historically this technique has been resorted to in order to help alleviate tensions, to make it possible for people to talk. Theodore Roosevelt, for example, helped mediate the settlement of the Russo-Japanese war in 1905. A decade or so later, Argentina, Brazil, and Chile helped mediate the conflict between the United States and Mexico.

There is also the Rogers plan, in which the United States has more recently offered its good offices in trying to defuse tensions in the Middle East.

Mr. President, I believe the approach which the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. BROOKE) and I are proposing today offers a means by which we can,

as a practical matter, help the parties stop the bloodshed. I also very much recommend the other imaginative alternative proposed by my colleague, the mechanism which already exists in Europe for the investigation of abuses of human rights. Also, perhaps, still another method would be the Common Market, Ireland and Great Britain both having joined that body this year.

Finally, of course, the United Nations can offer its good offices. There will have to be some means of withdrawing the British troops, ending internment without trial, and interposing another force which will not be held suspect to prevent the parties from clashing during the period of cooling off. Perhaps there could be a U.N. peacekeeping force; but somebody has got to start the talking going, and I believe as ancient friends, we Americans who have so many blood ties to both Great Britain and Ireland, can do something positive, and we must.

Mr. BROOKE. Mr. President, I thank my distinguished colleague from New York, first for having offered the resolution, and second, for having joined in his colloquy this morning.

I think, Mr. President, this is just the beginning of discussions of this matter on the floor of the U.S. Senate. I hope there will be more discussions of this nature. I think it will serve a very useful purpose. I think it lets not only Great Britain, but Ireland as well, and the peoples of the world, know of our deep concern about the problems there, and our efforts to lend our good offices and to make suggestions and recommendations for which, as my colleague has well pointed out, there is ample precedent.

I should like at this time to quote from the protocol of the 1950 Convention. It says:

> Every member of the Council of Europe—

I add that England and Ireland are members of that Council—

> Must accept the principles of the rule of law and the enjoyment by all persons within its jurisdiction of human rights and fundamental freedoms and collaborate sincerely and effectively in the realization of the aims of the Council. . . .

It goes on to enumerate other rights covered by the Convention, which include:

> Life, liberty and security of the person; freedom from arbitrary arrest, detention, . . . freedom of opinion and expression, freedom of assembly and association. . . .

Now, certainly, these are principles to which both England and Ireland are committed, and I think that if we can get on with some discussions under the good offices of the United States, under the European Commission on Human Rights, or under the United Nations, if there is a possibility of that. The Irish Foreign Minister, Mr. Hillery also suggested, I believe, that he would be calling on the heads of other nations around the world, particularly in Western Europe—and their good offices may be lent to the effort as well.

I think that perhaps, No. 1, we could start, hopefully, with termination of the internment policy, which I think is in violation of the principles set forth in this convention and in this protocol. No. 2, there could be a phasing out of British troops, over a period of time, during which time we could have some assurances from the Ulster government, for example, that there would not be a return of any militant groups and that there would be control of the Constabulary in Northern Ireland.

On the other hand, Prime Minister Lynch would have control over the Irish Republican Army, which he has indicated he would want to do and could do. Under these circumstances, all parties could get on to a political settlement of the differences.

As I said initially, I think they are not confronted here so much with a religious issue as with a political and economic issue. There is clearly some movement now, even in independent Ireland, with a change in the leadership in the church, to practice wide religious tolerance. Even some of the religious provisions in their constitution would be deleted.

Perhaps someday soon they might get on with what former Prime Minister Wilson has talked about; namely, the unification of Ireland. I do not know whether that is the answer to the problem. I am not suggesting that it is the answer to the problem. I am merely saying that there is nothing there now—even though there has been deepseated feeling dating back as far as 1170—that in 1972, with the development and great progress we have had in religious understanding, cannot be resolved through negotiations and discussions rather than through bloodshed and violence.

Mr. BUCKLEY. Mr. President, I could not agree more with the summary of the Senator from Massachusetts.

The important thing at this moment is to offer hope to these people that they can achieve justice, that they can achieve true economic and social and political equality, without a resort to demonstrations, without a resort to force. With the relief of tensions. I am confident that the sheer logic of the situation will have that result.

Our offer of help, of good offices, ought not be an attempt to impose a preconceived plan for the resolution of the unhappy situation that now exists.

I express my appreciation to the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. BROOKE) for taking so direct and active an interest in this issue.

Mr. BROOKE. I again commend the Senator and thank him for joining in this colloquy. No matter what is done by the European Commission on Human Rights, as I have suggested, or by the United Nations, I think it is important that Senators join in supporting the resolution of the distinguished junior Senator from New York. I think that, at the very least, we in the United States can offer our good offices to resolve some of the problems confronting Ireland and England.

I am hopeful that 100 Senators will join and sign that resolution, and that we can get it to the President of the United States, to indicate to him how strongly we feel about offering our good offices at this time to avoid what obviously threatens to be a most serious problem confronting not only the countries involved but the world as well.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. At this time, in accordance with the previous order, there will be a period for the transaction of routine morning business, not to exceed 30 minutes, with statements therein limited to 3 minutes.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time for the convening of the Senate on Monday next be changed from 11 a.m. to 10:45 a.m.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(Subsequently this order was changed to provide for the Senate to convene at 10 a.m. on Monday.

ORDER FOR RECOGNITION OF SENATOR BROCK ON MONDAY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that after the recognition of the joint leadership on Monday next, the distinguished Senator from Tennessee (Mr. BROCK) be recognized for not to exceed 15 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CHANGE IN FOGGY BOTTOM

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, the need for certain reforms in the State Department has been apparent for many years and proposals have been made in the Congress looking to bringing about such reforms.

When William Rogers became Secretary of State, he selected as Deputy Under Secretary for Management, William B. Macomber, who has been well and favorably known to Members of the Senate for many years.

One of Mr. Macomber's principal duties was to bring about some of these needed reforms.

Although there is still a long way to go, and the rate of progress must have been discouraging to many within and without the Department, Secretary Rogers and some of his assistants are entitled to receive more credit than they are given in the Halls of Congress and by the news media generally.

On January 26, Deputy Under Secretary Macomber gave an address in the international conference room of the Department of State setting forth some of the changes within the Department which have gone unnoticed by the public generally.

In this address, he admits there is still a long way to go; but at least there has been a breakthrough toward making this very important Department of the executive branch more efficient, more humane, and somewhat better understood.

I believe that Mr. Macomber should receive full credit for the good work he has been performing in the State Depart-

ment. I believe that credit should be given where credit is due, and I ask unanimous consent to have Mr. Macomber's address printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

CHANGE IN FOGGY BOTTOM: AN ANNIVERSARY REPORT

My Colleagues in the Department of State, Two years ago this month this Department launched an unprecedented program of management reform and modernization; and in this same period we have seen it move in a number of very important ways towards a more equitable and effective system of human relations.

On this second anniversary it is appropriate to take stock, to examine what working together we have accomplished in this period of ferment and change, and to focus on what remains to be done.

First let's look at the program of management reform and modernization.

This has been a unique and far-reaching effort. It has been unique in the sense that Secretary Rogers did not, as is traditional in an effort of this kind, turn the job over to a team of experts from outside. Instead, in an unprecedented step, he chose the career professionals themselves to draw the plans. He was convinced that you could do the job better than anyone else.

You responded to his challenge and produced the most comprehensive and searching critique ever written about this Department.[1] If one wants to really understand our problems (and our strengths), no other document can match it. More importantly, after months of consultation with colleagues in the Department and abroad, with other Government agencies, and with many institutions and experts outside of the Government, you produced an extraordinary blueprint for reform. This blueprint consists of over 500 recommendations, about 400 of which have been, or are now being, implemented.

This effort has not received the attention it deserves, which is perhaps understandable. Major changes in management techniques and philosophy are not the stuff of exciting newspaper copy.

It is a significant story, nonetheless.

For in the past two years, through this unique effort in self-analysis and creativity, important new foundations of a modern American foreign office have been laid.

I

It has been argued that developments over the last twenty-five years—the new involvement of most departments of government in foreign affairs and the development of national security council staffs or their equivalents—have lessened the importance of foreign offices everywhere. Nothing could be further from the truth.

The diplomat's job is more important and more complicated than it ever was. He carries his old responsibilities and needs all his old skills; but because of the vastly increased complexity and diversity of our foreign affairs, we need a broader range of skills and expertise; and because of the participation of so many other elements of our government in foreign affairs, our diplomats must now be managers, coordinators and leaders, to a degree undreamed of by their predecessors of a simpler age.

The collective wisdom, experience, and judgment in the foreign affairs field of the people in the United States Department of State is unmatched elsewhere in our Government or in any other government. The job therefore has been to find ways to unfetter those abilities and to bring them more effectively to bear on the Department's evolving responsibilities.

The significance of what has been happening within the State Department during the past two years is this: The career professionals (aware that all foreign offices tend to have a better understanding of what their job used to be than what it is today) have made a major effort to explore and define the new and expanded dimensions of their role. Further, they have determined that the management of the State Department and of the Foreign Service is not just the concern of the administrators. They also have concluded that to meet their new responsibilities, something more is required than the traditional adherence to a low profile and traditional reliance on native ability, experience, old fashioned intuitive judgment and "trying harder."

As a result, here is how far we have come:

We have for the first time a Policy Analysis and Resource Allocation system (PARA) in operation throughout the Department—a systematic process for the identification of issues, interests and priorities, the allocation of our resources in accordance with those priorities, and the periodic review of our policies.[2]

We have a new concept of team operation among the Seventh Floor principal officers which affords increased control of the Department's planning, decision-making, and allocation of resources. The team concept has permitted a more flexible utilization of the principals' time by breaking the relatively narrow field of specialization that each principal has been assigned. The Seventh Floor team is served by common staffs, operates under the aegis of the Secretary, and is directed by the Under Secretary.[3]

We have a new management evaluation capability in the expanded Inspector General's staff, which will now evaluate our policies as well as our performance.[4]

We have a new balance between competition and job tenure in our Foreign Service officer promotion system which preserves its competitive nature but provides increased stability and security in the middle years of an officer's career.[5]

We have made major changes in our recruiting activities which are already bringing a much wider range of skills into the Foreign Service Officer Corps than ever before.[6]

We have adopted the concept of a new Foreign Affairs Specialist Corps which has been very popular with our career specialists. Over 870 of these have applied for entrance into this new Corps. Legal objections have been raised against this Corps. I am very hopeful these will be overcome shortly so that this important innovation will play a key role in our modernization effort.[7]

We have established a "Mustang" program to identify clerical and staff support employees with unused talent or undeveloped potential and provide opportunities to them for advancement to officer-level positions through special training and assignments.[8]

We have encouraged the flow of information, new ideas, divergent opinion, and creative dissent within the Department and at our posts abroad through the mechanisms of special message channels, new staff functions, and the continued use of the Secretary's Open Forum Panel.[9]

In a quite different area, and in order to improve our service to the ever-increasing numbers of Americans traveling abroad, we have initiated a program in conjunction with the Postal Service to take passport applications in several hundred first-class post offices throughout the country. This will enable us to expand and improve our service dramatically without incurring the costs involved in establishing more federal facilities.

So on the managerial side these have been two very productive years. Much remains to be done, but much has been accomplished.

II

But modernization and reform, if it is to be really effective, requires more than improved management in these areas I have been discussing.

Of critical importance, as well, is the development of an increasingly effective, fair, and enlightened system of human relations within the Department. Here, too, we have had a remarkable two years, with much progress being made—and with much still left to be done.

To begin with, we have been operating on the simple, unassailable assumption that women possess approximately half the brain power in this country. We have therefore sat down with women employees and designed and implemented a program for encouraging rather than deterring career prospects for women officers. They are now assured equal consideration for assignments, training opportunities, and perquisites, without regard to sex or marital status. Indeed one of the more interesting aspects of programs to enhance career possibilities for women is the development of working family teams in which both the wife and husband are career Foreign Service employees. Over 30 such teams are now in the Department's Foreign Service, and more may be expected soon.[10]

The changes we have made in this area have been well publicized. They were made not only in justice to women but in the Department's own self interest, for we can ill afford to ignore this major brainpower pool. I am pleased to report that this fall nearly three times as many women applied to take the Foreign Service exams as applied in 1969—the year before this program began.

Efforts are also underway to accord increased recognition of the professional status and rights of secretaries—still one of the largest and most important groups of women in the Department's Civil and Foreign Services.

We have also addressed the problem of a bill of rights for the spouses and dependents of Foreign Service employees. The voluntary unpaid support that wives have traditionally given to our embassy efforts overseas has constituted one of the great strengths of our Service and also, from a family point of view, one of its most rewarding aspects. But there have been occasions when this tradition was abused and when its voluntary basis not properly understood. Working first with wives and later with the Secretary's Open Forum Panel we have now spelled out the rights of Foreign Service spouses and dependents—and I am confident that rather than weakening the traditional teamwork of Foreign Service families, this bill of rights will strengthen it.[11]

In the past two years we have continued to emphasize our minority recruitment program despite our personnel cuts and the resultant reductions in our over-all recruitment.

In addition we recognize that there are many persons, some from minority backgrounds, some not, who have the ability to rise to positions of considerable responsibility but who have been denied their opportunity because of inadequacies in their education. With this in mind we have, as I mentioned earlier, created the "Mustang" program which each year will provide opportunities for specially selected employees to advance to officer rank.

Within this critical area of the Department's human relations, however, I believe the creation of a formal employee-management relations system for the Foreign Service is of overriding importance.

Following changes in Civil Service procedure, this new system has just been promulgated by the President.[12] It is a pioneering effort specially designed for the Foreign Service and is the result of extensive debate and consultation between the management

Footnotes at end of article.

of the Department and representatives of the Foreign Service. For the first time members of the Foreign Service will have an important and formal voice in the development of all personnel policies—policies which play such an important part in their lives and careers.

Under this system members of the Foreign Service can elect an organization to be their exclusive representative, and administrative officials in the Department are required to consult with that organization on personal policies which either the Department or the employees wish to change. If these consultations do not result in agreement, the employee's representative can appeal over the heads of the Department's administrative officials to the Board of the Foreign Service.

The Board of the Foreign Service will have two subgroups to help it carry out its responsibilities. Both of these groups are independent of the administrative side of the Department. First is the three-member Employee-Management Relations Commission made up of representatives of the Department of Labor, Civil Service Commission, and Office of Management and Budget. This Commission will have the final say with respect to the supervision of elections and the adjudication of unfair labor practice complaints.

The second group, working directly under the Board of the Foreign Service, is known as the Disputes Panel. It is made up of one member from the Department of Labor, one from the Federal Services Impasses Panel, one from the public, and two from the Foreign Service. Thus the majority of this Disputes Panel comes from "outside" the Department of State. In addition, the two Foreign Service representatives cannot be part of the management of the Department. When the administrative authorities of the Department are unable to reach agreement in their consultations with the representatives of the Foreign Service employees, it is the function of this disputes group, acting on behalf of the Board of the Foreign Service, to establish the facts and seek a solution through mediation. If this fails, the Panel must then recommend an appropriate solution to the Board of the Foreign Service.

With the development of this employee-management relations system we have passed an historic milestone in the continuing development of the Foreign Service. But this milestone was not reached easily. There were strong differences of views, and much hard bargaining and public controversy.

But what has emerged in the judgment of both the management of the Department and the leadership of the American Foreign Service Association is "a system well adapted to the Foreign Service, and a system under which the men and women of the Foreign Service can have a real voice in the policies and regulations affecting their careers."

Here again, the past two years have seen an important breakthrough. But the job is just beginning, not ending. If this new system is to fulfill its promise, it is incumbent upon all members of the Foreign Service to pay close attention to the positions taken by the employee organization chosen as their exclusive representative. It is incumbent on that organization and the administrative officials of the Department with whom it will be dealing to make every effort to see that this new system works in a fair, constructive and responsible manner.

However, it is not enough simply to build a system where members of the Foreign Service, in the collective sense, will have a stronger and more effective voice in the development of personnel policies. In addition, there is the need for each individual member to have access to a meaningful grievance procedure independent of the Department's personnel authorities, and in which the individual's rights are clearly defined and understood. Until recently such a system did not exist. There was in its stead a formal system of limited scope and an informal system in which every effort was made to be fair, but which was neither independent of the personnel authorities nor characterized by any specific definition of the rights of an aggrieved employee.

We have now instituted an interim grievance procedure which is a major step forward.[13] The Interim Grievance Board is chaired by William Simkin, who from 1961 to 1969 was Director of the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service, and is made up of distinguished public members as well as career officials with considerable experience in the Foreign Service. Unlike the earlier arrangements, it is set up and operates independently of the personnel and administrative officials of State, AID and USIA.

It is an "interim" grievance procedure because we believe that the definitive grievance procedure should be bargained out in the employee-management relations system—which is just what such a system is for. Once the definitive grievance procedure has been hammered out, the Department will support legislation which incorporates the basic principles of that procedure as an amendment to the Foreign Service Act.

Another crucial area of the Department's human relations is that of involuntary retirement or "selection-out." I believe that such a system, presently required by law, is an essential ingredient of a strong Foreign Service, and I believe that this view is shared by the great majority of Foreign Service Officers.

But this system has recently come under increasing attack. We now have in the employee-management relations system a particularly appropriate means for the representatives of Foreign Service employees to sit down with the Department's management for a careful and thorough reexamination of the selection-out system. I am confident that out of the re-examination will come a reaffirmation of the need for a continued involuntary retirement system; and I am equally confident that in this re-examination we are going to find ways to make it a fairer and stronger system. Fewer than 10 officers are presently scheduled for involuntary retirement between now and June 30th. In view of this upcoming re-examination, the Department has suspended all final selection-out actions between now and that date.

In summary then, the most critical ingredients in the human relations field are the development of a strong employee-management relations system to deal with the development of personnel policies, and the establishment through the employee-management relations system, and ultimately by an amendment to the Foreign Service Act, of a definitive grievance procedure. Under the employee-management relations system we will also be re-examining involuntary retirement procedures and here, as elsewhere, looking for areas where we can strengthen the role of due process.

Some have said that in taking these actions we are undermining the basic discipline of the Foreign Service. Of course, the exact opposite is true. The way to guarantee the continuation of a disciplined Service is to make certain that its basic safeguards and fairness are apparent to all.

But as we move into this new era of the Department's human relations, let me make it clear that I do not believe the old system was as unfair as has sometimes been alleged. In a highly competitive system such as ours, there are bound to be disappointed persons. And while our involuntary retirement system has been run by human beings and is therefore fallible, it is my personal belief that those who manned the system earlier made every effort to make it as fair as possible.

But there is no denying that the system has been a paternalistic one. And even if it was far fairer than its critics give it credit for, it is not—because of its paternalism and its inadequate recognition of both the collective and individual rights of Foreign Service employees—a credible or acceptable system for today.

III

The past two years have been a time of tumult. There has been criticism, disagreement, and public controversy. This is understandable. When a major reform and modernization program is launched, it is predicated on the assumption that things are wrong and need correcting. One should not be surprised, therefore, when there is considerable public focus on what is wrong—and vigorous debate over proposed solutions. This controversy may appear unseemingly by earlier standards of State Department decorum. It is, however—except when disfigured by unjust and personal attacks on a dedicated career Foreign Service Officer—a very healthy and useful process.

It would be a mistake to allow the turmoil which has been a part of these last two years or the controversy and clash of views which will accompany the forthcoming employee elections, to obscure what is really going on in this Department. Controversy is an integral part of the progress we are all working for. There have been years in this Department when there has been very little tumult and very little progress. We are in a much better era now.

And now my final point: No effort of this kind starts without antecedents. Much of the credit must go to those career officers among you who in increasing numbers in the years immediately preceding January 1970 pressed for reform and set the stage for what has followed. To you and to the many who joined you in the past two years, we owe a considerable debt.

The question I put to you now is this: Will your commitment to this effort be sustained? Important decisions lie ahead, and modernization is a task which, by definition, is never done. Even in the specific areas I have been reporting on today, the record is one of useful and important beginnings—not final accomplishments.

Modernization as a process will continue in the Department. That is inevitable. The question is whether you, the career professionals, will continue to lead it. If you do, and for as long as you do, this critically important work will be in the best of hands.

FOOTNOTES

[1] *Diplomacy for the 70's, A Program of Management Reform for the Department of State.* Department of State Publication 8551, December 1970. Superintendent of Documents, United States Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C.

[2] "Policy Analysis and Resource Allocation in the Department of State", Management Reform Bulletin #26, July 2, 1971, Department of State, Wash., D.C.

[3] "The Seventh Floor", Management Reform Bulletin #24, July 2, 1971, Department of State, Wash., D.C.

[4] "The Evaluation Process: Office of the Inspector General", Management Reform Bulletin #25, July 6, 1971, Department of State, Wash., D.C.

[5] "Promotion Reform: Threshold Review and Mid-Career Tenure", Management Reform Bulletin #27, Department of State, Wash., D.C.

[6] "Broadening the Foreign Service's Recruitment Base", Management Reform Bulletin #2, January 6, 1971, Department of State, Wash., D.C.

[7] "Toward a Unified Personnel System: The Foreign Affairs Specialist Corps, "Management Reform Bulletin #8, February 16, 1971; and, "Toward a Unified Personnel System: The Foreign Affairs Specialist Corps" (Supplement to MRB #8), Management Reform

Bulletin #18, May 19, 1971, Department of State, Wash., D.C.

[8] "The 'Mustang' Program: Identifying and Developing Talent Within", Management Reform Bulletin #28, July 2, 1971, Department of State, Wash., D.C.

[9] "Policy on Security Practices and Expression of Views", Management Reform Bulletin #7, February 11, 1971; "Openness at Missions and Creative Dissent", Management Reform Bulletin #9, February 23, 1971; "Domestic Public Opinion: Informing the Policy Makers", Management Reform Bulletin #12, March 30, 1971; "Public Affairs in the Decisionmaking Process", Management Reform Bulletin #13, April 13, 1971; "Stimulation of Creativity", Management Reform Bulletin #32, November 17, 1971; Department of State, Wash., D.C.

[10] "Implementing Policy on Equal Opportunities for Women and Employment Abroad of Dependents of Employees", Department Notice, August 12, 1971, Department of State, Wash., D.C.

[11] "Policy on Wives of Foreign Service Employees," Department Notice, January 21, 1972, Department of State, Washington, D.C.

[12] "Employee-Management Relations in the Foreign Service of the United States," Text and Analysis of Executive Order 11636, Department of State Newsletter Special Supplement, January 1972. Department of State, Washington, D.C.

[13] "Foreign Service Grievance Procedures for State/USIA/AID", Department Notice, August 12, 1971, Department of State, Wash., D.C.

Mr. AIKEN. In his address, Mr. Macomber does admit there is still a long way to go, but at least we are on the way, and I believe that he is entitled to a great deal of credit for this.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I join the distinguished senior Senator from Vermont, the dean of the Republicans in this body, in what he has said about Under Secretary of State Macomber.

The Committee on Foreign Relations knows Bill Macomber well—very well—because, for a number of years, under the Eisenhower administration, he served as the liaison between the Department of State and the committee. No man could be more fair; no man, in my opinion, had greater integrity. So far as the members of the committee were concerned, he treated us all alike, told us the facts as he understood them, and did not attempt at any time to play any kind of politics whatever.

After that, he served as Ambassador to Jordan, and his record there was distinguished. Then he came back and, under the present administration, accepted—not with great enthusiasm, but because he thought it was a duty—the position he now occupies as Under Secretary of State for Management.

May I say that the regard for Bill Macomber in the Senate extends to both sides of the aisles, and I know of no Senator, either Democrat or Republican, who does not share that high regard for this man of integrity and dedication, who has done so well in his relations with Congress, and who I think has comported himself with great dignity under difficult circumstances.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I appreciate the remarks of the majority leader.

I will not attempt to enumerate all the changes which Mr. Macomber has been bringing about, but I will mention three or four of them.

He has been changing the recruiting policies and bringing into the Department people of more varied backgrounds. He has put a stop to using the wives of foreign officers as virtual servants for the wife of the Ambassador. This has not been a common practice, but it has been occurring. Now he has succeeded in getting an order putting a stop to that. He has set up a new State Department interim grievance procedure. In that, however, he was pressured somewhat by Congress. But that has been done. He stopped all selection-out firing between now and the end of June while personnel policy is being reviewed. Only 10 persons were scheduled to be fired, but there has been considerable injustice in that field.

Mr. Macomber has done particularly good work in making the progress he has been able to make up to now.

Mr. MANSFIELD. If the distinguished Senator from Vermont will yield further, may I say that if the Senator from Vermont had not done so, it was my intention to ask unanimous consent of the Senate to insert the same remarks. Thus, I join the Senator in that request and state that anyone who looks for perfection is just not looking at anyone who should be considered a human being. We make plenty of mistakes in this body, collectively and individually, but we are continuing to work in the right direction.

Reform has been needed in the State Department. It was long overdue. So far as I am aware, Mr. Macomber has been moving in the right direction, and I wish him all success in the months and years ahead.

Mr. AIKEN. I thank the distinguished majority leader for his comments.

PETITIONS

Petitions were laid before the Senate and referred as indicated:

By the ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore (Mr. ALLEN):

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin:

"1971 SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 19

"Enrolled joint resolution memorializing Congress to enact Federal legislation authorizing state public assistance programs to use vendor and voucher payments in certain circumstances

"Whereas, state administration of a public assistance program should recognize two basic objectives, first, the desirability of delegating some measure of moderate control to the local governments dispensing such assistance, and second, the necessity of taking into account the real difficulties encountered in administering assistance cases where there is a demonstrated mismanagement or misuse of funds; and

"Whereas, in an attempt to meet the latter objective congress has heretofore enacted sections 603(a)(5) and 606(b)(2) of the federal social security act, which provide in part that aid to families with dependent children may include payments in behalf of any such children made either to another individual concerned with the welfare of those children or to a person furnishing food, shelter, or other goods, services or items to or for them, provided that the number of said individuals or persons (who are commonly referred to as "protective payees") do not exceed 10 per centum of the number of other recipients of aid to families with dependent children in the state for any particular month; and

"Whereas, other sections of the social security act relating to the administration of public assistance require an unrestricted money payment unless the assistance agency has first provided the opportunity for a hearing to determine that the public assistance recipient is incapable of handling his funds, and only then may the agency appoint a protective payee; and

"Whereas, the protective payee system has proven completely unworkable because local welfare directors find it difficult if not impossible to find persons willing to serve as protective payees; and

"Whereas, as of January 1, 1971, Milwaukee county alone had 1,259 active cases in which there had been a demonstrated mismanagement of funds primarily because of failure to pay rent or utilities; and

"Whereas, in certain cases under the federally subsidized program of aid to families with dependent children (AFDC) where there has been demonstrated mismanagement of funds, the local welfare department often finds it necessary to authorize a double payment for rent and utilities after the first payment made from AFDC funds has been misspent, with the second payment coming from strictly county funds; and

"Whereas, failure to authorize federal funds for vendor and voucher payments made to AFDC recipients forces the state to assume an unfair burden in financing public assistance cases where mismanagement of funds has been demonstrated; and

"Whereas, the unrestricted money payment requirement causes problems for both the public and private assistance agencies because some AFDC recipients presently misuse the public funds given them for special needs, such as furniture, and then proceed to obtain these special needs items from private agencies; and

"Whereas, this situation results in a waste of public funds and depletion of the resources of private agencies; and

"Whereas, the practice of prohibiting voucher and vendor payments to AFDC recipients is neither economical nor equitable for state and local agencies administering federal assistance programs; and

"Whereas, as stated in the second paragraph hereof, the congress of the United States has already established the legislative precedent for a 10 per centum formula of restricted payaments in AFDC cases; now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the senate, the assembly concurring, That the legislature of the state of Wisconsin urges federal legislation to permit a county government or its welfare agency administering federal assistance programs to authorize the following two-fold limited voucher and vendor plan in granting aid to families with dependent children, without the loss of reimbursement of the federal share of such aid: 1st, to dispense grants of aid to all new AFDC recipients in the form of vendor payments and vouchers for commodities for an initial period of up to 120 days wherever it is feasible to do so, provided that the number of new recipients getting restricted payments do not exceed 10 per centum of the number of other AFDC recipients getting assistance from the same county government or agency for any particular month; and 2nd, to give aid to families with dependent children, as provided in section 49.19 (5) of the Wisconsin statutes, in the form of supplies or commodities or vouchers for the same, in lieu of money, as a type of remedial care whenever the giving of aid in such form is deemed advisable by the county welfare director dispensing such aid as a means either of attempting to rehabilitate a particular person having the care and custody of any such children or of

preventing the misuse or mismanagement by such person of aid in the form of money payments, provided that the number of such persons getting restricted payments do not exceed 10 per centum of the number of other AFDC recipients getting assistance from the same county government or agency for any particular month; and, be it further

"Resolved, That duly attested copies of this adopted resolution be immediately transmitted to the secretary of the federal department of health, education and welfare, the chairman of the finance committee and the ways and means committee and the clerk of the house of representatives of the United States, and to each of the 12 members of congress from this state."

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. SPARKMAN, from the Committee on Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs, without amendment:

H.R. 7987. An act to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the bicentennial of the American Revolution (Rept. No. 92-603).

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. ROTH (for himself, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. BAKER, Mr. BEALL, Mr. BELLMON, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. BENTSEN, Mr. BOGGS, Mr. BROCK, Mr. BROOKE, Mr. BUCKLEY, Mr. CHILES, Mr. CHURCH, Mr. COOK, Mr. COOPER, Mr. COTTON, Mr. CURTIS, Mr. DOLE, Mr. DOMINICK, Mr. ERVIN, Mr. FANNIN, Mr. GAMBRELL, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. GRIFFIN, Mr. GURNEY, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. HATFIELD, Mr. HOLLINGS, Mr. HRUSKA, Mr. JORDAN of Idaho, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. MCCLELLAN, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. METCALF, Mr. MILLER, Mr. MOSS, Mr. PEARSON, Mr. PERCY, Mr. PROXMIRE, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. SAXBE, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. STEVENS, Mr. TAFT, Mr. THURMOND, Mr. TOWER, and Mr. WEICKER):

S. 3123. A bill to impose a statutory limit on expenditures and net lending during fiscal year 1973. Referred to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BEALL:

S. 3124. A bill relating to the practice of the healing art in the District of Columbia. Referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BYRD of West Virginia (for Mr. JACKSON and Mr. MAGNUSON):

S. 3125. A bill to amend the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, to provide for a Columbia-Snake-Palouse program. Referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. CURTIS:

S. 3126. A bill for the relief of James Evans, publisher of the Colfax County Press, and Morris Odavarka. Referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MONDALE (for himself and Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. STAFFORD, Mr. MCGEE, Mr. PELL, Mr. HART, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. INOUYE, Mr. MONTOYA, and Mr. HUGHES):

S. 3127. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to eliminate the monthly premium requirements for individuals covered under the supplementary medical insurance program established by part B of such title. Referred to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. GRIFFIN:

S. 3128. A bill to increase the membership of the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations by two members who shall be elected town or township officials. Referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. KENNEDY:

S. 3129. A bill to authorize the establishment of the Longfellow National Historic Site in Cambridge, Mass., and for other purposes. Referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. STEVENS:

S. 3130. A bill to amend Public Law 92-203, an act to provide for the settlement of certain land claims of Alaska Natives and for other purposes. Referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. PROXMIRE:

S.J. Res. 196. A joint resolution extending the date for transmission to the Congress of the report of the Joint Economic Committee. Considered and passed.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. ROTH (for himself, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. BAKER, Mr. BEALL, Mr. BELLMON, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. BENTSEN, Mr. BOGGS, Mr. BROCK, Mr. BROOKE, Mr. BUCKLEY, Mr. CHILES, Mr. CHURCH, Mr. COOK, Mr. COOPER, Mr. COTTON, Mr. CURTIS, Mr. DOLE, Mr. DOMINICK, Mr. ERVIN, Mr. FANNIN, Mr. GAMBRELL, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. GRIFFIN, Mr. GURNEY, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. HATFIELD, Mr. HOLLINGS, Mr. HRUSKA, Mr. JORDAN of Idaho, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. MCCLELLAN, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. METCALF, Mr. MILLER, Mr. MOSS, Mr. PEARSON, Mr. PERCY, Mr. PROXMIRE, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. SAXBE, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. STEVENS, Mr. TAFT, Mr. THURMOND, Mr. TOWER, and Mr. WEICKER):

S. 3123. A bill to impose a statutory limit on expenditures and net lending during fiscal year 1973. Referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill providing for a strict limitation on Federal spending for fiscal year 1973. Forty-eight Senators now join me in the introduction of this measure.

Nearly 3 months ago, I stood here and asked the Senate to vote for a ceiling on 1972 expenditures. I asked that we curtail spending for this current fiscal year to the $229.2 billion which the President had requested in his budget message 1 year ago.

In November, when I presented that amendment to the Revenue Act of 1971, outlays, which include net lending, were projected to reach $232 billion in fiscal year 1972. The deficit, on a unified basis, was predicted to be $28 billion, and on a Federal funds basis, just under $34 billion.

Unfortunately, this year's budget message proved these estimates wrong. With 6 months left to go in this fiscal year, spending is forecast to be $236.6 billion, with a deficit of $44.8 billion in Federal funds, $38.8 on the unified basis. This latter calculation of course includes the surplus in the many trust funds now in operation. Though we tax more than we pay out under these programs, the surplus is used to buy Treasury debt incurred as the result of extra spending elsewhere. The unified concept of budgeting only helps muddy the waters. I, for one, feel the trust fund accounts should be withheld from the deficit calculation.

Regardless of the methodology though, the message remains the same. Our Federal budget faces a larger deficit now than any time since World War II. Obviously, we in Congress are responsible for part of this.

But adding to the deficit have been lower-than-expected GNP, personal and business income, reflecting lower actual tax receipts in this fiscal year. Furthermore, programs such as those administered by the Commodity Credit Corporation, have experienced "uncontrolled" spending bulges of more than a billion dollars.

So, Mr. President, I am asking again today that we consider the dire state of this Government's budget. On January 25 the distinguished Senator from Montana (Mr. MANSFIELD) and the distinguished Senator from Virginia (Mr. BYRD) summarized the budget crisis in very succinct terms. Let me only remind the Senate that the pressure for new programs, increases in old programs, and the built-in cost of living increases under our Federal employee retirement programs can only add to the prospect that spending will escalate.

Let me make another point that shows, over a longer time period, that all administrations have been faced with this same problem. In the 11 years between 1962 and the estimates for 1973, our gross national product in money terms has grown at a compound rate of 6.9 percent, while Federal spending has outpaced it, growing at a compound rate of 7.9 percent.

To finance this growing Federal participation in our national economy, we have borrowed at a compound rate of 4.3 percent increase per year. But due in large part to the Treasury's difficult task of placing this debt, interest on the debt has grown more than twice as fast as the principal, at a compound rate of 8.9 percent.

Many noteworthy economists have argued that concern for the size of the Nation's debt is a meaningless argument, since it is money the Nation owes itself. In part they are right, but economists of all persuasions recognize that debt held outside the country can be a major influence on this Nation's policy. The most recent issue of the Federal Reserve Bulletin shows that between January and November 1971, the U.S. debt held by foreign investors more than doubled from $20.9 billion to $44.1 billion.

Can we reasonably expect foreign confidence in the dollar to continue if our budget repeatedly shows spending far beyond our inclination to tax? Secretary Connally has recently concluded a delicate series of negotiations with the Group of Ten, under which the United States has agreed, in principle, to revalue the dollar downward. Sometime later this session we will be asked to consider that measure. And it is my opin-

ion we can only avoid further devaluations by bringing our fiscal policies more in line with world expectations.

We cannot exist in an economic vacuum. This year's staggering trade deficit of more than $2 billion only helps punctuate our reliance on world opinion and confidence in our economy.

In short, we are facing an election year in which the temptation to spend will surely increase, but where our ability to spend will be determined largely by an economy showing only mixed signs of recovery and a world marketplace which may place severe pressures on us for domestic economic reform.

It seems necessary, then, that we face this situation with a "no nonsense" attitude. Two weeks ago, I placed in the RECORD an article from the Washington Post, indicating that the President might ask Congress for a spending ceiling. The following day, the budget message included a request for such a ceiling.

Today, I am asking that we act now, early in the session, to pass this bill which would bind both the executive and Congress to an airtight ceiling on outlays—expenditures plus net lending.

There are no exceptions. In several previous attempts, Congress has tried to limit spending, but excluded the so-called uncontrollable elements of the budget—interest payments, unemployment benefits, social security and veterans benefits, and so forth. Funds for the Vietnam war were also exempted from the 1968 and 1970 legislative measures.

But this is a bill which plugs those holes. Since total Federal spending effects total Federal borrowing, we must take the bit in our teeth and pass the only workable legislation which will keep the lid on all of our spending.

I am not completely convinced that our trading partners embrace the full employment method of budgeting. Many see only another U.S. deficit running at $36.1 billion in Federal funds, $25.5 under the unified calculation. It is these perceived deficits which will continue to place pressure on the dollar and force interest rates back up.

Nevertheless, I have asked that we adopt the administration's figure of $246.3 billion, confident that the "water" which is included in every budget will be enough to soak up any unexpected increases in "uncontrollables." However, I would be happy if the Senate would accept a lower figure.

Mr. President, I heartily concur with the distinguished majority leader's concern for our runaway spending. It is up to Congress to impose a statutory limit early in this session so that we may appropriate funds in full knowledge of the goal we have set for ourselves and the administration.

I welcomed Mr. MANSFIELD's support last November, when, without administration's support, I came within seven votes of having a similar measure passed. I am hopeful that now, with endorsement from the White House, I can garner bipartisan support for a measure which clearly is in the Nation's best interest.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

S. 3123

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) expenditures and net lending during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, under the Budget of the United States Government shall not exceed $246,300,000,000.

(b) The President shall, notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, reserve from expenditure and net lending, from appropriations or other obligational authority heretofore or hereafter made available, such amounts as may be necessary to effectuate the provisions of subsection (a).

(c) In the administration of any program as to which—

(1) the amount of expenditures is limited pursuant to subsection (a), and

(2) the allocation, grant, apportionment, or other distribution of funds among recipients is required to be determined by application of a formula involving the amount appropriated or otherwise made available for distribution,

the amount available for expenditure (as determined by the President) shall be substituted for the amount appropriated or otherwise made available in the application of the formula.

By Mr. BYRD of West Virginia (for Mr. JACKSON and Mr. MAGNUSON):

S. 3125. A bill to amend the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, to provide for a Columbia-Snake-Palouse program. Referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to submit a statement on behalf of the distinguished Senator from Washington (Mr. JACKSON) as well as introducing a bill on behalf of the Senator from Washington (Mr. JACKSON) and his colleague, Mr. MAGNUSON.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BENTSEN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR JACKSON

Senator Magnuson and I introduce this legislation today to help solve a major soil erosion problem in the Pacific Northwest.

The legislation permits the Department of Agriculture to enter into special soil conservation contracts with farmers and landowners in the Columbia-Snake-Palouse region. The farmers in this region, which covers a 46-county area in Washington, Oregon and Idaho, are suffering millions of dollars of losses in damage to crops as well as enormous amounts of irreplacable topsoil washing down to the sea each year.

This conservation and environmental program is similar to one now in operation in the Great Plains area. It is designed to bring the severe water and wind erosion of the area's farm land under control, while substantially reducing sedimentation and pollution of the air and water.

Soil erosion in the area has damaged domestic water supplies, adversely affected fish and wildlife, diminished the value of recreational developments and caused more expensive road maintenance.

We believe that legislation is necessary to help cope with these problems as well as helping to minimize the direct losses to farmers in the form of crop damage and soil eroded by wind and water.

We join our colleagues in the House, who have introduced similar legislation, in urging prompt action on this bill.

By Mr. MONDALE:

S. 3127. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to eliminate the monthly premium requirements for individuals covered under the supplementary medical insurance program established by part B of such title. Referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, today I am introducing with Senators HUMPHREY, MCGOVERN, STAFFORD, MCGEE, PELL, HART, RANDOLPH, INOUYE, MONTOYA, and HUGHES a bill to eliminate the medicare part B premium. This premium is now paid by more than 19 million of our elderly citizens. Ninety-six percent of all those who are eligible for medicare hospitalization also pay the premium for supplementary medical insurance.

The part B premium is a terrible burden for many of our elderly citizens. Since 1967, the premium has gone from $3 per individual per month to $5.60 per month per individual. And if nothing is done about it, the premium will continue to rise. We are all aware of the rapid increase in medical costs, and if the premium is not eliminated, month by month our elderly will be forced to pick up a share of these rapidly rising costs—$5.60 a month may not seem like much to most Americans, but to many of the elderly it is a high and cruel monthly charge. For many of them, it means the difference between being able to buy a new pair of shoes or going another year or two with the old shoes. One of my constituents has recently written me that she has not had a new pair of shoes in 10 years, or a new dress in four—25.3 percent of the elderly are poor and this percentage of poor is twice our national average.

It is a national disgrace compounded by the fact that we ask these old people to lay out almost $6 a month from their meager incomes for this medical insurance program.

The average social security benefit is only $120 a month, so that for the average social security beneficiary the elimination of the part B premium is the equivalent of almost a 5-percent raise in social security benefits. The premium payments which they save will be immediately available to them for their use.

I am in favor of raising social security benefits, not only by eliminating this premium, but by voting a larger benefit increase than the 5 percent suggested in H.R. 1. But the elimination of the premium will be an important step in the right direction.

The elimination of the premium will not eliminate completely doctor bills and related fees which so burden our elderly. Supplementary medical insurance still will include a heavy deductible charge.

Medical expenses which are not covered by supplementary medical insurance because of the deductible features, cost the elderly more than $1 billion per year. And these charges will continue to fall on the elderly even if the premium is eliminated. In fact, H.R. 1 calls for an increase in a deductible which is now $50 to $60, and it includes a provision for a 20-percent coinsurance feature.

I think these deductibles should be

eliminated also, but at the very least we must eliminate the premium.

Many people have asked me how I intend to finance the elimination of the premium. At present, the elderly pay 50 percent of the costs of supplementary medical insurance through the premium. The other 50 percent is paid from general revenues. My bill shifts the entire cost of the supplementary medical insurance program to general revenues.

I was pleased by the President's announcement in the state of the Union message that he would support the elimination of the part B premium. However, I was disappointed to see in his budget that he intends to shift the $1.4 billion cost of eliminating the premium to the payroll tax. This is an important difference between his proposal and my bill.

Mr. President, in my opinion it would be grossly unfair to shift the cost of eliminating the premium to the payroll tax. Our elderly citizens do not want to burden their working children unfairly by shifting the burden of this premium to the payroll tax. The costs of treating our elderly fairly should be borne by general revenues and by all the taxpayers.

Everyone knows that the payroll tax, unlike the income tax and the corporation tax, is regressive, falling particularly heavily on the salaried workingman.

Capital gains, interest payments and other income sources which the salaried workingman rarely enjoys, are not touched by the payroll tax.

We recognized in 1967 that 50 percent of the costs of supplementary medical insurance should be borne equitably by all American taxpayers. It would be a step backward to now ask only Americans with salary income to finance the elimination of the premium.

Mr. President, shifting the cost of eliminating the part B premium to the payroll tax would require a very steep rise in that tax. Estimates are that financing elimination of the part B premium through the payroll tax would add 0.25-0.3 percent to both the employee's and the employer's tax. The 1972 tax would jump from an already high 5.2 percent to about 5.3 percent. In 1973, the rates would be 5.95 percent for both the employee and the employer.

If, on the other hand, the cost is paid by an increase in the payroll earnings base, rather than an increase in the tax rate, this would be fairer. But not as fair as shifting the cost to general revenues. Any method of financing which does not recognize the payroll tax as less progressive than financing from general revenue will be a step backward from the position taken in 1967.

We need to eliminate the part B premium. We need to improve the situation of our elderly in many other ways also. Prescription drugs should be covered by medicare. Medicare deductibles should be reduced and eliminated. But we should not try to finance all or even most of these improvements by taxing only the American workingman or woman through the payroll tax. Payroll taxes are increasing too fast while the more progressive income tax and corporation taxes have actually been falling. If we do not quickly come to recognize the danger in increasing the payroll tax, the American worker, who alone pays the payroll tax, is going to become an opponent of a better break for the elderly.

The Wall Street Journal has joined many others recently in recognizing the alarming trend in our tax policy. Progressive taxes are being reduced while payroll taxes are increasing. Moreover, there is talk of instituting a regressive sales tax at a national level. Call it what you like, a tax on the value added is a sales tax and it will hurt the poor and workingclass people while the wealthy will be spared. The part B premium should be eliminated but this necessary and humane step should be financed by progressive taxes which are paid by everyone.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

S. 3127

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress amended, That (a) section 1831 of the Social Security Act is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 1831. There is hereby established an insurance program to provide medical insurance benefits in accordance with the provisions of this part for individuals 65 years of age or over who are covered under part A or who elect to enroll under such program, to be financed from funds appropriated by the Federal Government."

(b) Section 1837 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 1837. (a) Any individual who, for the month of July 1972, or any succeeding month, is covered by the hospital insurance program established by part A shall also be covered by the program established by this part.

"(b) Any individual who is not covered by the program established by this part for the month of July 1972, or any succeeding month, by reason of the provisions of subsection (a), shall, if he is eligible under section 1836 to enroll in the program established by this part, secure coverage by enrolling therefor in such manner and within such time period, which shall not be later than the month following the month in which such individual applies for enrollment under such program, as the Secretary shall by regulations prescribe."

(c) Sections 1837, 1838, 1839, 1840, and 1843 of such Act are repealed.

(d) Section 1844 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 1844. There are authorized to be appropriated from time to time, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the Federal Supplementary Medical Insurance Trust Fund, such sums as may be necessary to assure that there will be, at all times, sufficient moneys in such Fund to make prompt payment of benefits provided under this part and the administrative expenses thereunder, and otherwise assure that any other financial obligations of such fund can promptly be met."

SEC. 2. The amendments and repeals made by the first section of this Act shall be effective on and after July 1, 1972.

By Mr. KENNEDY:

S. 3129. A bill to authorize the establishment of the Longfellow National Historic Site in Cambridge, Mass., and for other purposes. Referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

THE LONGFELLOW HISTORIC SITE

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I am introducing legislation today to establish the Longfellow National Historic Site in Cambridge, Mass. This legislation provides that the Secretary of Interior may acquire the home of Henry Wadsworth Longfellow at 105 Brattle Street in Cambridge for establishment as the Longfellow National Historic Site.

The Longfellow home is not only an outstanding example of colonial architecture, but it served as George Washington's headquarters in 1775 and 1776 and was the home of the poet, Henry Wadsworth Longfellow, from 1837 to 1882. It is only fitting that this home be preserved in public ownership for the benefit and inspiration of all the citizens of the United States.

We are indeed fortuante that through the centuries the Longfellow home has been maintained with great care and despite some alterations the structure remains intact architecturally and is in a state of good repair. Those members of the community who realized long ago that they were in possession of a great national historic resource determined to keep the home in excellent condition for generations to come. And for this we can only feel a very deep gratitude.

In July 1775, the Longfellow home became George Washington's headquarters for 10 months during the seige of Boston. Longfellow's association with the house began in 1837 when he rented a room there. In 1843 Henry Wadsworth Longfellow and his bride were given the home as a wedding present and enjoyed life there until 1882. Portions of some of Longfellow's greatest works were written here: "The Courtship of Miles Standish," "Evangeline," "Hiawatha," and the "Skeleton in Armor." The buildings, grounds, and furnishings including some priceless art objects have remained essentially as they were when Longfellow lived and wrote there.

I am happy to introduce today this legislation to establish this beautiful home as a national historic site. I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of my remarks the text of this bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 3129

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That in order to preserve in public ownership for the benefit and inspiration of the people of the United States, a site of national historical significance containing a dwelling which is an outstanding example of colonial architecture and which served as George Washington's headquarters during the siege of Boston in 1775–1776, and from 1837 to 1882 as the home of Henry Wadsworth Longfellow, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to acquire by donation the fee simple title to the real property and improvements thereon, together with furnishings and other personal property, situated at and known as 105 Brattle Street, Cambridge, Massachusetts, for establishment as the Longfellow National Historic Site.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Interior is further authorized to accept the donation of not less than $200,000, and such other sums of money as may be tendered from time to time

by the Trustees of the Longfellow House Trust, established pursuant to indentures dated October 28, 1913, and November 18, 1914, and such funds or any part thereof and any interest thereon, may be used exclusively for the purposes of administration, maintenance, and operation of the Longfellow National Historic Site.

SEC. 3. The Longfellow National Historic Site shall be established when title to the real and personal property described in section 1 of this Act and the sum of $200,000 as set forth in section 2 of this Act have been accepted by the Secretary of the Interior, and upon such establishment, the Longfellow National Historic Site shall be administered by the Secretary of the Interior in accordance with the Act approved August 25, 1916 (39 Stat. 535), as amended and supplemented, and the Act approved August 21, 1935 (49 Stat. 666).

SEC. 4. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act.

By Mr. STEVENS:

S. 3130. A bill to amend Public Law 92–203, an act to provide for the settlement of certain land claims of Alaska Natives and for other purposes. Referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I am introducing today a bill to amend Public Law 92–203, which was the Alaska Native Land Claims Settlement Act of 1971. One of the difficulties of that act was that the moneys to be paid to Alaska Natives from the Federal Treasury as part of the settlement will be paid over to regional corporations which have had to be formed. In each of the 12 regional areas of Alaska there is a regional association comprised of Alaska Native people. Each of these now has the duty to form a regional corporation and to assist the Natives of each village in the area of each regional corporation also to incorporate. The act we passed last December also places a duty on the village and regional corporations to identify lands which will be conveyed to them pursuant to the Alaska Native Land Claims Settlement Act.

Unfortunately, the moneys will not be paid to the regional corporations until the roll of those entitled to share in the settlement is completed. This will be done, we trust, in about 2 years. Meanwhile, there is an immediate need for funding for the purpose of organizing the corporations and for the purpose of identifying the lands to be conveyed to the regional village corporations.

I have discussed the problem of funding these regional and village corporations on an interim basis with responsible financial institutions both within and without Alaska. The legal advisers of these institutions have taken the position that loans cannot be made beyond the limits of loans to individuals until the regional corporations are legally formed and approved by the Secretary of the Interior. We are hopeful that this will be done in the very near future and that advances will be made by the institutions to those corporations to start their work which is vital to the completion of this settlement. In any event, it is apparent that in these 2 first fiscal years before the final loan is completed money will be needed by the regional and village corporations.

One of the agreements made in our conference committee and approved by the Congress was that there should be $12.5 million available in the first fiscal year and $50 million in the second fiscal year. To place these moneys in a fund in the Treasury will be of no use to these regional village corporations, which so vitally need the funds to initiate the work for the Alaska Native people in each area.

I realize there is a difficulty in terms of identifying the villages which will be eligible for participation under the Alaska Native Land Claims Settlement Act. Without attempting to decide that question, the bill I have introduced today provides that the regional associations may advance funds to village corporations only if the village for which the corporation is organized is listed on the Preliminary Statement of Eligibility prepared by the Bureau of the Census showing that 25 or more Native residents resided in such village on the date of the 1970 census.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

S. 3130

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Public Law 92–203 shall be amended by adding at the end of section 6(c) thereof the following:

"*Provided,* That there shall be advanced to each regional association the sum of $1,000,000 in fiscal year 1972 and $3,000,000 in fiscal year 1973 which shall be used solely for organization of the regional corporations and village corporations within each region and to identify land for such corporations pursuant to the Act of December 18, 1971. Such advance shall be credited against the first moneys due to such corporations under this Act and shall first be used to repay any loans advanced to such corporations by any financial organization after December 14, 1971. No funds may be advanced by any regional association to any village corporation unless the village for which such corporation was organized is determined by the Bureau of the Census to have had 25 or more Native residents living within such village according to the 1970 census."

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

S. 2981

At the request of Mr. AIKEN, the Senator from Utah (Mr. BENNETT), the Senator from Nevada (Mr. BIBLE), the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. FULBRIGHT), the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. MCGEE), the Senators from Rhode Island (Mr. PASTORE and Mr. PELL), the Senator from Alaska (Mr. STEVENS), and the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. MONTOYA) were added as cosponsors of S. 2981, a bill to amend the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act and the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act.

S. 3121

At the request of Mr. SCOTT, the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. BROOKE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3121, a bill to extend the Commission on Civil Rights for 5 years.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 107

At the request of Mr. TOWER, the Senator from Illinois (Mr. STEVENSON) was added as a cosponsor of Senate Joint Resolution 107, a joint resolution to authorize and request the President to issue annually a proclamation designating the month of February of each year as "American History Month."

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF RESOLUTIONS

At the request of Mr. TUNNEY, the Senator from Delaware (Mr. BOGGS) was added as a cosponsor of Senate Resolution 145, urging the Voice of America to be broadcast in the Yiddish language to the Soviet Union.

At the request of Mr. CASE, the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. RIBICOFF) was added as a cosponsor of Senate Resolution 214, relative to the submission of any Portuguese base agreement as a treaty.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 57—SUBMISSION OF A CONCURRENT RESOLUTION CALLING FOR A NATIONAL DAY OF PRAYER FOR THE CAUSE OF WORLD PEACE

(Referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.)

NATIONAL DAY OF PRAYER FOR THE CAUSE OF WORLD PEACE

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, the Bible tells us that "the work of righteousness shall be peace." On February 21 of this year, the President of the United States will begin a journey to do the work of righteousness. He will go to do the work of a people who, however often we may falter and fail in our efforts, still seek to be a righteous people—a people who covet no nation's holdings.

We covet the future, because it belongs to our children and their children and so on. It belongs as well to the children of those who would make themselves our adversaries, and we cannot suppose that the leaders or the laborers of any other nation love their children less than we love our own. This much we share with them, and more. We share the same planet, and the same destiny as inhabitants of this planet. We share the same fate as children of a just God, who must judge us all. We share the same responsibility for our deeds—and we cannot suppose that a just God finds satisfaction in the pain of some of his creatures, and sorrow in the pain of others—so that our deeds must be judged equally with the deeds of those whom we oppose in the world.

In these things that we share, the peoples of the world are united. We see this clearly. It is our hope that the leaders of the other great powers also see it clearly. By what we hold in common, we hope to find a common road to peace. We believe that there is today as great an opportunity as has occurred in this century to find a lasting peace. In this belief and in this hope, President Nixon will go in search of that peace.

And as we all share in the desire for peace as we must all share in the hope that he will succeed. But our hopes alone are not sufficient. We must send our prayers as well.

As a gesture of that shared desire and as a demonstration of our good will, I hereby offer a resolution to read as follows:

Whereas the American people share with all the peoples in the world an earnest desire for peace and the relaxation of tensions among nations; and

Whereas it is the policy of the United States to engage in negotiations rather than confrontations with other nations; and

Whereas on February 21, 1972, the President of the United States will begin a historic visit in the Peoples Republic of China to confer with that nation's leaders with the purpose of seeking more normal relations between the two countries and exchanging views on questions of mutual concern; and

Whereas the people of the United States hold the highest and most fervent hopes for the success of the President's mission; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That it is the sense of Congress

(1) That Monday, February 21, 1972, be commemorated as a day of united support for the President's efforts in pursuit of the relaxation of international tensions and enduring and just peace;

(2) That the leaders of all nations and men of good will throughout the world be urged to devote all possible efforts to promote the cause of peace and international harmony as set forth in the preamble to the Charter of the United Nations;

(3) That the President designate Sunday, February 20, 1972, as a National Day of Prayer for the cause of world peace; and

(4) That copies of this resolution be sent to the Governors of the several States and be delivered by the appropriate representatives of the United States Government to the Appropriate representatives of every nation of the world.

Mr. President, the quest for peace knows no partisanship, no regionalism—nor does it recognize nationality or ideology. The quest for peace is its own universal cause.

I extend a firm and open invitation to all my colleagues to join in sponsoring this declaration of our Congress and our people's hope and support for the president.

And I would trust that with the cooperation of the Senate leadership, it might secure expedited consideration and speedy approval and serve as a means of saying to the President, as in the scriptures, "Go in Peace."

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 58—SUBMISSION OF A CONCURRENT RESOLUTION CALLING FOR THE RECOGNITION OF BANGLADESH

(Referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.)

RECOGNITION OF BANGLADESH

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I am submitting a concurrent resolution today calling for U.S. diplomatic recognition of Bangladesh. As early as December 15 I urged the President to consider extending diplomatic recognition as one step toward ending the crisis. Since that time open hostilities have abated. Accordingly, I urged the President on January 11, at which time other governments had recognized the sovereignty of Bangladesh, to extend recognition to that country and the government of Sheikh Mujibur Rahman.

Today I am offering a resolution which incorporates the points I made in my remarks of December 15 and 21 of January. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

S. CON. RES. 58

Whereas the territory of East Pakistan was proclaimed the independent country of Bangladesh on April 10, 1971;

Whereas the elected head of the Awami League, Sheikh Mujibur Rahman, returned to Bangladesh on January 10, 1972 and set up a popularly accepted government on January 12, 1972;

Whereas the Rahman government is in full control of a defined territory and population;

Whereas several governments have already extended diplomatic recognition to Bangladesh;

Whereas the Congress has authorized and appropriated relief assistance for refugees from East Pakistan, now known as Bangladesh;

Whereas the United Nations and several voluntary organizations have organized relief assistance to India and the territory of Bangladesh;

Whereas a significant portion of American assistance to India, provided under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 as amended, was cut off during the war in South Asia; therefore, let it be

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Congress that the President should extend immediate diplomatic recognition to the country of Bangladesh and the government of Sheikh Mujibur Rahman; be it further

Resolved, That the Congress urge the President to plan immediately to utilize the funds which Congress has authorized and appropriated for relief assistance, for economic and humanitarian assistance programs for East Pakistani refugees, especially those programs run under international auspices; be it further

Resolved, That the Congress urge the President to resume economic assistance to India which was cut off during the war in South Asia; and be it further

Resolved, That the Congress urge the President to make every effort possible to restore good relations between the government of India and the United States.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, this resolution calls upon the President to do four things:

First. Extend recognition to the sovereign country of Bangladesh and the government of Sheikh Mujibur Rahman;

Second. Provide economic and humanitarian assistance to Bangladesh from funds already authorized by Congress for this purpose;

Third. Resume fully funded economic assistance programs to India, provided under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1971 and earlier acts; and

Fourth. To take other appropriate steps to improve our relations with India.

I offer this proposal in an effort to repair the damage which has already been wrought in our relations with the Bengali people of Bangladesh and the Government of India.

In past remarks I have cataloged a list of criticisms on our policies and actions in South Asia.

I do not intend to do that today. Stories appear every day pointing up U.S. mismanagement throughout the entire crisis. They indicate the cloistered and superficial way some of our most important foreign policy decisions are made.

My resolution seeks to solidify our relations with the two most largely populated countries of the South Asian subcontinent: Bangladesh and India.

I believe our Government should join other governments who have extended diplomatic recognition to Bangladesh. This step is a symbolic gesture of good will and also an essential measure if we intend to participate in any humanitarian relief assistance in that part of the world. And participate we should. We must have diplomatic relations to carry out aid programs and establish interim contacts with the people of Bangladesh.

Funds have already been authorized and appropriated by Congress for this purpose. The United States and the World Bank are preparing for a full-scale relief effort and other voluntary agencies have been working for a considerable amount of time with the refugee problem. All the President has to do is make these funds available to the organizations which in his estimation are best equipped to handle this major task. I urge him to work as much as possible with the United Nations and its subsidiary organizations. Not only is the U.N. equipped to handle the job, but it needs the support of the United States to demonstrate just how viable and effective an institution it really can be.

I am not suggesting that the United States take on the entire burden of reconstruction and rehabilitation for Bangladesh itself. The Government of Bangladesh does not want to become the breadbasket—as Dr. Kissinger has put it—of the United States any more than the United States wants it to. What I am proposing is that we utilize funds the Congress has already authorized in the most effective manner possible and that we join in aid consortia with other countries assisting Bangladesh in its efforts to get back on its feet.

With respect to India, I have proposed that the United States call off its suspension of $87.6 million of economic assistance for India. Our Government originally suspended these funds which were in the pipeline on December 6. The ostensible reason was that these funds were not covered by irrevocable letters of credit, and therefore, could be suspended for further review. What our Government apparently intended was to rebuke the Government of India for its actions.

The Government of India has acted in a dignified manner and to my knowledge has not formally requested the $87.6 million, which were virtually committed by our Government. It would, therefore, be a gesture of good faith to restore these funds. I would even hope that our Government would contemplate more assistance to India, not for purposes of buying back a broken friendship, but simply for alleviating the tremendous human burden which Indians have been forced to bear due to the massive influx of refugees from East Pakistan.

Finally, I urge the President to make other gestures of good faith. There are subtle ways to do this, such as writing

to the Prime Minister in response to her letter, stepping up diplomatic contacts and consultations, and establishing a network of cultural exchanges between our two countries.

I do not think that India is a capricious country. Her historic friendship with the United States cannot be broken easily, but we have tested India's friendship the last few months in a way which we ourselves would find difficult to endure. We should not test India to the breaking point. Unless President Nixon reverses his present course, I fear that is the direction we may be going.

I urge the President and my colleagues who will be voting on this resolution to recognize the importance of the stakes. Bangladesh and India, the entire world, is waiting for our response.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF A CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 55

At the request of Mr. HOLLINGS, the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. CASE) and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. RIBICOFF) were added as cosponsors of Senate Concurrent Resolution 55 expressing the sense of Congress that the President should immediately recognize Bangladesh as an independent foreign country and recognize the Government of that country.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF AN AMENDMENT

AMENDMENT NO. 832

At the request of Mr. KENNEDY, the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. HUMPHREY), and the Senator from California (Mr. TUNNEY) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 832 proposed to H.R. 12067, the foreign aid appropriation bill, 1972.

NOTICE OF CHANGE OF DATE OF INDIAN HEARINGS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, on behalf of the distinguished Senator from Washington (Mr. JACKSON), I ask unanimous consent that a statement concerning a change of date with respect to hearings by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs on S. 2724, the Indian comprehensive education bill, be printed in the RECORD.

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

NOTICE OF CHANGE OF DATE OF INDIAN HEARINGS

I wish to announce to the Senate and the public that because of the Lincoln Day recess it has been necessary to make a second change in the scheduling of the hearings set by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs on S. 2724, the Indian Comprehensive Education bill. The hearings now set for February 9 and 10 will instead be held on March 6 and 7. At that time we will receive testimony from Indian and nongovernment witnesses. Testimony from the Departments of the Interior and Health, Education, and Welfare and from national education organizations will still be received on March 1 as originally planned.

The hearings on all three days will begin at 10 a.m. in room 3110, New Senate Office Building.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

IN DEFENSE OF AMERICA

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, we so often hear bitter, unjust criticism of the United States and its policies from the officials of foreign government that we sometimes are inclined to forget that this country has many good and loyal friends overseas. In this connection, I recently ran into a newspaper article from Bonn, Germany, written by Mr. Peter Petersen, a member of the West German Parliament representing Wuttemberg-Baden. The article is unusual because of its clarity, its truth and its acknowledged prejudice on behalf of the United States.

Mr. Petersen makes no bones about his reasons. He cited the first one as follows:

America saved my people from starvation not so very long ago. No German called that U.S. imperialism. Thousands of American soldiers—225,000 to be exact—are stationed in my country and because of this commitment and their loaded guns we are still a free people.

Where I come from, we still know what freedom means—because 17 million of us are locked up behind barbed wire, walls and mine fields, behind what amounts to the ugliest and most inhuman border in the world. Some 400 of my people have been shot and killed because they wanted to go from one part of our country to another. The American commitment to freedom and the price Americans are paying for that every day saves us from the fate of our neighbors, the Czechs who are the victims of imperialism.

Yes, I am prejudiced, and I don't apologize for the fact that I love America.

Mr. Petersen says he holds to that prejudice even though a recent trip to this country caused him considerable worry and concern. He mentioned encountering personally people who were having trouble with unemployment and crime and other problems.

He says, by way of comparison:

When I was in this country 20 years ago the people in whose homes I stayed never locked their doors. This time I was warned not to walk back to my hotel after a concert.

Mr. Petersen was especialy disturbed over American students who in all sincerity talk about U.S. imperialism. He says they don't realize that the problem in the world today is exactly the other way around. He explained:

We have a crisis in the free world because Americans appear to us to shrink back from the responsibility that goes with being the strongest power in the world. It is clear to us that the Soviet don't have such qualms—and that is why they fill every vacuum America and its allies are leaving.

Mr. President, because this article is such an unusual and welcomed expression of gratitude and such an incisive appraisal of how we look today to our foreign friends, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Petersen's article, entitled, "The American Dream" be printed in its entirety in the RECORD.

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

THE AMERICAN DREAM

(By Peter Petersen)

BONN.—I am prejudiced when writing about America.

America saved my people from starvation not so very long ago. No German called that U.S. imperialism. Thousands of American soldiers—225,000, to be exact—are stationed in my country and because of this commitment and their loaded guns, we are still a free people.

Where I come from, we still know what freedom means—because seventeen million of us are locked up behind barbed wire, walls and mine fields—behind what amount to the ugliest and most inhuman border of the world. Some four hundred of my people have been shot and killed because they wanted to go from one part of our country to another.

The American commitment to freedom and the price Americans are paying for that every day saves us from the fate of our neighbors the Czechs who are the victims of imperialism.

Yes—I am prejudiced, and I don't apologize for the fact that I love America.

Yet, I am worried. Recently I talked to officers and soldiers on a big Air Force base in the deep South. I moved around in the most confusing of all American cities, Los Angeles. I had dinner with the president of a big corporation who laid off 80,000 people, and I spent an evening in the home of an old friend who is unemployed now. His two boys are at a university. He makes ends meet by fixing things up in neighboring homes (he is an engineer) and his wife got a job in a shop selling antiques the Americans like so much.

This friend considers himself lucky. A man driving my taxi was not so lucky—seventy dollars a week unemployment compensation. His savings are gone, and he is now cheating by driving a taxi for a few hours every day.

And then I looked at the headlines of the papers—there was a pitched battle in a jail somewhere—another city reports on the dope problem, and in many cities, parents protest busing their children from their neighborhood school to another part of the city to get integrated. No one has been able to explain to me yet this busing scheme.

When I was in this country twenty years ago, the people in whose homes I stayed never locked their doors. This time I was warned not to walk back to the hotel after a concert.

Americans are not very articulate—even though they might talk a great deal. So they leave the forming of their image as a nation to Madison Avenue and to Hollywood. Americans are probably the world's greatest salesmen of material goods, but they are very inept in selling ideas.

Of course, these ideas are all there—in the history of America there are the forces that made America a great country and inspired a dream to peoples all around the world.

There was a time twenty years ago when Americans often got on our nerves because they were so sure of themselves. Now we get nervous because Americans seem to be losing faith in their own destiny, and so a student—what Americans would call a "nice kid"—would in all sincerity talk about U.S. imperialism. That boy—a student in a seminar on current history—and many of his friends don't realize that the problem is exactly the other way around. We have a crisis in the Free World because Americans appear to us to shrink back from the responsibility that goes with being the strongest power in the world. It is clear to us that the Soviets don't have such qualms—and that is why they fill every vacuum America and its allies are leaving. Vietnam, I should think, proves my point. A truly imperialistic power as this "nice kid" believes America to be would have carefully calculated the risk and the price, and then if the price seemed

right and the aim worthwhile, it would have gone in with no holds barred.

I know from many conversations in Communist countries that the people there understand that basically freedom is indivisible, and they dream the American dream—not of Coca Cola or two cars in every garage but of freedom as conceived in this country in 1776. Because it is not "American" freedom in a national sense, it is the basis of human dignity everywhere.

When I mingled in the crowd in the airport in San Francisco, I wished I had a way to shake these people to remind them of what they are and to convince them of what we expect from them. Not because they are better or more intelligent perhaps than the people who would crowd the airport in Düsseldorf or Berlin, but because they have in their own heritage the hope of the world. I believe it is the only hope we have—because if America fails, the world fails, and I hope I will not again meet an American who apologizes for the fact that he is American.

TECHNOLOGY ASSESSMENT, A MUST FOR TODAY AND THE FUTURE

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, the critical challenges facing America—and indeed all civilization—come not only from our scientific and technological advancements, but from the rapid pace of change we are experiencing. We are unable to respond as quickly and sufficiently as we should to meet the emerging and complex problems threatening the entire earth—the poisoning of our air, land, and water; rapid consumption of our precious—and limited—natural resources; unbridled destruction of our natural environment; wholesale extinction of many forms of animal and plant life; deterioration of our cities and landscapes, erosion of our beaches, the elimination of our wildlife areas; and a general worsening of our human surroundings.

For my part, I do not believe we can accept the dangerous side effects of a "runaway technology" as the price of progress. The costs of pollution and destruction of our natural environment are too high for any of us. If we pay them, we will damage the present and we will lose the future.

The critical and overwhelming paradox between scientific progress and ecological destruction which confronts us today urgently concerns me.

The labor and tools of our scientific and technical communities have helped establish our strong national defense and security system, which in turn has permitted within our Nation, a creative atmosphere for research, development, and innovation. Our progress has allowed us to take a small look into some of the secrets of the universe. As a result we may soon be able to conquer the scourges of disease, poverty, and misfortune that have stalked man since his origins.

We can—and should—take justifiable pride in the remarkable scientific and governmental programs which have yielded the fruits of health and security to vast numbers of our citizens. Our pride in these accomplishments, however, must be tempered by the humility that comes with recognition of the problems that remain in front of us. Through sad experience, we are learning that scientific, technical, and industrial solutions have often resulted in conditions which are worse than the original problems we set out to solve. In short, we are rapidly becoming the victims—not the beneficiaries—of a "runaway technology."

While some of my efforts in this regard have become law, including the National Water Quality Improvement Act of 1970, the Clean Air Amendments of 1970, and the Resource Recovery Act of 1970, I am nonetheless deeply aware that we in Congress have much more to do in order to meet the total array of problems affecting our well-being.

Who makes the vital decisions that affect our lives and universe? As C. P. Snow states in his book "Science and Government":

> One of the most bizarre features of any advanced industrial society in our time is that cardinal choices have to be made by a handful of men who cannot have a first-hand knowledge of what those choices depend upon or what their results may be.

We in the Senate must be counted among that "handful of men."

In this regard, our current decision-making processes must be augmented by the creation of a specialized information center that will provide analytical and other information services concerning scientific, technical, economic, and social questions awaiting our attention.

On July 19, 1971, I, therefore, introduced S. 2302, which would establish an Office of Technology Assessment for the Congress. Such an office would assist us in identifying and considering the probable impacts on all of society of those technological applications involved in legislation we are called upon to consider, and answer the "what if" questions that always haunt us.

An Office of Technology Assessment would reduce the dependency of the Congress on the executive bureaucracy and other groups, many of whom have special, vested interest either for or against certain legislation. We need objective, unbiased information on the many complex issues facing us. We desperately require sound alternatives and options, carefully arrived at, which we can consider when legislation is before us. In this regard, we cannot, as legislators, be fully expected to deal specifically, and in detail, with the many complexities posed by rapid technical and scientific progress, unless we first have all the necessary information upon which sound judgments must be made.

We in the Congress have excellent resources at our disposal in the Library of Congress and its Congressional Research Service. We have dedicated, skilled and loyal staffs both in our own offices and attached to those committees on which we serve. However, the sheer magnitude, complexity, and scope of the problems confronting us call for an extremely high volume of sophisticated data to be analyzed and evaluated if we are to make sound and long-range decisions concerning the course of public programs and policies.

Consider the intense debate and controversy surrounding the proposal to develop the super sonic transport—the SST. The Senate required analytical and objective data in order to fully understand and assess the potential impacts of the SST on our environment, our communities, our long-range transportation needs, and our economy. The White House and the Department of Transportation shared some of their research and information with us, but only that which in general favored the SST. I am certain that a great deal of information and interpretative analysis concerning the SST originated from groups and organizations which were not able to share with us the findings of their research and analysis.

We are all aware that the legislative Branch of our Government is not receiving adequate, objective, and timely information concerning the impact of scientific and technological proposals that we are constantly called upon to consider. It is my hope that we will not have to continue to pay the price of this inadequate information flow. Let us heed the warnings already present in our polluted atmosphere and endangered rivers and oceans. Let us act now to halt the depletion of our natural resources and and the degradation of the quality of our environment.

A beginning can be made. Senate bill 2302 calls for the Congress to "equip itself with new and effective means" for securing competent, unbiased information concerning the physical, economic, social, and political effects of the applications of technology.

This bill does not call for the creation of another bureaucracy, but for establishment of a desperately needed system for providing timely information and sound alternatives concerning pending legislation for the Congress. I emphasize the term "alternatives."

How often have we been faced with rendering legislative judgments on proposals for which we require alternative considerations, but have had none to consider?

The Office of Technology Assessment that would be created by this bill would provide all of us with the vitally needed assistance and services necessary to assess the short- and long-range effects of the many complex and technical proposals being brought to our attention.

The time is long past when the Senate can afford to forego modern techniques in the areas of information and policy analysis. The tools and talents we urgently require are within our reach. The executive branch and many organizations from the private sector have developed highly sophisticated resources and procedures for acquiring, analyzing, and assessing data. We in Congress should do no less, because the quality—and even survival—of life itself rests in the balance. If we are to be that "handful of men" to make the vital decisions, we must take advantage of the best information available. The establishment of the Office of Technology Assessment would be a most significant step toward providing Congress with this vital information.

DOCK STRIKE

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, on January 28, 1972, the Nashville, Tenn., Banner devoted much of its editorial page to the crippling west coast dock strike. President Nixon's reference to the strike in his state of the Union is carried on this page. You will remember he said:

The Nation is faced with yet another transportation strike which is intolerable . . . and I am determined that we end it at once.

Mr. President, the President needs the help of the Congress. We all know the problem is a severe one and that it should not be swept under a rug. It must be faced. I ask unanimous consent that the lead editorial, "Congress Must Act on Dock Strike" and two adjacent columns, "Nixon Firm" and "Labor Will Fight" be printed in the RECORD.

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

CONGRESS MUST ACT ON DOCK STRIKE

The dock dispute on the West Coast has been festering for more than a year. A serious economic blow—estimated at $2 billion in losses—has been dealt to the United States by the work stoppage. President Nixon has asked Congress to act quickly on stopgap legislation that would allow federal mediators to step in and dictate a settlement.

To bring an end to this crippling strike, Congress should give swift passage to the measure.

But Congress still is giving President Nixon only half a loaf.

In February of 1970, the President submitted new, comprehensive legislation that would provide the government with broad authority to deal with crippling transportation strikes before they occur, rather than afterwards. That bill has gathered dust in Congressional committees, in spite of the repeated warnings by the administration of the measure's urgency.

On July 1, 1971, the longshoremen went out on strike. This halted all shipping on the West Coast and triggered economic crises in industry after industry, all of them innocent bystanders.

The strike brought a significant drop in exports, threatened a permanent loss of foreign markets, torpedoed our balance of trade and accounted for a decrease in farm prices. With the West Coast docks paralyzed, wheat and corn overflowed grain elevators and backed up on barges on the Mississippi River.

The strike is costing the 24 West Coast ports an estimated $24 million daily in cargo.

The longshoremen struck for 100 days last year while collective bargaining foundered.

During that time, American farmers lost face with one of their most attractive foreign markets, Japan, which buys more than $1 billion in agricultural imports. President Nixon has warned that Japan is concerned over the constant danger of a dock strike and is trimming its dependence on American exports.

When the dock strike began again nine days ago, Japan confirmed their economic withdrawal by ordering 8.7 million bushels of wheat from Canada and Australia and only 1.6 million bushels from the United States.

The stubborn attitude of longshoremen leaders is noted elsewhere on this page today. Their refusal to settle the strike requires emergency action by the Congress.

The nation needs this legislation; moreover, it needs the comprehensive tools to deal with national emergency strikes in advance. President Nixon has given Congress a way to deal with this problem. The time has come for Congress to quit sitting on its hands.

NIXON FIRM

(By Alice Widener)

NEW YORK CITY.—President Nixon is entirely right in asking Congress for special legislation to halt the "intolerable" West Coast dock strike. It is intolerable. It cost thousands of people their jobs. It has cost companies millions upon millions of dollars. It has halted American exports abroad and barred much-needed imports from abroad.

The West Coast dock strike epitomizes the truth of what a top economic adviser to the West European Common Market told me last year:

"You Americans pride yourselves on championing democracy, but you tolerate in your country the most powerful dictatorship in the world, the dictatorship of the Big Labor union bosses. Their rule is more absolute than that of any absolute monarch in long past history and that of any Communist or Fascist ruler in recent history."

For much too long, radical Leftist, pro-Communist Harry Renton Bridges—whom Damon Stetson of the New York Times recently described as a "lean, hawk-faced Australian-born agitator who plunged San Francisco into an agonizing general strike in 1934"—has ruled West Coast docks with a relentless anti-capitalist hand.

Over the years there has been many Congressional investigations of Harry Bridges' radical Leftist political connections. It is now alleged that he no longer is a fiery revolutionary. Perhaps he isn't. But he certainly is as destructively despotic as if he still were. It is said now that "rebellious, militant ideologues" in his own union are threatening Mr. Bridges' leadership. This may be true. But who put these militants hating American free enterprise and seeking to destroy it into their high posts within the International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union? Bridges did.

It happens that my daughter is employed in a Los Angeles firm that has been forced to discharge hundreds of employes because of the dock strike. The company has lost millions of dollars due to the strike. The company's stock has declined in value as a result of several hundred thousand investors and pensioners have been very adversely affected. How can President Nixon help to increase employment and better economic conditions if he is balked in both attempts by militant Leftists eager to "bring down the system" regardless of how many people get hurt?

In the 1940's, our government tried to deport Harry Bridges from our country as a Communist. As in so many similar cases, unfortunately, Bridges won and our government lost, leaving Bridges free to enjoy all the American liberties he held in utter contempt.

Though Communists pretend to be friends of labor while seeking to gain absolute power they immediately rob labor of all power, including the right to strike, as soon as they control a government. There is no right to strike in the Soviet Union, Red China or any other Socialist country.

Recently big labor boss George Meany suddenly revealed his true concept of himself as a man so big he could be rude, crude and boorish to an invited guest, the President of the United States. An indignant public cut Meany down to size and he is through as a figure of any significant influence in American affairs be they Democratic or Republican.

Now Harry Bridges and his fellow militant ideologues are defiantly trying to halt our economic recovery and need to be cut down to size. They too have revealed themselves for what they really are and public opinion will no longer tolerate their destructive "shut it all down" wrecking operation.

Americans everywhere ought to write or wire their representatives in Congress to blast Bridges & Company.

LABOR WILL FIGHT

(By Victor Riesel)

WASHINGTON.—Two hours before President Nixon drove up the Hill with his State of the Union message, he swiftly scrawled some words into the script—words which will become one of the truly eruptive issues of this Presidential campaign.

"The nation cannot and will not tolerate that kind of irresponsible labor tieup in the future," he wrote, referring to Harry Bridges' harassing West Coast longshore waterfront paralysis.

The next day, after applying hydraulic personal pressure on Secretary of Labor Hodgson, to whip up a written remedy in 24 rather than 72 hours, Mr. Nixon demanded Congressional power to force a settlement.

And AFL-CIO President George Meany, now back on virtually full cigar- and Nixon-chewing schedule in his eighth-floor office, decided the labor movement would become the immovable object in the way of what traditionally has been Presidential irresistible force.

"We will fight it all the way," said one of Meany's colleagues—a fully authorized source—referring to Mr. Nixon's ultra-emergency demand for Congress to empower him to ask Labor Secretary Hodgson to appoint a three-man arbitration board to dictate a settlement.

"We will not buy compulsory arbitration against anyone, any place for any reason. The fact that it is aimed at Harry Bridges makes no difference. It is consistent with the policy the federal (AFL-CIO) always has taken. And we're also opposed to his other proposed legislation for the long haul."

This was a jab at what President Nixon now has begun calling the Crippling Strikes Prevention Act, on which he said Congress has been dragging its feet for two years.

And for full measure, the labor federation will oppose confirmation of Judge George (Gid) Boldt as Pay Board chairman. So phase two of the Battle of Bal Harbour continues. Once more Meany, now well rested, and Mr. Nixon will go eyeball to eyeball.

Meany's war cry is they shall not pass—neither the one-shot legislation aimed at the West Coast longshoremen nor the broader bill which would affect all transport by subjecting transportation strikes to final and binding arbitration. Meany always counts the votes before he moves and presumably he believes he has the votes in the Congress and on its key labor committees to checkmate the President.

This confrontation could determine how many votes Mr. Nixon or Meany's candidate gets in November—which is the final and binding count for the career of each of these powerful men.

There's some obvious political skimming here for the President. Again it is he against the cigar-chomping curmudgeon and the labor troops. It is he—Mr. Nixon—who is championing the farmers whose grain has wasted and rotted in fields, small town streets and over-spilled silos. And he can show that he has gone all the way including talking to the 70-year-old Bridges face to face.

It was Bridges who said, a few minutes after the President demanded compulsory arbitration legislation, "Any legislation proposed by the President will not settle the strike." Meaning, of course, that Harry, a little more polished than in the old bloody Embarcadero general strike days, was telling the Congress and the President where to go.

But the President is uptight on this one for other than political reasons. As one of his intimates said the other day when asked why the President had scrawled the anti-strike words into the State of the Union speech—which was extraordinarily unusual:

"Well, every time it looked like we might have a settlement—which Bridges once said

we'd have in a week—it would blow. This could have serious long-range effects not only on the economy in California but across the nation. We were just showing recovery from aerospace layoffs. This is a critical moment. Unemployment there is over 6 percent. Everybody is getting hurt."

THE GENOCIDE CONVENTION AND THE INDIVIDUAL

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, some people oppose American ratification of the Genocide Convention because they believe that the Convention's definition of the word "genocide" dangerously distorts the true meaning of the term. They maintain that article II of the treaty would require each signatory to prosecute any person demonstrating the intent to destroy or harm a single member of a specified ethnic, racial, or religious group. This mandate they consider too broad.

However, this concern is unwarranted. First, article II of the treaty rather explicitly states that only the intent to destroy the "whole" or part of such groups would require Government action. In 1950 Deputy Under Secretary of State Dean Rusk drew the distinction between crimes of genocide and homicide by noting that the former designated the intent for large-scale violence against members of a specific group while actions against one or two members of a racial or ethnic group would fall in the latter category.

Furthermore, ratification of the Genocide Convention would not increase the number of prosecutions for violence against individuals because the U.S. legal system already considers such violent actions to be criminal offenses. Violence and persecution in any form has long been abhorrent to those upholding the principles of freedom and democracy for all men. Ratification of this document would merely reaffirm our commitment to those principles. After more than 20 years of debate such a reaffirmation is more important that ever.

Finally. the Convention allows for each nation in agreement to devise implementing legislation consistent with the constitutions of those nations. This provision would allow the United States to make a stand of moral opposition to genocide while maintaining criminal statutes against homicide and discrimination.

Mr. President, I ask the Senate to ratify the Genocide Convention as quickly as possible, and make clear America's position against mass violence.

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO LAW PROFESSOR OPPOSES EQUAL RIGHTS FOR WOMEN AMENDMENT

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, one of the Nation's most outstanding law professors, Philip B. Kurland, professor of law at the University of Chicago Law School and editor of the Supreme Court Review testified last year before the House Judiciary Committee in opposition to the equal rights for women amendment.

In his statement, Professor Kurland maintains that adequate authority now exists for the legislatures of the States and Congress to pass legislation "that is directed to specific evils and effective administration of that legislation will be far more effective in accomplishing the purpose of eliminating invidious discrimination." I agree with Professor Kurland and I think that the advocates of the equal rights amendment could make much better use of their time in bringing forth specific proposals before Congress and the State legislatures that would be designed to correct specific areas of discrimination against them.

Professor Kurland finds a great deal wrong with the fact that the equal rights amendment could be interpreted to abolish all legal differences in the treatment of men and women. Professor Kurland called this "a demand for unisex by constitutional mandate." And, with simple clarity, Professor Kurland explains what is wrong with the unisex amendment. He said:

> There are physiological and biological differences between men and women that are not subject to eradication even by constitutional amendment.

Professor Kurland discusses in detail one very practical problem which could be caused by the passage of the equal rights amendment. I sincerely hope that each Senator, before voting on the equal rights amendment, will think about this problem. Professor Kurland has this to say:

> Times have changed in such a way that it may well be possible for the generation of women now coming to maturity to surrender all special legal protection and privileges. A great majority of them have had all the opportunities for education and training afforded to their male peers, with an expectation of full opportunities to put that education and training to the same use as their male peers. They may well be able to succeed in a competitive society in which all differences in legal rights between men and women were wiped out. There remains, however, a very large part of the female population on whom the imposition of such a constitutional standard could be disastrous. There is no doubt that society permitted these women to come to maturity not as competitors with males but rather as the bearers and raisers of their children and the keeper of their homes. There are a multitude of women who still find fulfillment in this role. This may be unfortunate in the eyes of some; it remains a fact. It can boast no label of equality now to treat the older generations as if they were their own children or grandchildren. Nor can women be regarded as unified in their desire for this change. Certainly the desire to open opportunities to some of them can be achieved without the price of removal of the protection of others.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Professor Kurland's statement be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

STATEMENT BY PHILIP B. KURLAND, PROFESSOR OF LAW, THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

I am grateful to the committee for its invitation to express my views on the subject of a proposed constitutional amendment to provide "equal rights for women." I am not sure that I have any contribution to make to a subject that has received such extensive attention by the Congress over a period of almost 50 years now.

Indeed, I have but two points to make to this committee on the subject. First, I do not believe that a constitutional amendment is either necessary or appropriate to alleviate the very real discriminations suffered today by women in American society. I say this for two reasons. The discriminations from which women suffer in our society are essentially not those imposed by laws of either national or local governments. I submit, too, that legislation, for which Congress and the States already have ample authority, that is directed to specific evils and effective administration of that legislation will be far more effective in acomplishing the purpose of eliminating invidious discrimination.

My second proposition is that if such an amendment is to be proposed by Congress, its aims and purposes ought to be clearly delineated, either in the language of the amendment or by the reports of the committees recommending the amendment to the respective houses of Congress. Congress should particularly indicate whether it is fostering a "unisex" approach or one that bars only invidious discrimination against women. They are not the same, however much some of the sponsors of the proposed amendments would like them appear to be the same.

At the risk of trying to teach my grandmother to suck eggs, I should like to begin by referring to the tortured history of the proposed amendment.

I. SOME LEGISLATIVE HISTORY

Last year, some 47 years after it was first proposed in Congress, a joint resolution to initiate an equal rights amendment was sprung from the grasp of this committee, rushed through the House after a debate of less than 1 hour, and failed of endorsement in the Senate by a whisker. The 1923 version was put simply and ambiguously: "Men and women shall have equal rights throughout the United States and in every place subject to its jurisdiction. Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation." Obviously, the language so chosen was rife with problems of appropriate construction. The 1970 language, in a form that has essentially been used for the last 15 years or so, and repeated in the proposed resolutions under consideration here today, afforded different, but no less challenging, ambiguities. It reads:

"Equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex. Congress and the several States shall have power, within their respective jurisdictions, to enforce this article by appropriate legislation."

The proposal for an equal rights amendment obviously had not lain dormant between 1923 and 1970. After the initial impetus provided by the suffragettes, it emerged again in the period following the Second World War, during which much of what had therefore been considered men's work was ably performed by women. Indeed, in the years 1942, 1944, 1946, 1948, 1950, 1952, 1953, 1956, and 1962, the Senate Committee on the Judiciary had reported favorably on essentially the same proposal as that under consideration in 1970. And, in 1950 and 1953, the Senate had approved those resolutions with the votes of 63 to 19 and 73 to 11, respectively. There was, therefore some irony in the fact that the proposal that had in the past succeeded in the Senate but languished in the House of Representatives should, in 1970, have met its doom in "the other body" after passage in the House of Representatives.

There is an explanation for this. The Senate had not in fact changed its position in the interim. The two successful Senate forays, in 1950 and 1953, had been accomplished only after the proposal had been amended by Senator Hayden's language, which appended the following: "The provisions of this article shall not be construed to impair any rights, benefits or exemptions conferred by law upon persons of the female sex." Had the pro-

ponents of the 1970 proposal taken cognizance of this history and accepted the conditions of the Hayden qualifications, I venture that the proposal would have again readily secured Senate acquiescence. The refusal by some protagonists to accept the qualification was probably not, however, inadvertent; it was calculated. It represented a deliberate choice between two different objectives, either but not both of which the proposed amendment might fully serve.

II. CONSTRUCTION AND RECONSTRUCTION

Mr. Justice Frankfurter once told us: "Legislation has an aim; it seeks to obviate some mischief, to supply an inadequacy, to effectuate a change of policy, to formulate a plan of government. That aim, that policy is not drawn, like nitrogen, out of the air; it is evinced in the language of the statute, as read in the light of other external manifestations of purpose. That is what the judge must seek and effectuate, and he ought not to be led off the trail by tests that have overtones of subjective design." If it is the duty of the judiciary to effectuate the aim of legislation, it is no less the duty of the legislation, to the best of its capacity, to make clear what its aims are. It ought to say what mischief it wishes to obviate, what inadequacy it wants to supply, what change of policy it desires to effectuate, or what the plan of government is that it is seeking to formulate. If it is an act of usurpation for the judiciary to read legislation to effect its own aims and purposes, it is an act of abdication for the legislature to fail to state its purposes and aims in framing the legislative act that it promulgates.

The prime difficulty with the proposed 1970 equal rights amendment was that the National Legislature came close to approval of constitutional legislation without defining—without knowing?—its aims and purposes. This is not a lawyer's cavil. It was a defect so patent that newspaper editorial writers could see it. Thus, the New York Times wrote:

"Equal rights for women is a proposition so unarguable in principle and so long overdue in practice that it is a pity to have it approached by the House of Representatives as an exercise in politcal opportunism. For 47 years that body regularly rejected out of hand all proposals for a women's rights amendment to the Constitution. Now it approves, without committee hearings and after only an hour's debate, a constitutional change of almost mischievous ambiguity."

The Times itself was guilty of compounding the confusion, for it fell into the trap of thinking that equal rights and women's rights are necessarily descriptive of the same legislative objectives. It is of the essence of the problem that frequently they are not. And so there is merit in its desire for elimination of almost mischievous ambiguity, just as there is merit in the editorial proposal of the Wall Street Journal: "Well, we're all for the ladies, but even so, before we write some new words into the Constitution it would be nice to know what they really do mean."

A. A basic conflict of purpose

The primary problem of construction offered by the proposed equal rights amendment derives from the fact that the movement for women's rights is Janus-faced. The proposed amendment presented one aspect, while much of its support was voiced in terms of its other visage. The first would command the treatment of men and women as if there were no differences between them, even at the price of removing protections and benefits that have otherwise been afforded to females. It was a demand for unisex by constitutional mandate. And much of the benefit of such a proposal, to the extent it was possible to effectuate it, would inure to males rather than females, since equality may be attained by applying to all the rules that had theretofore been applied only to females, such as a lower age of emancipation, no legal obligation of family support, exemption from military service.

The second attitude sought only the elimination of discrimination against women, a ban on treating females as a disabled class. Legislation purporting to afford—and in fact affording—privileges to women that were not also available to men would not run afoul such constitutional provision. The difference is essentially the difference between the amendment without the qualifying Hayden language, and with it. And herein lies the conflict among those who would support some constitutional amendment to abate the legal incapacities of women, certainly a sufficient majority of both the House and the Senate to promulgate a proposed amendment if they could but agree on its purpose and function.

There are some basic difficulties with the unisex approach, not the least of which is that there are physiological and biological differences between men and women that are not subject to eradication even by constitutional amendment. Practically, of course, this may present no difficulties for the very reason that nature cannot be subjected to human laws while humans must bow to the laws of nature. The essential claim for such a declaration of equality of the sexes is its symbolic value. The temper of our times demands instant and simplistic answers to complex problems. And it is this temper that assumes that the cure for such problems lies in the incantation of the word "equality" by our highest governmental means, the Constitution, or by the voice of the Constitution, the Supreme Court of the United States. Without denying the importance of symbols, it is necessary to recognize that when they are only the creatures of the Constitution, thus far at least, their effect has been less than pervasive.

A second difficulty with a constitutional mandate of instant equality of the sexes is that proferred by history. Times have changed in such a way that it may well be possible for the generation of women now coming to maturity to surrender all special legal protection and privileges. A great majority of them have had all the opportunities for education and training afforded to their male peers, with an expectation of full opportunities to put that education and training to the same use as their male peers. They may well be able to succeed in a competitive society in which all differences in legal rights between men and women were wiped out. There remains, however, a very large part of the female population on whom the imposition of such a constitutional standard could be disastrous. There is no doubt that society permitted these women to come to maturity not as competitors with males but rather as the bearers and raisers of their children and the keeper of their homes. There are a multitude of women who still find fulfillment in this role. This may be unfortunate in the eyes of some; it remains a fact. It can boast no label of equality now to treat the older generations as if they were their own children or grandchildren. Nor can women be regarded as unified in their desire for this change. Certainly the desire to open opportunities to some of them can be achieved without the price of removal of the protection of others.

On the other hand there are also difficulties in an amendment that does not ban all legislative distinctions in treatment of men and women, that would leave unchallenged those laws that purported to confer, in Senator Hayden's language, "rights, benefits or exemptions * * * upon persons of the female sex." The question when a statute confers a benefit rather than imposing a disability is often difficult of answer. The most cited example of the problem are those laws that provide for minimum wages, maximum hours, limitations on night work, and requirements of sanitary conditions for women workers. Certainly since Louis D. Brandeis fought for the validity of such legislation, it has been assumed by right-thinking people that the legislation was for the benefit of women.

Classical economists, on the other hand, are clear that such laws put women at a competitive disadvantage in the employment market. A Department of Labor study, however, purported to show that there was no difference in women's employment between those States that have laws providing minimum wages or banning night work and those that didn't and only a very small difference between the States that banned women's overtime work and those that did not. This sort of question, whether the legislation affords privilege or imposes disability, however, may be one appropriate or judicial resolution on a case by case basis, with the results dependent on the facts adduced and the values assigned to them.

B. The problem of equality

If an amendment were passed that in effect prohibited all legislative classification in terms of sex, the results might not be desirable but the problems of construction would be minimal. The judicial answers could be mechanical and, therefore easy. The difficulty is that not even the sponsors of such a unisex amendment have made the claim for rigid classification. Apparently embarrassed by the prospect of the abolition of such existent requirements as separate toilet facilities for men and women or the availability of maternity leaves, proponents of the equal rights amendment asserted that certain distinctions could continue to be maintained, so long as the principle of equality is assured. The concept of equality is not, however, one that is easily defined or confined.

The phrase "equal rights" might be repeated an infinite number of times without providing additional guidance to the speaker or listener. Mr. Justice Cardozo noted some time ago that "a great principle of constitutional law is not susceptible of comprehensive statement in an adjective." And it was almost a century ago that Sir James Fitzjames Stephen asserted that "equality is a word so wide and vague as to be by itself almost unmeaning." Nothing that has happened in the intervening years has done anything to make it more specific.

There are suggestions in some of Mr. Justice Frankfurter's opinions to mark the perimeter of a constitutional notion of equality that have an appeal, if only to a small audience. In *Whitney* v. *Tax Commission*, he pointed out that: "The equal protection clause was not designed to compel uniformity in the face of difference." And, in the same term of Court, he announced in *Tigner* v. *Texas*. "The Constitution does not require things which are different in fact or opinion to be treated by the law as though they were the same." It was also his view that "there is no greater inequality than the equal treatment of unequals." Applying these notions in the context of the equal rights amendment, one might work out some generalizations. Governmental distinction between males and females would have to be justified in fact before it could pass muster under the proposed amendment. If the distinction were based on reason, then the legislation should be presumptively valid. The mere fact that there are two sexes should not be reason in itself for distinguishing between them in legislation. On the other hand, the mere fact that a distinction was drawn between them ought not to suffice to invalidate the law. I should think that appropriate data of sociological conditions, especially those deriving from a history of different treatment of the sexes, might warrant the continuance of certain benefits and protections. This should certainly be true of laws relating to domestic relations where marriage contracts were made under laws that created certain

expectations or obligations of one spouse to the other, including the male's obligation to support not only his wife but his children as well.

C. The Equal Protection Clause

Such a construction necessarily raises the question whether the equal protection clause of the 14th amendment does not already afford all that the proposal equal rights amendment would offer. The difficulty is that the other informed answer must be that it probably does, but we have no definitive construction by the Supreme Court to give us adequate assurance. Certainly there are cases in the past that raise some doubts that this notion of nondiscrimination on the ground of sex has yet been constitutionally established. Certainly *Breedlove* v. *Suttles, Goessart v. Cleary,* and *Holt* v. *Florida,* to the extent that they are still viable precedents, do not make it clear that classification by sex is yet regarded, under the 14th amendment, as a "suspect classification" like those of race or religion.

On the other hand, there can be little doubt that the 14th amendment together with the Commerce clause give more than adequate authority to the national legislature to ban discrimination on the basis of sex. And the 1964 Civil Rights Act affords ample evidence that the power can be utilized where the legislature finds that such invidious discrimination needs extirpation.

The scope of the 14th amendment as a direct restraint on Government action still reveals some ambiguities, however, that would also trouble the proposed equal rights amendment. To what extent is the constitutional ban to be read as one against State action only? When is individual action to be treated as State action? And to what degree does the constitutional ban on discrimination authorize legislation providing for "reverse discrimination" or "benign quotas?" If a new amendment does not—and it is not likley that it will—reveal the answers to these questions in its language, it would be helpful to its proper construction to know from the legislative history what Congress thought to be the proper answer to these questions. As of now, the entire legislative history—from 1923 to 1970—is less than enlightening on these subjects.

I tend to believe that an equal rights amendment would be more important for its enabling clause than for its direct substantive effect, especially if the "unisex" construction were not adopted. And such an enabling clause would certainly add little to what is already provided by the 14th amendment and the Commerce clause. Today, the area of governmentally compelled or sanctioned discrimination against women is very limited and is growing smaller all the time. It should be noted, for example, that some of the primary planks of the "women's liberation" platform, such as the right to abortion, or to "child care centers," would be totally unaffected by the proposed amendment even in its "unisex" version.

III. CONCLUSION

I come back to the point at which I started. I don't think that the controversy over the proposed amendment goes to the question whether invidious discrimination against women should be eliminated, but rather to the question of the appropriate means for accomplishing that objective. If the answer is to be by amendment, which I regard as unnecessary because the legislative power that it would confer already exists, the amendment should be something more than a license to the judiciary to create that kind of amendment that Congress was itself unable to frame. Congress should, at least, choose between a proposal that would purport to say that there are no differences between men and women that are cognizable by law and its alternative that would seek to protect women against discrimination.

THE SPACE SHUTTLE

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, President Nixon has recently committed this Nation to a new goal in the continuing challenge of space exploration. I refer, of course, to the decision to develop the space shuttle as an economic means of increasing the potential use of space. I have no doubt that this decision will certainly rank with another Presidential decision of 11 years ago that committed our scientific and industrial resources to a manned lunar landing, and I applaud the President's foresight and initiative.

The space shuttle, as the name implies, will permit us to go into space frequently and relatively easily. Dale D. Myers, Associate Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration estimates that the shuttle cost will be about a quarter of that for the Apollo program. Additionally, Mr. Myers points out that the technology required for the shuttle for the most part is already present. Thus, Apollo and the shuttle compliment each other, the latter building upon the technical accomplishments of the former to increase many times the benefits available from space.

The space shuttle will allow us to explore the mysteries of space at a fraction of the present cost. Because it is reusable, the shuttle will reduce the cost of payloads going into space to less than $100, as compared to $15,000 per pound for small payloads to $1,000 per pound for large payloads currently. It will also reduce costs in another way. Since it can place satellites and other payloads into orbit, this Nation's number of conventional launch vehicles can be drastically reduced. We are learning to use satellites in global monitoring and management of natural resources, as well as agricultural applications and pollution control. Soon these versatile tools will guide aircraft and bring televised education to remote areas of the world. But these possibilities and others like them with direct bearing on human betterment cannot be fully realized so long as every orbited satellite is the result of massive effort and tremendous cost. Space shuttle will solve these problems. Clearly, it is a wise investment in the future.

Our expenditures in space are significant, but yet in 1972 this Nation will spend only 1.4 percent of its total budget on space, including the development of the space shuttle. This, I believe is a small price to pay for the invaluable return we receive in knowledge. Space, like any frontier is initially costly to explore. But this exploration promises to unlock untold secrets, and it is up to the space shuttle to carve the broad highways through the heavens, bringing the benefits of space to all minkind.

RULES OF THE COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING AND URBAN AFFAIRS

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, section 133B of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended by the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970, requires that each committee publish its rules in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD not later than March 1 each year.

In accordance with that section, I ask unanimous consent that the rules of the Committee on Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs be printed in the RECORD.

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

RULES OF COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING AND URBAN AFFAIRS

[Adopted in executive session, March 11, 1971]

RULE 1.—REGULAR MEETING DATE FOR COMMITTEE

The regular meeting day for the Committee to transact its business shall be the last Tuesday in each month; except that if the Committee has met at any time during the month prior to the last Tuesday of the month, the regular meeting of the Committee may be cancelled at the discretion of the Chairman.

RULE 2.—COMMITTEE

Investigations

(a) No investigation shall be initiated by the Committee unless the Senate or the full Committee has specifically authorized such investigation.

Hearings

(b) No hearing of the Committee shall be scheduled outside the District of Columbia except by agreement between the Chairman and the Committee and the ranking minority member of the Committee or by a majority vote of the Committee.

Confidential testimony

(c) No confidential testimony taken or confidential material presented at an executive session of the Committee or any report of the proceedings of such executive session shall be made public either in whole or in part or by way of summary, unless specifically authorized by the Chairman of the Committee and the ranking minority member of the Committee or by a majority vote of the Committee.

Interrogation of witnesses

(d) Committe interrogation of a witness shall be conducted only by members of the Committee or such professional staff as is authorized by the Chairman or the ranking minority member of the Committee.

RULE 3.—SUBCOMMITTEES

Authorization for

(a) A subcommittee of the Committee may be authorized only by the action of a majority of the Committee.

Membership

(b) Membership to subcommittees shall be by nomination of the Chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee and shall be approved by the majority vote of the Committee.

Investigations

(c) No investigation shall be initiated by a subcommittee unless the Senate or the full Committee has specifically authorized such investigation.

Hearings

(d) No hearing of a subcommittee shall be scheduled outside the District of Columbia without prior consultation with the Chairman and then only by agreement between the Chairman of the Subcommittee and the ranking minority member of the Subcommittee or by a majority vote of the Committee.

Confidential testimony

(e) No confidential testimony taken or confidential material presented at an executive session of the Subcommittee or any report of the proceedings of such executive session shall be made public, either in whole or in part or by way of summary, unless specifically authorized by the Chairman of

the Subcommittee and the ranking minority member of the Subcommittee or by a majority vote of the Subcommittee.

Interrogation of witnesses

(f) Subcommittee interrogation of a witness shall be conducted only by members of the Subcommittee or such professional staff as is authorized by the Chairman or the ranking minority member of the Subcommittee.

Special meetings

(g) If at least three members of a subcommittee desire that a special meeting of the Subcommittee be called by the Chairman of the Subcommittee, those members may file in the offices of the Committee their written request to the Chairman of the Subcommittee for that special meeting. Immediately upon the filing of the request, the Clerk of the Committee shall notify the Chairman of the Subcommittee of the filing of the request. If, within three calendar days after the filing of the request, the Chairman of the Subcommittee does not call the requested special meeting, to be held within seven calendar days after the filing of the request, a majority of the members of the Subcommittee may file in the offices of the Committee their written notice that a special meeting of the Subcommittee will be held, specifying the date and hour of that special meeting. The Subcommittee shall meet on that date and hour. Immediately upon the filing of the notice, the Clerk of the Committee shall notify all members of the Subcommittee that such special meeting will be held and inform them of its date and hour. If the Chairman of the Subcommittee is not present at any regular, additional, or special meeting of the Subcommittee, the ranking member of the majority party on the Subcommittee who is present shall preside at that meeting.

RULE 4.—WITNESSES

Filing of statements

(a) Any witness appearing before the Committee or Subcommittee (including any witness representing a Government agency) must file with the Committee or Subcommittee before noon on the day preceding his appearance 75 copies of his statement to the Committee or Subcommittee. In the event that the witness fails to file a written statement in accordance with this rule, the Chairman of the Committee or Subcommittee has the discretion to deny the witness the privilege of testifying before the Committee or Subcommittee until the witness has properly complied with the rule.

Length of statements

(b) Written statements properly filed with the Committee or Subcommittee may be as lengthy as the witness desires and may contain such documents or other addenda as the witness feels is necessary to present properly his views to the Committee or Subcommittee. It shall be left to the discretion of the Chairman of the Committee or Subcommittee as to what portion of the documents presented to the Committee or Subcommittee shall be published in the printed transcript of the hearings.

Fifteen-minute duration

(c) Oral statements of witnesses shall be based upon their filed statements but shall be limited to 15 minutes duration. This period may be extended at the discretion of the Chairman presiding at the hearings.

(d) Witnesses may be subpoenaed by the Chairman of the Committee or a subcommittee with the agreement of the ranking minority member of the Committee or Subcommittee or by a majority vote of the Committee or Subcommittee.

Counsel permitted

(e) Any witness subpoenaed by the Committee or Subcommittee to a public or executive hearing may be accompanied by counsel of his own choosing who shall be permitted, while the witness is testifying, to advise him of his legal rights.

Expenses of witnesses

(f) No witness shall be reimbursed for his appearance at a public or executive hearing before the Committee or Subcommittee unless such reimbursement is agreed to by the Chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee or by a majority vote of the Committee.

Limits of questioning

(g) Questioning of a witness by members shall be limited to 10 minutes duration, except that if a member is unable to finish his questioning in the 10 minute period, he may be permitted further questions of the witness after all members have been given an opportunity to question the witness.

Additional opportunity to question a witness shall be limited to a duration of 10 minutes until all members have been given the opportunity of questioning the witness for a second time. This 10 minute time period per member will be continued until all members have exhausted their questions of the witness.

RULE 5.—VOTING

Vote to report a measure or matter

No measure or matter shall be reported from the Committee unless a majority of the Committee are actually present. The vote of the Committee to report a measure or matter shall require the concurrence of a majority of the members of the Committee who are present.

Any absent member may affirmatively request that his vote to report a matter be cast by proxy. The proxy shall be sufficiently clear to identify the subject matter, and to inform the Committee as to how the member wishes his vote to be recorded thereon. By written notice to the Chairman any time before the record vote on the measure or matter concerned is taken, any member may withdraw a proxy previous given. All proxies shall be kept in the files of the Committee, along with the record of the roll call vote of the members present and voting, as an official record of the vote on the measure or matter.

Vote on matters other than a report on a measure or matter

On committee matters other than the vote to report a measure or matter, a member of the Committee may request that his vote may be cast by proxy.

RULE 6.—QUORUM

Unless the Committee otherwise provides or is required by the Rules of the Senate, one member shall constitute a quorum for the receipt of evidence, the swearing of witnesses, and the taking of testimony.

RULE 7.—STAFF PRESENT ON DAIS

Only members and the Clerk of the Committee shall be permitted on the dais during public or executive hearings, except that a member may have one staff person accompany him during such public or executive hearing on the dais. If a member desires a second staff person to accompany him on the dais he must make a request to the Chairman for that purpose.

BUSINESS BEHIND THE IRON CURTAIN

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, during a trade mission to Poland, Hungary, and Czechoslovakia, the Director of the U.S. Department of Commerce Field Office in Pittsburgh, Lewis E. Conman, discovered that even top Communist officials have a genuine interest and curiosity about Americans.

Specifically, Mr. Conman says the Communist countries are interested in establishing trade relations with the United States. Conman says:

A host of different kinds of products would sell behind the Iron Curtain.

Pursuing this subject in the Pittsburgh Press, William H. Wylie, business editor, has written an interesting and informative article which I commend to Senators and ask that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

THERE'S BUSINESS BEHIND IRON CURTAIN, CITY FIRMS TOLD

(By William H. Wylie)

Has 25 years of anti-American propaganda poisoned the minds of people living behind the Iron Curtain?

Apparently not, according to Lewis E. Conman, director of the U.S. Department of Commerce Field Office in Pittsburgh.

He recently led a 15-day trade mission to Poland, Hungary and Czechoslovakia.

Conman related an episode that shows even top Communist officials sometimes have their "capitalistic foibles."

He said he was attending a very serious, top-level meeting sponsored by the Czech Trade Ministry in Prague. During a lull in the session, a Czech official turned to Conman and inquired:

"Who won the World Series this year?"

Surprised, Conman quickly brought the Czech up to date on the Pirates' No. 1 achievement in 1971 and asked, "How do you know about the World Series?"

"I was assigned to the Czech Consulate in Chicago for 12 years and became quite a Cub fan," the Czech explained. His next question was "where did the Cubs finish this year?"

Conman wasn't sure and told the Czech he thought they landed in third or fourth place—not bad information, considering the Chicagoans tied with the Mets for third place in the National League's Eastern Division.

Actually, baseball is incidental to this yarn. The point is that people in Iron Curtain countries are interested in Americans and want to do business with us, Conman said.

Dust from Soviet tanks that crushed the Czech insurrection has long since settled. Now a strictly-business attitude prevails, Conman said, and American businessmen are being edged out by other nations.

"The Japanese are everywhere," he said, "and the Germans, who are practically next door, are after the business, too."

Other European countries—England, France, Austria and Spain—are equally aggressive.

Nevertheless, Coman said the Czechs, Poles and Hungarians expressed genuine interest in American products and asked "Why don't the U.S. companies call on us?"

Evidently American business is losing by default. No real effort has been made to get business behind the Iron Curtain, Conman said.

The purpose of the trade mission was to change all this. Besides the Commerce Department official, representatives of six instrument manufacturers went along.

The initial payoff was impressive—$900,000 sales over the next 24 months. It cost the federal government $4,000 and the companies picked up their tab.

Although none of the instrument companies is located in Western Pennsylvania, the door is open to similar missions by local firms, Conman said. The Commerce Department sponsors approximately 40 missions a year.

A host of different kinds of products would "sell" behind the Iron Curtain, Conman said. Local firms manufacturing high-technology

goods would have the best crack at these markets.

The export control list—once a barrier to trade with the socialist nations—is being trimmed, he continued. The door is open to many items once forbidden.

Demand is strong for electrical and non-electrical machinery, building materials, chemicals, crude petroleum, transportation equipment and pharmaceuticals.

Conman reported keen interest in American packaging techniques, mainly for food products. Office machines, especially computers and copiers, are a hot item, too.

And it's a big market—in the $8–$10 billion range in total. At present American companies are getting less than 2 per cent of it. Russia, of course, dominates with about 30 per cent.

Current U.S. exports to the three countries are mainly raw materials or farm products.

The Export-Import Bank is not permitted to finance trade with Poland, Czechoslovakia or Hungary, but the rules may be changed next year. Anyway, financing is no problem, Conman said. It can be arranged through banks in the foreign nations.

There's already a "U.S. flavor" in the Iron Curtain countries. Conman said while he was in Poland Coca-Cola and Pepsi-Cola negotiated contracts to distribute their products there. And Heinz products were on the tables "everywhere we went," he added.

A HAVEN FROM PERSECUTION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I rise today to speak in support of those proposals which have recently been introduced in the Congress to provide additional funds for the resettlement of Soviet Jews in Israel. I have repeatedly urged that our Government take an initiative in this direction and to work relentlessly to pressure the Soviet Union to end its persecution of Jews and other minorities in the Soviet Union. I have cosponsored several pieces of legislation which urge the President to take appropriate action and I intend to cosponsor the legislation now placed before the Senate. This legislation should receive the unanimous support of the Congress because of the basic humanitarian concern to which it addresses itself.

There are approximately 3 million Jews in the Soviet Union and they are not allowed to live a life free from religious, social, and political persecution. Many who have contributed a great deal to their country have been forced out of their jobs; their children are deprived of an education; and the elderly are left uncared for. Their lives are an all too chilling echo of the past, a past which the United States committed American lives, and treasure to rectify. We worked to build the United Nations just to avoid the human suffering and indignity that tainted the history of our civilization. The Senate now has before it the Genocide Convention which is designed to make acts of genocide an international crime. It is shameful to think that there could be any hesitation in this great Chamber to ratify such a treaty. I urge that the Senate consider it as a first priority. There is the United Nations Declaration on Human Rights which outlines a basic and universal standard of human liberties, an international bill of rights.

Against a backdrop of world law, there have been frequent instances, all too frequent I am afraid, of abuse of the law. Persecution of the Jews in the Soviet Union is the most flagrant example we have today of crimes against humanity. But there are others, perhaps smaller in scale, and still equally painful to enumerate. There are roughly 1,500 Jews in Iraq who are hostages of their own government. The same is true in Syria where there are 4,500 Jews living in the sleepless haunt of senseless and inhumane retribution, punishment for the crime of existing. According to some accounts, all the Jews of Damascas are confined to a zone beyond which they dare not venture. If they do, it is because of a major exception such as an illness requiring hospitalization. Jews are barred from public office and the professions, forced into degrading positions for no reason at all.

These are stories of religious prosecution. In the next chapter of the book of man you will find political prosecution: Eastern Europe, the Ukraine, China, West Pakistanis, and Baharis in Bangladesh, to name but a few.

Is it not, then, the obligation of the United States to do what it can to help take us out of this chapter and on to the next, one where world law and government prevail? We are still a rich Nation, at least rich enough to afford to help Soviet Jews resettle in Israel. The cost for Israel is $30,000 per family and predictions for the influx of Jewish emigres from the Soviet Union during 1972 are in the range of 40,000 to 50,000 people. For a country the size of Israel with a GNP in the range of $5 billion, and a foreign debt of over $3 billion, the cost is phenomenal. For the United States the cost is minimal, especially when expressed in human terms.

I prefer not to name a price when the subject is human lives and welfare. Israel has not asked the United States for help, anymore than the United States asked other countries for help when it felt the sudden growing pains of an influx of immigrants. But the United States was big and could easily absorb a burst in population. Israel cannot. Israel's wealth lies in her dedication to human freedom.

The United States has always considered itself a Nation of immigrants, and Israel wears the same robe. Now we must share it so she can continue to be the great haven from prosecution she has become.

SENATOR HAYDEN

Mr. JORDAN of Idaho. Mr. President, the rich and fulfilled life of the Honorable Carl Hayden has come to a close and it is with great sorrow and deep respect that I pay tribute to our esteemed colleague today.

The facts have all been given—little remains to be said about this "Arizona legend"—for Carl Hayden's record is a monument in itself, it needs no oral commentary.

The words of the English jurist and antiquary, John Selden—"They that govern the most make the least noise"—could well have been spoken in reference to the late Senator from Arizona. Indeed, Carl's silence wielded more power than most men's speech.

Men the caliber of Carl Hayden do not walk through the Chamber doors everyday—his departure from the Senate 4 years ago created a gap and his recent departure from this good earth creates an even greater gap. We shall all miss Carl Trumbull Hayden.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF POSITION ON VOTE

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, on February 3, while I was necessarily absent, the Senate voted (No. 32 Leg.) on an amendment offered by the Senator from Virginia (Mr. BYRD), to reduce the U.S. contribution to the Inter-American Development Bank. If I had been present, I would have voted "nay." I ask that the permanent RECORD reflect my position.

PRESIDENT'S INTERFERENCE WITH THE LEGAL SERVICES PROGRAM

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, about once a year since the inception of the Federal legal services program, men of conscience have had to stand up to defend that program against short-sighted, narrow-minded, politically motivated agents of injustice. Whether it was the various so-called Murphy amendments, or the Reagan veto or other less notorious conflicts such as regionalization, by and large, the forces of justice triumphed each time in form if not in substance. Unfortunately, the time has come once again for men of good will to stand up in the name of justice, and this time the threat is open and blatant and comes from the man who stands a heartbeat away from the Presidency.

The newspaper stories of the past 2 days describing the Vice President's efforts to interfere with the proper functioning of both the OEO Office of Legal Services and the judicial system in the State of New Jersey, as well as the lawyer-client relationships between poor Americans and their attorneys, cannot be attributed to an isolated happenstance. Rather it is clear that he has embarked upon a concerted and deliberate effort, with malice aforethought, to tear down the structure that the Congress and the bar and the directors of legal services and, at least until 1969, the White House and the poor people themselves have built to give full meaning to the concept of equal justice under law. It is not by happenstance that the Vice President made a trip to Camden, N.J., last month to begin his campaign with a rash and irrational public attack on the local legal services program.

It is not by happenstance that the Vice President held his now famous meeting this week with OEO and Camden legal services officials after he had been specifically warned by executive branch attorneys that his continued public interference in the Camden litigation could well bring severe professional criticism that his statements were ethically improper and highly prejudicial, and would obstruct and delay the possibility of successful settlement negotiations.

It is not happenstance that at the Vice President's request the highly professional Bureau of Budget staff was asked to play the heavies and lean on the legal services office to cut off the Camden

program, after the Vice President had received an unequivocal legal opinion that there was no basis whatsoever for such a cutoff and that the Camden program had been operated competently and fully within the applicable laws and regulations. And it is hard to believe that it is happenstance that delivered a transcript of his Tuesday meeting, prepared by the Vice President's office, to the New York Times on Wednesday, although it was unavailable to Members of Congress on Thursday.

Mr. President, I cannot fathom the Vice President's logic in arraying himself against the legal services concept—perhaps he feels the need to strengthen his own position on the ticket by pondering to the Reagan Republicans, or perhaps he thinks he is protecting the President's right flank during the Peking trip by this attack on the rights of the poor—but his rationale is unimportant. The simple fact is that after he has been told by his own party's executive appointees that the city of Camden has been in willful noncompliance with applicable State and Federal statutes and regulations affecting poor people's rights and racial discrimination and that suits against local government are necessary to vindicate the rights of the poor, the Vice President wants to ignore both the rights and the remedies to which the poor, like all citizens, are entitled.

I am left with only one question for the Vice President: Where, Mr. Vice President, would you rather see America's poor resolving their legitimate complaints—in the courts, or in the streets?

Mr. President, I think the RECORD should show the advice the Vice President received before his meeting this week, and I ask that the conclusions of the memorandum presented to him be printed.

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

SUMMARY OF CONCLUSIONS IN MEMORANDUM TO VICE PRESIDENT ON CAMDEN REGIONAL LEGAL SERVICES (CRLS)

Based on the information received and examined to date, several conclusions can be reached:

(1) There have been no instances of substantial noncompliance by CRLS with applicable statutory and regulatory requirements governing the operation of a Legal Services project.

(2) There is no credible evidence available to enable the federal government to prosecute successful termination proceedings against CRLS.

(3) Without reference to any specific case now in litigation, there is evidence that for several years there has been a pattern of willful non-compliance by the City of Camden with applicable state and federal statutes and regulations governing the relocation of displaced residents, effective community involvement in efforts to deal with urban decay, and the prevention of racial discrimination.

(4) Public comments by public officials concerning pending litigation subject the officials to the possibility of severe professional criticism that they are ethically improper and highly prejudicial when they purport to favor one party or attack the other.

(5) Continued reliance by governmental litigants on the prospect of pressures being brought by federal officials and funding agencies against the opposing litigants obstructs and delays the possibility of successful settlement negotiations.

(6) Camden Regional Legal Services in general, and attorneys David Dugan and Peter O'Connor in particular, are professionally competent, ethical lawyers deeply committed to obtaining equal justice for the poor.

(7) The Camden Coalition and other individual litigants represented by CRLS perceive grievances and seek judicial relief; and CRLS represents them in negotiation and litigation in the same manner as competent private counsel would represent paying clients—in both situations the clients retain ultimate control within the bounds of the law, of the decisions to be made concerning terms of settlement or insistence on continuing litigation.

(8) Community complaints about city inaction and failure to comply with the law pre-dated the existence of CRLS and led to the prior formation of the Camden Coalition.

(9) Effective legal representation of the poor in following the Congressional mandate to provide equal justice and attack the paradox of poverty requires a heavy emphasis on broad impact litigation to reform the law.

(10) In order to effectively vindicate the rights of the poor, it may be necessary to litigate cases against units of government at any level, for history is replete with instances of official abuse and denial of fundamental rights of individuals—with such litigation always constitutionally subject to ultimate review by an independent judiciary in our adversary system of justice.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, as a member of the Employment, Manpower, and Poverty Subcommittee and as chairman of the Administrative Practices Subcommittee, I have also asked Mr. Speaker's office and the Vice President's office to provide full information on these events, and I am awaiting that information now. I am hopeful that the Senate will give this matter its full attention.

SENATOR ROBERTSON

Mr. JORDAN of Idaho. Mr. President, it is with sadness that I join my colleagues in mourning the passing of another great American patriot, the late Senator A. Willis Robertson.

In the few years we served together, I developed a great respect for this fine Virginian, who served his State and country in a manner deserving of the highest of tributes and the greatest of praise.

The late Senator and I shared many mutual interests—among them finance, economics, and conservation—not to mention a great love and respect for the outdoors. Senator Robertson was a most versatile scholar and I can remember conversing with him on subjects ranging from the shenanigans of college football to the intricacies of international finance. Even though we wore different party labels, I often sought his counsel during my early days in this body. I had great respect for his nonpartisan judgment and openminded attitude for I knew that behind each word he spoke lurked a great amount of thought and wisdom.

Senator Robertson was a most effective and able statesman and none would deny that his 20 years of service in this Chamber were wellspent. Indeed, Virginia and the Nation have lost one of their finest public servants—and I have lost a dear friend.

SOCIAL SECURITY FINANCING—SOME ACTION NECESSARY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, a recent article in the monthly review of the Federal Reserve Bank of Richmond examined the entire question of social security financing: How to change it; what assumptions currently underlie the present system; and what new assumptions are necessary if this system is to be made more equitable and efficient.

The article clearly shows what all of us in Congress already know: that though the social security system has served this country well over the years, the financing of social security has now reached the point where we must make significant changes in the fundamental assumptions that underpin the current system. The present system places an inordinate burden on wage earners of this Nation, and especially on low-income wage earners. It has created an intolerable situation, a situation which requires swift and comprehensive reform. As this Richmond article states:

The adoption of a predetermined system to establish tax and benefit schedules has definite advantages. In the past, Social Security beneficiaries have had to rely on ad hoc decisions by Congress to receive increased benefits. Adoption of the recommendations by the advisory council would result in automatic adjustments of benefit payments following increases in prices. Revising the method of forecasting benefit payments and taxes to reflect more accurately anticipated economic conditions and maintaining trust fund balances equal to one year's benefits would allow payment of benefits to increase without comparable tax increases in the near future. This change, however, would not reduce the overall cost of payments. The new financing system might reduce the volume of Social Security tax receipts temporarily, but it would also necessitate a larger volume of tax receipts in the next century. An increase in benefits would have to be financed, sooner or later, from an increase in taxes.

Last November I introduced legislation which would have instituted a system of general revenue financing, raised the minimum monthly social security benefit to $100, and provided for a 10 percent across-the-board increase in other monthly benefits. As I pointed out when I introduced S. 2838:

Social Security has been the psychological and financial breakwater against individual and family catastrophe. Millions of recipients have found their lives made more secure by it . . . Without a doubt, the economic status of the aged is bleak. These persons have worked a lifetime—they have contributed to society, they are responsible citizens; they are deserving citizens . . . We simply must make provisions for our retired persons that adequately support them without draining the resources of current workers.

We were late in establishing a system of social security for the aged; several other countries adopted their systems before we did. In many ways we are still behind. The welfare of our aged, as well as the burden placed on our taxpayers, is approaching crisis proportions. For the

sake of all Americans, we must begin to consider proposals for change.

I ask unanimous consent that "Social Security Financing: A New Package or Just New Packaging," by James R. McCabe, be printed in the RECORD.

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

SOCIAL SECURITY FINANCING: A NEW PACKAGE OR JUST NEW PACKAGING?

INTRODUCTION

The social welfare activities of Government have grown significantly since the passage of the Social Security Act in 1935. Congress has progressively expanded the original social security program to include disability insurance, hospital insurance, and supplementary medical insurance, as well as old-age and survivors insurance.

The expansion in programs has been accompanied by expansion in coverage of workers. The proportion of persons in paid employment covered by social security increased from 58 percent in 1940 to 90 percent in 1971. By 1950, the Social Security Act has been amended to cover railroad workers, certain World War II veterans, regularly employed farm and domestic workers, nonfarm self-employed persons, and Federal civilian employees not under the Federal retirement system. Legislation in the 1950's and 1960's brought professional, self-employed individuals, members of the Armed Forces, and ministers into the programs.

Social security tax receipts also have grown over the past 35 years because of growth in covered population, higher tax rates, and higher maximum wage bases—the maximum annual wages to which social security tax rates are applied (Table I). Social security taxes paid in fiscal 1971 totaled $52.7 billion, compared to the $593 million paid in 1940. In 1937, covered employees and their employers each were taxed at a rate of 1 percent of the employee's annual wages up to $3,000. By 1971, the tax rate on individual employee wages paid by both the employee and employer had increased to 5.2 percent, and the wage base had risen to $7,800. The 1972 tax rate is 5.2 percent, with a maximum wage base of $9,000. Under present law (PL 92-5), the base is not scheduled to increase after 1972, but the tax rate will rise to 6.05 percent by 1987.

TABLE I.—MAXIMUM TAXABLE EARNINGS, TAX RATES, PREMIUMS, AND AVERAGE MONTHLY BENEFITS UNDER SOCIAL SECURITY, 1937-71

Year	Annual maximum wage base	Tax rate (percent) [1]				Monthly premium	Average monthly benefits		
		Total	OASI [2]	DI [3]	HI [4]	SMI [5]	Retired worker and wife [6]	Survivor—widow and 2 children [7]	Disabled worker—2 or more children [7]
1937-49	$3,000	1.0	1.0				[8] $38.40	[8] $47.90	
1950	3,000	1.5	1.5				71.70	93.90	
1951-53	3,600	1.5	1.5				78.90	103.90	
1954	3,600	2.0	2.0				99.10	130.50	
1955-56	4,200	2.0	2.0				104.70	138.20	
1957-58	4,200	2.25	2.0	0.25			109.80	149.00	$165.50
1959	4,800	2.5	2.25	.25			121.60	170.70	188.30
1960-61	4,800	3.0	2.75	.25			125.20	188.70	193.00
1962	4,800	3.125	2.875	.25			127.90	190.70	194.70
1963-65	4,800	3.625	3.375	.25			133.90	201.90	203.50
1966	6,600	4.2	3.5	.35	0.35	$3.00	142.50	221.90	217.80
1967	6,600	4.4	3.55	.35	.5	3.00	144.20	224.40	217.30
1968	7,800	4.4	3.325	.475	.6	4.00	166.30	257.10	242.00
1969	7,800	4.8	3.725	.475	.6	4.00	168.90	255.80	241.30
1970	7,800	4.8	3.65	.55	.6	5.30	197.00	295.00	272.00
1971	7,800	5.2	4.05	.55	.6	5.60	(9)	(9)	(9)

[1] Tax rate paid by each employer and employee. Self-employed pay 75 percent of combined rate paid by employer and employee for OASDI and the same rate as the employee rate for HI.
[2] Old age and survivors insurance.
[3] Disability insurance.
[4] Hospital insurance.
[5] Supplementary medical insurance. Monthly premium paid by participant and matched by Federal Government and determined annually by the Secretary of HEW.
[6] Wife's entitlement not dependent on having entitled children in her care.
[7] Wife's entitlement dependent on having entitled children in her care.
[8] Benefit payments began in 1940.
[9] Not available.

Source: Social Security Bulletin, Supplement, 1969, pp. 39 and 43; 1971 Annual Report of Trustees of FOASDI Trust Funds, p. 14.

Whether these future tax schedules will become effective is problematical. In accordance with the provisions of the Social Security Act, in 1969, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare appointed an Advisory Council, composed of 13 members representing different public interests, to review the status of the social security trust funds in terms of long-term commitments, adequacy and scope of benefit coverage, and impact on public assistance.[1] The Council's recommendations, submitted in March 1971, call for provisions to increase benefits and the maximum tax base automatically and to formalize the present pay-as-you-go financing system. Limitation of trust fund balances at a level approximately equal to one year's benefit payments and revision of current conservative estimates of future tax receipts could result in larger benefit payments without comparable tax increases in the near future. Other recommendations, however, include larger benefit payments not currently scheduled.

If Congress were to adopt the financing and benefit payment reform recommended by the Advisory Council, increases in tax rates after 1972 might be postponed until after the year 2000. Under this proposal, the tax rate paid by both employees and employers would increase to 6 percent in 1972, and the maximum wage base would rise to $12,000 in 1974. Further increases would automatically follow gains in employee earnings (Table II). Even so, under this proposal, total social security taxes paid would increase. The Council's recommendations are discussed in a later section of this article.

Footnotes at end of article.

TABLE II.—SOCIAL SECURITY TAX RATES (EMPLOYEE AND EMPLOYER, EACH), 1972-2045

[In percent]

Year	Present law [1]			Advisory council recommendation [1 2]			Year	Present law [1]			Advisory council recommendation [1 2]		
	OASDI	HI [3]	Total	OASDI	HI and SMI [3]	Total		OASDI	HI [3]	Total	OASDI	HI and SMI [3]	Total
1972	4.6	0.6	5.2	4.70	1.30	6.00	1978	5.15	.7	5.85	4.35	1.65	6.00
1973	5.0	.65	5.65	4.65	1.35	6.00	1979	5.15	.7	5.85	4.35	1.65	6.00
1974	5.15	.65	5.65	5.45	1.55	6.00	1980-81	5.15	.8	5.95	4.35	1.65	6.00
1975	5.0	.65	5.65	4.45	1.55	6.00	1982-86	5.15	.8	5.95	4.20	(4)	(4)
1976	5.15	.7	5.85	4.40	1.60	6.00	1987-2020	5.15	.9	6.05	4.20	(4)	(4)
1977	5.15	.7	5.85	4.40	1.60	6.00	2021-45	5.15	.9	6.05	5.05	(4)	(4)

[1] Maximum wage base under present law would be $9,000. Under Council's recommendation, maximum wage base would be $9,000 for 1972 and 1973 and $12,000 for 1974. Thereafter, Council recommends that the maximum wage base increase automatically to reflect increases in the cost of living.
[2] Tax rates would be increased if benefits are increased to reflect adjustments for standard of living.
[3] Under present law, SMI is financed by contributions from participants. Revision of medicare financing under Council's recommendation would increase payroll tax to finance SMI.
[4] Not available since Council recommends estimates for HI and SMI to be made for only 10 years forward.

Source: Reports of the 1971 Advisory Council on Social Security, p. 73.

THE CURRENT PROGRAM

Financing

Employers withhold social security taxes from their employees and remit the proceeds, along with their own matching contributions and withheld income taxes, to the Treasury. Social security taxes are then transferred from the Treasury's general revenue fund to the social security trust funds according to the tax rates on wages of covered employees shown in Table I. Those who are eligible and elect to participate in the supplementary medical insurance program pay monthly premiums that are matched by Government contributions from the general revenue fund. Additional trust fund receipts from the general revenue fund finance certain benefit payments and cover interest on U.S. Treasury securities held by each trust fund.

Trust funds

Reflecting the concept that social security benefits are related to contributions, the tax receipts are placed in designated trust funds that are separate from the general revenue fund. The current method of financing and the present size of trust fund balances, however, reflect a current-cost financing system or a pay-as-you-go approach. Current balances in the OASI and DI trust funds would support benefit payments at their present level for only 13 months. This current-cost system certainly would not meet the actuarial standards of private insurance companies. To be considered actuarially sound, a private insurance fund should be sufficient to pay all accrued liabilities if operations were terminated. Social security actuaries and most policymakers, however, have an alternate conception of soundness for social security insurance. That is, expected future receipts should be sufficient to cover anticipated benefit payments and administrative costs over a specific valuation period. Under this theory, the benefits to be paid to current contributors depend upon the taxes to be paid by future contributors.

Cycle of financing and benefit payments

Congress has followed no official schedule or guidelines in increasing social security taxes and benefits over the years. In recent years, however, pressure to raise benefits has arisen because of sharp increases in prices and loss of purchasing power of benefits. In addition, a noticeable pattern has resulted, in part, from the method of forecasting future taxes and benefit payments used by the Social Security Administration.[2] Even though more accurate short- and intermediate-range estimates of future tax receipts are prepared, conservative, long-range forecasts have dominated Congressional decisions regarding increases in benefit payments. Benefit and tax schedules are determined so that the social security programs are actuarially sound according to social security insurance standards—long-run benefit payments equal long-run receipts. The long-range forecasts, though, have historically underestimated future tax receipts because they have underestimated future earnings. As a result, cash surpluses have been higher than estimated, and trust fund balances have increased to such an extent that the program has appeared to be overfinanced according to social security actuarial standards.

As a result, strong pressure to increase benefits has developed every year or so, and on several occasions Congress has amended the Social Security Act to liberalize benefits. When this has been done, however, Congress has usually set new tax schedules to provide for relatively small increases in the funds.

Footnotes at end of article.

Underlying assumptions

Projections of future social security tax receipts and benefit payments are largely dependent upon future taxable earnings and population growth and composition. Estimates for the various time periods shown in Table III are based on alternate assumptions. Short-range estimates for old-age survivors insurance and disability insurance are based on the assumption that tax and benefit schedules will not change from those under existing law. Intermediate-range estimates for both programs assume periodic increases in the maximum taxable earnings base. Because growth in both earnings and benefits is assumed in the short- and intermediate-range forecasts, these projections are more realistic than long-range estimates.

[In millions of dollars]

Calendar year	OASD [1]		HI [2]	
	Benefits	Balance	Benefits	Balance
Short-range: [3]				
1971	37,022	41,426	6,419	1,948
1972	38,999	48,606	7,593	819
1973	40,662	61,603	8,902	(4)
1974	42,347	76,503	10,149	
1975	44,087	93,115	11,499	
Intermediate-range: [5]				
1980	75,466	149,771	17,696	
1985	109,543	204,427	24,221	
1990	155,858	221,305	32,752	
Long-range: [6]				
1980	49,060	112,626		
1985	56,219	147,720		
1990	63,241	171,691		
1995	69,079	189,918		
2000	73,186	213,814		
2025	117,506	272,675		

[1] OASI and DI combined.
[2] Estimates reflect increasing earnings and benefits.
[3] Estimates for OASI and DI reflect increasing earnings and tax and benefit schedules of Public Law 92-5.
[4] Fund exhausted in 1973.
[5] Estimates for OASI and DI reflect increasing earnings and benefits.
[6] Estimates reflect level earnings and constant prices.

Source: 1971 Annual Report of the Board of Trustees of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance and Disability Insurance Trust Funds, pp. 25, 26, 36, 37, and 41. 1971 Annual Report of the Board of Trustees of the Federal Hospital Insurance Trust Fund, p. 14.

Hospital insurance (HI) estimates are based on assumptions that include growth in taxable earnings and rising costs of benefits because of a larger number of beneficiaries and higher hospitalization costs. The maximum wage base is expected to increase at the same rate as wages covered by social security.

Evaluation of the actuarial soundness of the supplementary medical insurance (SMI) program is made by comparing short-range estimates of benefit payments to estimates of tax receipts based upon the current contribution premium. If the contributions are projected to fall short of benefit payments, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare may increase the monthly premium each December.

To insure ample trust fund balances, conservative, long-range projections, which underestimate future tax receipts, assume that average earnings and prices will remain unchanged from those prevailing at the time of the forecast. Policy decisions by Congress are usually based on intermediate-cost estimates of long-range forecasts that are simply averages of high-cost and low-cost estimates. Different projections of population growth result in a range of cost estimates rather than a single projection. Comparison of intermediate-range projections with long-range projections of trust fund balances for 1980, 1985, and 1990 shows that forecasts that assume no change in wages and prices consistently underestimate future trust fund balances. Therefore, if long-range forecasts were based on more realistic assumptions, Congress could increase the amount of current benefits and, at the same time, continue to provide for an actuarially sound program.

ADVISORY COUNCIL RECOMMENDATIONS

Selected changes in social security financing recommended in March 1971 by the Advisory Council on Social Security are summarized below:

1. Cost estimates for cash benefits should be based—as the estimates for the hospital insurance program now are—on the assumptions that earnings levels will rise, that the contribution and benefit base will be increased as earnings levels rise, and that benefits will be increased as prices rise.

2. Tax rates should be based on single, best estimates derived from a single set of assumptions that reflect likely future trends in factors that affect income and outgo of the program.

3. Current-cost financing should be adopted to include maintenance of trust fund levels equal to one year's expenditures.

4. Explicit procedures to determine benefit and tax schedules should be established. Increases in benefits should be automatic and based on increases in prices. The maximum wage base should increase to $9,000 in 1972 and to $12,000 in 1974. Thereafter, the maximum wage base should increase automatically at the same rate earnings increase. Tax rates increases would be established by Congress on an *ad hoc* basis at the time real improvement in benefit payments is granted.

5. General revenue financing of the combined Medicare program should eventually equal one-third of total program costs.[3]

EVALUATIONS OF RECOMMENDATIONS

The first three recommendations reflect the Council's desire for Congress formally to adopt and improve the present method of pay-as-you-go financing. More realistic estimates of future cash flows and trust fund balances would eliminate the conservative bias that usually results in overfinancing. Coordination of the new estimates with the plan to limit trust fund balances would mean that social security taxes, in this century, could be less than presently scheduled.

The Council's fourth recommendation is designed to eliminate the present financing cycle by establishing an explicit schedule to increase social security taxes and benefits. To supplement the automatic increases designed to maintain purchasing power of beneficiaries, Congress could finance *ad hoc* changes in real benefits—benefit increases greater than changes in price levels—by increasing social security tax rates.

Revision of Medicare financing, recommendation five, is necessary because the health insurance trust fund will be exhausted in 1973. Also, the Council believes that the current method of financing supplementary medical insurance from monthly premiums paid by current beneficiaries results in an excessive burden on contributors. Because supplementary medical insurance benefit payments are not based on prior earnings or contributions, increased financing from the general revenue fund is advocated. Benefits would be financed by equal contributions from employee, employer, and general revenue.

Comparative costs

The Advisory Council's proposal to stabilize social security tax rates at 6 percent would seem very appealing when compared to the alternative of rising tax rates scheduled under current law (Table II). The Council's recommendations, however, call for greater contributions by increasing the maximum wage base at the same rate as the earnings of workers covered by social security. Furthermore, the Council's recommendations include greater benefits than currently legislated. Yet, even though these

larger benefits are not scheduled under current law, if the current financing system were maintained, benefits would be increased over time as overfinancing again resulted in surpluses.

Overemphasis of the declining tax rate for old-age, survivors, and disability insurance until after the year 2000 could lead to misunderstanding of the true cost of the recommended program. These declining tax rates would be offset by an increase in tax rates for Medicare, i.e., hospital and supplementary medical insurance.

The Office of the Actuary of the Social Security Administration has estimated that the cost of benefits recommended by the Council would average 15.82 percent of taxable payroll over the valuation period ending in the year 2045.[4] By comparison, the cost of benefits provided by present law would average 13.41 percent of taxable payroll. In addition, increased general revenue financing under the proposed program is estimated to total 1.3 percent of taxable payroll in 1975.

Stabilization of tax rates under the Council's program is predicated on the benefit schedule of the proposed system. After 1975, benefit payments under the Council's plan would rise more slowy than they have in the past because automatic increases in benefits would be tied to price increases. However, Congress could still decide to increase real benefits and finance the increase by hikes in the tax rate. Therefore, the Advisory Council's 6 percent tax rate figure might well be considered ony a minimum. Furthermore, the Council estimated wages—the source of taxes—to grow at twice the rate of increase of prices. A slower productivity growth would reduce this relationship and increase pressure to raise tax rates to finance scheduled benefits. Also, in the past, a large part of the increased financing resulted from expanded coverage of workers. Expansion of coverage in the future, however, will be limited because 90 percent of workers in paid employment are already covered by social security. Thus, it seems likely that in the future most unanticipated financing needs will have to be met by increasing tax rates or the maximum wage base.

Expected changes in the composition of the population after the year 2000 will affect both the proposed and current program. The ratio of beneficiaries, mainly those who are 65 years of age or older, to taxed wage earners, those who are 20 to 64 years of age, is expected to increase significantly. If the current-cost financing proposed by the Council is adopted, tax rates would have to increase sharply near the year 2011. Alternatively, if trust fund balances were allowed to increase as currently forecasted, these funds could be drawn down to supplement tax receipts in the next century.

PENDING LEGISLATION

In June 1971, less than three months after the Advisory Council presented its report to Congress, the House passed bill HR 1, which included certain reforms recommended by the Council.[5] At the time of this writing, the Senate has not yet acted on this legislation. Under this bill, liberalization of certain benefits would become effective in January 1972, in addition to an increase in benefits of 5 percent beginning in June 1972. The maximum wage base would increase to $10,200 in 1972 and to $10,800 in 1974; tax rates would increase to 5.4 percent in 1972, 6.2 percent in 1974, and 7.4 percent in 1977.

To maintain the purchasing power of the benefits, the bill provides for automatic increases if prices rose by at least 3 percent during the preceding year and if no increase in benefits had been granted during the preceding year on an *ad hoc* basis. The increase in benefits, to compensate for a rising cost of living, would be financed by an increase in the maximum wage base in proportion to the increase in the level of average covered wages.

The long-range estimates of taxes and benefits used to determine the actuarial soundness of the provisions in bill HR 1 were based on the assumption of constant prices and constant average earnings. As in the past, the long-range estimates to determine benefit and tax schedules were based on intermediate-cost assumptions. No single, best estimate, as recommended by the Council, was used. The House voted not to increase contributions from the general fund to finance social security programs, except to cover benefits extended to certain disabled beneficiaries.

In part, the automatic adjustments in benefit payments and maximum wage bases would incorporate the current-cost or pay-as-you-go financing system into the social security program. Short-range estimates of future balances of old-age, survivors, and disability insurance trust funds under bill HR 1 are closer approximations of yearly expenditures. Even so, under bill HR 1, long-range estimates of future trust fund balances are significantly higher than those estimated under current law. Under bill HR 1, it is estimated that the old-age and survivors trust fund would total $410.7 billion by the year 2025, compared to $272.7 billion under current law. Therefore, the pay-as-you-go financing system has not been completely adopted.

CONCLUSION

The adoption of a predetermined system to establish tax and benefit schedules has definite advantages. In the past, social security beneficiaries have had to rely on *ad hoc* decisions by Congress to receive increased benefits. Adoption of the recommendations by the Advisory Council would result in automatic adjustments of benefit payments following increases in prices.

Revising the method of forecasting benefit payments and taxes to reflect more accurately anticipated economic conditions and maintaining trust fund balances equal to one year's benefits would allow payment of benefits to increase without comparable tax increases in the near future. This change, however, would not reduce the overall cost of payments.

The new financing system might reduce the volume of social security tax receipts temporarily, but it would also necessitate a larger volume of tax receipts in the next century. An increase in benefits would have to be financed, sooner or later, from an increase in taxes.

—JAMES R. MCCABE.

FOOTNOTES

[1] U.S. Cong., H.R., *Reports of the 1971 Advisory Council on Social Security*, communication from Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, 92 Cong. 1st Sess., Apr. 5, 1971 (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1971).

[2] For more complete discussion see Joseph A. Pechman, Henry J. Aaron, and Michael K. Taussig, *Social Security: Perpsectives for Reform* (Washington: The Brookings Institution, 1968), pp. 149–164.

[3] For discussion of the recommendatons listed above, see *Reports of the 1971 Advisory Council on Social Security*, pp. 57–74.

[4] *Ibid.*, p. 87.

Footnotes at end of article.

SPECIAL EDUCATION INNOVATIONS

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, an innovation in handicapped education has been undertaken by a Kansas special education project headquartered in Dodge City.

The new system accommodates hard-of-hearing, visually impaired, and mentally retarded children of various age groups in special education classrooms. Each classroom is specially equipped to handle a specific disability. Eventually satellite centers will be set up in order to facilitate participation by eligible children who reside great distances from Dodge City.

I ask unanimous consent that an informative article from the January 29 Hutchinson, Kans., News, regarding this new technique in special education, be printed in the RECORD to obtain wide distribution and to call attention to the beneficial ideas introduced by this program. The information may be helpful to other school systems seeking ways to improve their special education programs.

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

DODGE CITY SPECIAL ED PROJECT: PLAN "SATELLITE" SCHOOLS

(By Mary Anne Crabb)

DODGE CITY.—Five more schools were accepted for membership this week in the Southwest Kansas Area Special Education Project headquartered in Dodge City.

They are Ness City, Dighton, Ransom, Bazine and Utica. They will participate in the comprehensive special education program set up last year by Dodge City and seven neighborhood school districts—Bucklin, Cimarron-Ensign, Ingalls, Jetmore, Minneola, Montezuma and Spearville-Windthorst.

Services now are centered in Dodge, but, with the addition of the new schools, satellite centers will be started, said Harold Hosey, assistant superintendent of schools at Dodge and director of SKASEP. The new schools will be surveyed as to needs, a staff will be hired and the program will be ready to go next fall.

NEED TWO MORE

At least two additional teachers, for the educable mentally retarded (EMR) and speech therapy programs probably will be needed.

Employment of three additional teachers was approved Wednesday for improvement of the current program by the board of directors. They are for the EMR program, speech therapy and a school psychologist.

The program will be financed 62 per cent by Dodge City and 38 per cent by the remaining schools, at $4,000 each.

About 500 children are receiving some type of special training this year, Hosey said. Dodge City has an enrollment of approximately 4,500 and the present seven other schools have a combined enrollment of 3,600.

WORK IN HOUSE

One of the unusual aspects of the SKASEP program is the training provided for the older group of trainable mentally retarded. Eleven students, ages 12 to 19, spend the school day in a six-room house where they clean, cook, wash, iron and work in a basement workshop, as well as attend classes in speech therapy, math, arts and crafts and reading. Each student buys food at the nearby supermarket.

The students are repairing pop cases in the workshop and are making a small profit on the work.

The house idea was borrowed from Omaha, Neb., Hosey said, and he recommends it for any special education program.

USE RANCH FACILITIES

Another unique part of the SKASEP program is use of the ranch facilities of Methodist Youthville Inc. near Dodge for emotionally disturbed students. Youngsters from throughout the district can be accommodated at day classes there. Usually the student remains at least a semester, but may attend

longer. SKASEP pays the teacher and Youthville provides the facilities.

The cooperative has the only program for hard-of-hearing children in Southwest Kansas, and children from as far away as Liberal are enrolled. The nine now enrolled formerly were being educated in Wichita, and Amarillo, Tex.

APPLY FOR GRANT

An application has been made for a federal grant of $13,000 for electronic equipment necessary to equip another classroom for the hard-of-hearing.

In the past, the project has had a class for the visually impaired, but enrollment was not great enough to require the program this year. The one youngster who is totally blind is enrolled in the second grade and is receiving special tutoring.

The current traveling staff includes two psychologists, responsible for evaluating and placing students in various programs, and four speech clinicians.

Five classrooms with six teachers are provided in Dodge City for educable mentally retarded children, ages six to 18.

The junior high program includes two teachers working with 25 students in team teaching.

Two classrooms have been set up for nine children, age six to 12, in the beginning level for the trainable mentally retarded.

Three teachers work in the area of learning disabilities, a program for students who have difficulty in the regular classroom due to hearing and sight problems. These are the first classrooms for learning disabilities in Southwest Kansas, Hosey said, and are serving approximately 21 students.

One teacher travels to outlying classrooms to train teachers in handling learning disabilities. Another learning disabilities teacher has been employed in the Dodge City school system through Title I of the federal education act.

NEW SERVICE

A new service initiated this year, with total federal funding, is an instructional materials center for special education programs, serving 28 counties.

Dodge City is one of seven satellite depositories from the main center at the University of Kansas. The Dodge center, staffed by three persons, contains equipment and materials used primarily for work with handicapped children. It has access to all materials housed at KU.

The Southwest Kansas program is a way for schools to comply with the September 1974 deadline set by the legislature for establishment of services for students with handicaps specified as educable mental retardation, trainable mental retardation, cerebral palsy and epilepsy, for which schools will receive state reimbursement. Other special education services, with state reimbursement, probably will be required later, Hosey said.

DOCK STRIKE HEARING RESUMED

Mr. PACKWOOD. Mr. President, yesterday the Labor and Public Welfare Committee resumed its hearings on Senate Joint Resolution 187, which Senator JAVITS and I have cosponsored in an effort to end the west coast dock tieup, now in its 17th week.

Testimony on the impact of this critical situation was presented by Transportation Secretary Volpe, Agriculture Secretary Butz, and Commerce Undersecretary Lynn. The statements brought to the committee by these distinguished gentlemen were tremendously informative, and I believe clarified for all who listened to the disastrous nature of the continuing dock blockage. I ask unanimous consent to have these excellent statements printed and further commend them to all Senators for their reading.

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

STATEMENT OF SECRETARY JOHN A. VOLPE, BEFORE THE SENATE SUBCOMMITTEE ON LABOR OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE, ON SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 187, THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 3, 1972

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee: I appreciate the opportunity to appear before you today in support of S.J. Resolution 187. I only wish, however, that my appearances before this Committee concerning a crippling strike in the transportation industry would be less frequent. My real regret, however, is that the Congress has had before it, for almost two years, a proposal which would provide a meaningful remedy for settling these disputes without congressional action.

In February 1970, the President first submitted to Congress his Emergency Public Interest Protection Act designed to amend our hopelessly antiquated transportation labor realtions legislation and bring to an end the devastating effects of strikes and lockouts in the transportation industry. The President again recommended that proposal (S. 560) to this Congress on February 3, 1971, and just two weeks ago, in his State of the Union message, repeated his urgent call for action. In submitting S.J. Resolution 187 to Congress, the President made it clear that we were again at the "flash point" because of Congress' inaction on his comprehensive labor legislation, which he has aptly renamed the "Crippling Strikes Prevention Act." As you know, Mr. Chairman, again yesterday the President issued another plea to the Congress for immediate action on both S.J. Resolution 187 and S. 560.

The last time I came before this Committee, I left hopeful that a permanent resolution of this problem was near at hand and that Congress was ready to act.

I am sorry to say I was disappointed. But I remain optimistic. It is through the Congress—through your efforts—that we shall solve this problem. I sincerely hope that this labor impasse is the last we shall have to solve by short term action.

The proposal we are considering today (S. J. Res. 187) is not a comprehensive solution for ending disputes in the transportation industry. It is yet another emergency measure meant to solve fully only the crisis at hand. Yet it must be passed—limited as it is—to protect the interest of the American people until a permanent solution is legislated for all transportation strikes.

As you know, Mr. Chairman, rare is the occasion that I come before the Congress and use harsh words. Unfortunately, this occasion demands harsh words.

I find my appearance today discouraging for another reason. As I believe most of you know, I have had a long association with labor unions and still hold a lifetime membership in the International Plasterers Union. I believe in the trade union movement. I know what it has meant to the American working man. Yet, I also know that the participants in the West Coast dock strike cannot be allowed to show a callous disregard for the American people. Frankly, the history of the current West Coast strike is a sorry one. Negotiations have continued on and off for 15 months. Both sides—management and labor—have been to blame for a seeming inability to resolve their differences.

Let me just say something which I know this Commission is certainly well aware of, but which I think bears repeatng. Strikes and lockouts are economic tools of labor and management. They are meant to assert pressure, to change values and constraints, to make settlement preferable to the continuation of the status quo. This dock strike, however, is similar to many transportation strikes in that its economic effects fall heavily on the shoulders of people not directly involved. People truly affected are the farmers whose crops lie rotting while the entire Pacific marketplace is closed to them. Other people truly affected are the Hawaiian housewives who pay exorbitant prices for everyday goods which must be airlifted from the mainland. And we should not forget the thousands of union members—in all trades and industries—who are also affected.

What of the factory workers who must be laid off because their factory can neither receive its raw materials nor deliver its finished products? What of solidarity now?

And what of our country's economic health? We are now deeply involved in, and individually committed to, phase two of the President's new economic policy. All of us—not just management—not just labor—not just the housewife—but all Americans must strive to break the cruel inflationary spiral which saps our prosperity and standard of living. We are now, after a revaluation of our country's currency, for the first time in a great while able to compete successfully in European and Asian markets. How can we allow the approximately 13,000 participants in this dispute to frustrate the economic expectations of more than 200 million Americans? There is too much at stake to allow so few to harm so many.

If you think these are harsh words, just look at our projections, based on an analysis of last September's dock strike.

The losses in port service industries which are directly involved in the dispute are estimated to be about 8 million dollars a week. The loss to the shipping industry is estimated at 3 million dollars a week, and the loss to the inland transportation companies, 5 million dollars per week. Greater losses will appear in the wholesale and retail trade sectors—29 million dollars per week—and in the industrial and agricultural sectors of the economy—46 million dollars per week. These losses will add up to a 3.4 percent reduction in the regional product of the West Coast States measured at a weekly rate at the height of impact.

Since this Nation's transportation system is so complex and interrelated, the elimination of one of the modes has an immediate effect on the connecting modes. In this case, the initiation of the West Coast dock strike resulted in the embargoing of all rail and truck traffic destined for the West Coast ports.

Depending upon the inventories and amount of storage facility available, the losses caused by the strike would begin within days after the strike and would build to a peak in about 8 weeks. Due to the previous work stoppage, inventories are probably in a more serious condition now than at the beginning of the conflict in July.

The peak employment impact, not including agriculture, would be as follows:

Shipping, 5 thousand people out of work.

Port services, 18 thousand people out of work.

Inland transportation, 10 thousand people out of work.

Trade, 7 thousand people out of work.

Industry, 148 thousand people out of work.

Each day this strike is permitted to continue, the more burdensome the results will become and the more difficult a full recovery will prove to be. At this point in time we can only speculate on markets permanently lost, income losses from spoiled produce and nonrecoverable losses to surface transportation modes due to diverted or cancelled traffic. Be assured, however, that as the data come in and the impact is fully documented, it will make grim reading for all concerned—workers—industry—and government.

The proposal the Administration brings before you today was outlined and explained

earlier by Secretary Hodgson. I shall not repeat his statement. Let me only say this: compulsory arbitration should be the last choice in any free economic society—a choice rightfully exercised only in extreme situations. But, Mr. Chairman, we have reached such a situation. We are at the point where there is left only that last choice.

The President and the Administration have reluctantly but responsibly reached that difficult decision. It is now time for Congress to exercise similar responsibility.

In the future—and I hope the very near future—you shall see fit to enact a more comprehensive measure. Now, however, you must move forward immediately to meet the crisis at hand. I am confident that the Congress will act in the public interest.

STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE EARL L. BUTZ, SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE, BEFORE THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE FEBRUARY 3, 1972

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee: I am grateful for your invitation to meet with the Committee and to discuss the need for emergency strike legislation. American farmers are being hurt each day by a strike that eliminates a major part of their overseas market. They are seriously concerned, and I am concerned on their behalf.

The farmer is much more dependent on exports than the operators of most other businesses. He ships overseas the production from almost one cropland acre out of four—even more in the case of such major crops as wheat and soybeans. Our agriculture must compete effectively in world trade, or it simply cannot exist on anything like the scale that we know it today.

U.S. farmers were seriously injured by last year's strikes—on the West Coast, at the Port of Chicago, and at Atlantic and Gulf ports. But they did have the benefit of injunctions that opened the ports and kept them open through a critical period during and following the harvest—a record harvest, by the way, for major crops.

The frightening thing to farmers, as we look ahead in 1972, is that they cannot look for further help from their government under existing legislation. The West Coast ports have again closed, and the injunction on the East Coast and Gulf ports is rapidly coming to an end. Farmers fear that their outlets to world markets will be totally closed.

To put this into dollar figures, the West Coast strike is reducing farm exports by almost $6 million every work day that it remains in effect. If East and Gulf ports again go on strike, this will reduce farm exports by $18 million a day. Moreover, there is good evidence that these strikes are damaging our reputation as a dependable supplier of farm products, and this loss could be immeasurable.

It is so important to realize that these strikes not only halt shipping and clog the ports, they also disrupt the entire system by backing up commodities into barges, rail cars, trucks, and warehouses all the way to the farm.

Farmers, along with other major users of the transportation system, have long been concerned by the danger in protracted and crippling strikes. Almost two years ago, President Nixon requested legislation that would give him certain options in the case of strikes such as those now occurring. That legislation was reintroduced last year.

Now, with a specific strike causing untold losses and hardship to farmers and others who are not a party to the issues being negotiated, the President simply is asking for authority to take reasonable action. This is the proposal embodied in S.J.R. 187.

WEST COAST

The short run impact of the dock strikes last summer and fall on agricultural exports is now apparent. The 100-day West Coast dock strike which began July 1, 1971 and was interrupted October 9 by a Taft-Hartley injunction reduced agricultural exports from the West Coast during the June–September period from $288 million a year earlier to $73 million in 1971.

Moreover, this coincided with the harvest of one of the largest wheat crops in the history of the Pacific Northwest. At the peak of harvest over 30 million bushels of wheat were on the ground due to a lack of transportation caused by the dock tieup. Some of this wheat suffered quality deterioration.

The 100-day strike and the threat of a continuation have created uncertainty in the wheat market. Based on purchases by the Japanese Food Agency, the U.S. farmer's share of this market for the March-December period fell from 55 percent to 40 percent. U.S. losses of sales are in the neighborhood of 25 million bushels valued at $40 million, and this loss continues to build. On January 19, the day after the West Coast dock strike resumed, the Japanese purchased 8.7 million bushels of wheat for March-April delivery; yet only 1.6 million bushels were purchased from the United States.

If the strike continues for another 60 days, we will lose wheat sales in Japan and other Asian countries for the rest of this fiscal year. This will result in the buildup of huge wheat stocks in the Pacific Northwest which will compete with next year's crop.

Other Far Eastern countries are looking to other sources of supply. A Korean tender for 110,000 tons of barley off the West Coast was recently cancelled due to the strike, and this barley has been purchased from Australia.

Korean imports of U.S. wheat in July-December 1971 were only 17 million bushels, compared with 28 million bushels in the same months the preceding year. The most affected varieties were hard red winter and soft white. The Koreans have purchased their needs from Australia.

Taiwan's imports of U.S. wheat in July-December 1971 were only 5.0 million bushels, compared with 12.4 million bushels the year before—a decline of almost 60 percent. In western soft wheat alone, the decline in U.S. sales to Taiwan was from 5.4 million bushels in July-December 1970 to only 1.6 million bushels the same months of 1971.

Thus wheat exports were the largest casualty of the 100-day strike, although other commodities were affected too, particularly fruits, vegetables, rice, cotton, and livestock products. Even those commodities that succeeded in reaching foreign markets did not represent a total plus.

Of those commodities which did move about one-half were fruits and vegetables and other non-bulk commodities. Lemons were flown to Japan, and fruits and vegetables were moved overland to Gulf and Canadian ports. Some Oregon seed producers were forced to ship overland to New York City to insure that their contracts would be met with foreign buyers.

The results of these costly diversions were less than encouraging. For example, two shipments of raisins and one shipment of prunes arrived in the United Kingdom contaminated by insects. The shipments have been investigated and the infestation was found to be directly attributable to the required diversionary hauls.

There is normally a constant flow of tallow from renderers to markets. The West Coast dock strike rapidly backed up exports and filled the limited storage available. For a time tallow was diverted to Canadian ports, but now this outlet is no longer available and the tallow is being diverted to the Midwest, at an increased marketing cost of over one cent per pound.

However, for most products the cost involved in diversion was too high, and consequently there were significant losses. In California ten alfalfa meal dehydration plants were forced to close during the West Coast strike. Since exports usually account for about two-thirds of the California output, the domestic market was quickly flooded with alfalfa that would normally be dehydrated for exporting. Furtheromre, alfalfa cubes and pellets destined for export and held by the strike were exposed to the sun which reduced carotene content to no more than that of ordinary hay. As a result their value dropped to $30 per ton compared to the pre-strike price of $50 per ton.

The West Coast strike has had a serious impact on prices for acala cotton. This is a specialty cotton grown in the far West which normally sells for a premium of 4 cents per pound above regular cottons. Substantial quantities of acala cotton are exported, and the export market is necessary to maintain the price differential. During the strike and with the threat of a new strike, acala cotton lost its normal premium price and is now selling below the levels of other cottons which do not have acala's unique qualities.

The loss of agricultural exports has a serious impact on port economies. Seattle, a city already beset by serious unemployment problems, is suffering additional losses in employment due to the dock strike. Last year agricultural export losses cost the port district over $1.0 million monthly in wages and $3 million monthly in sales and revenues for local businesses.

CHICAGO

The problems which arose on the West Coast last summer were repeated on the Gulf Coast, the East Coast and in Chicago on the Great Lakes last fall.

The Chicago strike of 9 elevators out of a total 11 in that port began September 1, 1971. These elevators were open from October 9 to November 3 under a temporary restraining order. The court, however, refused to issue an 80-day Taft-Hartley Injunction. The elevators have been closed since that time, and this will again be an acute problem once warm weather reopens the Great Lakes shipping route. Export capacity of the 9 closed elevators was estimated for September-December at 35 million bushels of corn and soybeans. The closing of this vital port during the height of harvest of a record corn and soybean crop was deeply felt in the corn belt. Cash farm prices for corn and soybeans were discounted well below the normal differential between the near term Chicago futures quotation and cash country prices in Indiana and Illinois.

EAST AND GULF COAST

The East and Gulf Coast strikes started October 1, 1971 and ended in late November when Taft-Hartley injunctions were issued. These injunctions expire in the middle of February 1972. An evaluation of the impact of this strike is difficult because some ports were open during part of the October-November period. As an example, the West Gulf Ports which are important outlets for wheat, sorghum, rice, and cotton, continued to work until November 15. New Orleans, the major export point for soybeans and corn was opened from October 28 through November 15 due to an NLRB action. Mobile, Beaumont, and Baltimore were open for shorter periods. Philadelphia was open from October 26 to November 15 under a state court action.

The East and Gulf Coasts normally account for about two-thirds of our total agricultural exports. During the October-November period in 1970 these ports exported $917 million of agricultural products compared to $400 million during the same period in 1971.

The strike impact was especially severe in October on exports of soybeans and corn from Gulf ports. Corn exports were down from $67 million to $9 million and soybeans were down from $95 million to about $16 million. By the time the Taft-Hartley injunction had been issued on the East and Gulf Coasts, 25 ocean-going vessels were idle

at Gulf ports, the port elevators were filled, and an estimated 50 million bushels of corn and soybeans were backed up the Mississippi River Valley in barges and railroad cars.

Some of the soybean crushing mills along the Mississippi were forced to close temporarily while others operated at sharply reduced capacity. During this period tallow stocks on the East Coast increased and over 100 million pounds of tobacco were stalled at dockside.

THE COST TO AGRICULTURE

In total, the dock strikes on the East, Gulf and West Coasts reduced U.S. farm exports during the shutdowns by over $700 million from year earlier levels. Diversionary movements to open ports during the strike, anticipatory shipments off the East and Gulf Coasts before the strike, and heavier than normal shipments following the strike will assist in reducing the losses. However, some losses are permanent, and the impact of these strikes will be felt in lost future sales.

The strike impact is not limited to lost export sales. It is felt in the form of reduced farm prices, increased marketing costs, and spoiled crops. This is especially true for those products for which the export market is substantial. We export over one-half of our rice, wheat, and soybean production; nearly two-fifths of the cattle hides; over one-third of the tallow, tobacco and cotton produced; and one-fifth of total feedgrain sales by U.S. farmers.

For example, if past performance is a guide, we expect that at the height of the strike during October and November, our farmers sold over 800 million bushels of corn and over 500 million bushels of soybeans. The price discounts received by farmers during this period were a direct result of the reduced foreign demand for these commodities caused by the dock strikes.

U.S. agricultural exports this fiscal year could very well be down $400–$500 million below last year. Part of this decline is due to lower unit values for some of our commodities but American agriculture is not getting the volume gains that could come from these lower prices. Without work stoppages Canada is experiencing a record year for barley exports. Some of our key customers are turning to Canada and Australia for more of their wheat supplies. The Russians were forced to purchase part of their corn requirements from Argentina because of the uncertainty of our port situation. Foreign customers are telling American agriculture that they are shifting their purchases elsewhere where they can get assured delivery. That is the real tragedy of these work stoppages—the loss of future sales to our competitors not only for this year but for years to come.

It is of utmost importance that these dock work stoppages be ended promptly, and that provision be made to prevent future tieups in our transportation system. Not to do this, promptly, will be to subject American farmers to an erosion of income which they cannot and should not be expected to endure. They are growing weary of being bloodied, as innocent bystanders, by someone else's fight. They are justifiably incensed and frustrated at not being able to move to market at harvest time the product of a whole year's labor, because of unresolved arguments among small groups of people in transportation. Our farmers want protection from this kind of restrictive action—and they want it *now*.

PACIFIC COAST EXPORTS—JULY-SEPTEMBER, 1970 AND 1971

[Dollars in millions]

Commodity	1970	1971	Percent, 1971 of 1970
Grain and feed	$141.8	$13.8	10.0
Wheat and flour	88.7	1.4	2.0
Rice	25.7	5.6	22.0
Prepared feed/alfalfa meal	8.8	.7	8.0
Fats and oils	12.3	7.4	60.0
Tobacco	0	0	.....
Cotton	17.4	2.5	14.0
Dairy	7.0	1.5	21.0
Poultry	2.8	1.1	39.0
Livestock and meat	32.4	13.7	42.0
Tallow and greases	10.9	4.3	39.0
Hides and skins	12.0	5.3	44.0
Fruits and vegetables	69.3	30.9	45.0
Citrus fruits	11.0	8.5	77.0
Fruit cocktail	2.7	.3	11.0
Fruit juices	3.3	1.1	33.0
Other fruits and nuts	37.6	14.8	39.0
Vegetables	13.0	6.2	48.0
Sugar and tropical products	5.3	2.1	40.0
Total—all agricultural commodities	288.3	73.0	25.3

STATEMENT OF JAMES T. LYNN, UNDER SECRETARY OF COMMERCE, BEFORE THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE, ON SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 187, FEBRUARY 3, 1972

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee: I appreciate the opportunity to appear before your committee to present my views in support of Senate Joint Resolution 187, a resolution to provide procedures for the settlement of the dispute on the Pacific Coast and Hawaii among certain shippers, associated employers and their employees.

In light of Secretary Hodgson's testimony, I will not dwell on the facts of the current longshore dispute. Suffice it to say that the negotiations have been underway since October 1970 and that all attempts to resolve it have failed. The exhaustive mediation efforts by the Director of the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service and the good offices of the Governors of the Western States have proved to be of no avail. All the procedures for resolving this dispute under the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947 have been exhausted.

In September of 1971, the President personally met with the disputing parties in an attempt to settle the impasse. The President's efforts were in vain and he is now asking the Congress for emergency legislation to avert further economic hardship to this Nation.

If the Congress does not act promptly, this strike will cause serious human suffering and economic losses resulting from unemployment, market dislocation, food shortages and higher prices.

Let me spell out these losses in more detail—

BALANCE OF TRADE

Continuation of this strike can only aggravate the U.S. balance of trade position. This could raise serious questions in the minds of our trading partners as to our will and our ability to resolve our economic problems.

As you know, in recent years, U.S. imports have been growing at a faster rate than U.S. exports, progressively diminishing the favorable balance of trade we have long enjoyed. Last year, for the first time since 1893, the United States had a trade deficit. The trade deficit, which was $2 billion, is a matter of highest national concern and vigorous action has been initiated by the Administration and the Congress ot reverse the situation.

Many American export commodities have close substitutes in world markets. If our products are not readily available, our foreign customers can obtain and will seek substitutes elsewhere. Moreover, if the strike continues, foreign customers may shift permanently to non-U.S. sources of supply, resulting in a continued loss of export markets.

West Coast ports are important to the conduct of U.S. foreign trade. In 1970, vessel shipments through those ports accounted for $4.2 billion in U.S. exports whereas in 1971, only $3.3 billion in exports were shipped from the West Coast. Although part of this was due to lessened demand by our foreign customers, our figures indicate that the West Coast dock strike has had a significant adverse effect on U.S. shipments to foreign markets. Also, during the 100 day strike which began on July 1, 1971, U.S. exporters were able to divert some shipments to Canadian and Gulf ports at additional expense.

This option has been significantly more limited since the resumption of the strike. Tuesday, pickets at the Mexican Border had to be enjoined from preventing diversions to Mexican ports, and as of yesterday, the Canadian longshoremen were still refusing to load any U.S. products diverted from the West Coast to Canadian ports, although I understand that an injunction was also issued there last night.

Continuation of the present strike would cause our export losses to increase further, particularly since our foreign customers have already been severely inconvenienced and are even less likely to tolerate additional delays in delivery of U.S. products. Exports which depend heavily on West Coast dock facilities for access to international markets would be particularly affected. Among these are exports of logs and lumber, about 75 percent of which normally move through the affected ports, 40 percent of woodpulp exports, and over 33 percent of wheat exports. For example, the Western Wood Products Association estimated that its members suffered actual losses of $943,000 per day during the 100 day strike.

So much for exports; but, what about imports? Obviously, these have also been affected by the West Coast dock strike. A case in point is the Japanese automobiles normally unloaded on the West Coast. These are transported on specially designed ships which have the flexibility to unload in any U.S. port. Although this would involve some delay in delivery schedules, these automobiles can be unloaded in Gulf ports, as they in fact were during the 100 day strike. Because products imported through the West Coast are essentially finished and semi-finished manufactures which have a considerably greater dollar value per ton than the agricultural products and other raw materials exported from the West Coast, the diversion of imports is economically much more feasible than the diversion of exports. Estimates predicated on data available in the Department indicate that the net effect in 1971 on our balance of trade resulting from the 100 day strike was a deficit of $500 million.

MARITIME LOSSES

The renewal of the strike continues to severely affect U.S. flag operators. Their financial losses directly impair our efforts to rebuild the U.S. merchant marine

As of today, loss of earnings in the longshore segment of the maritime industry resulting from the current strike are estimated to amount to $410,000 per day in losses of wages. During the 100 day strike, direct wage losses to U.S. ships' crews amounted to $5 million, exclusive of fringe benefits. Some 46 U.S. flag vessels and 203 foreign flag vessels were laid up during the peak of the strike's impact resulting in a loss of over 3,000 ship days for U.S. flag vessels alone. When I testified before the House Subcommittee on Labor, only two days ago, I stated that 17 U.S. flag vessels and 69 foreign flag vessels were already strike bound. Today, there are 22 U.S. flag vessels and 71 foreign flag vessels strike bound. The number is growing daily!

DOMESTIC LOSSES

Most of the food supplied to the State of Hawaii normally is shipped from the West Coast ports subject to the strike. During the 100 day strike, food supplies had to be shipped from other ports or by air freight

at significant additional expense. Rice, an important food staple in Hawaii, had to be rationed. Retail food prices in Hawaii went up approximately 8 percent in the six week period from July 1, to the date of the wage-price freeze.

Approximately 95 percent of Hawaii's sugar output normally is shipped to the West Coast ports subject to the strike. During the 100 day strike, significant losses were incurred as a result of higher shipping costs to other ports and emergency storage costs for these shipments which were delayed.

I'm sure you are aware that a group of Hawaiian small businessmen have formed "Operation Black Eye" and have brought to Washington a petition signed by 80,000 residents of Hawaii pleading for an immediate termination of this strike to alleviate the critical situation in that State. Considering the fact that the total population of Hawaii is approximately 769,000, we believe that the number of signatures reflects the concern with which Hawaiians view this strike.

The small businessmen who organized "Operation Black Eye" have indicated to the Department of Commerce that the true impact of the strike cannot adequately be measured by statistics, but must also be seen in human terms, in terms of consumers, particularly those in lower income levels, and in terms of small businessmen. The lower income consumer finds himself unable to purchase many necessities because of the extra costs of air freight and the scarcity of products. The small businessman finds himself lacking the resources to weather the financial burdens of the strike. In short, the people of Hawaii see themselves the victims of a situation over which they have no control and for which they are in no way responsible.

Additional losses occurred in other states affected by the strike. Based on state government statistics, we estimate that cargo losses during the 100 day strike amounted to $17.5 million per day through California ports and $6 million per day through Oregon and Washington ports. Losses of $1 million per day were reported in the states of Washington and Oregon in the form of lost wheat and lumber sales alone. Food prices increased in Alaska, prior to the wage price freeze, as a result of having to ship food by truck or from other ports.

The strike also has a severe, if not disastrous, impact on some small nearby port neighborhoods and businesses. The halt in port activity adversely affects small truckers, importers and exporters whose livelihood depends on a steady flow of merchandise and also affects small retail establishments.

In closing, I believe that continuation of the dock strike would be a severe blow to the welfare and economy of this Nation. Accordingly, I urge prompt enactment of Senate Joint Resolution 187.

YOUTH FOR UNDERSTANDING

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I want to pay tribute today to the exchange program for high school and college students, Youth for Understanding. Ever since 1951, Youth for Understanding has played a leadership role in promoting international understanding through a wide-based program of cultural exchanges. The underpinning of the entire program is the belief that a youth's education must involve a living experience in some foreign country. How else can we move toward the kind of international understanding that we have been striving for over centuries?

YFU has grown rapidly and impressively over this short period of time. Since its inception, more than 19,300 students from 47 countries in Europe, Asia, Latin America, and Africa have come to the United States. Since 1956, more than 11,300 American high school students have gone overseas under the auspices of YFU, particularly in the Latin American countries of Bolivia, Guatemala, the Dominican Republic, and Nigeria. Each program has a unique quality that is adjusted to the general character of the community where the YFU participant is living. In addition, there are special programs such as the YFU Chorale and the Community College program which have been a tremendous success.

The admirable record of YFU is greatly due to the work and dedication of Dr. Rachel Andresen, executive director, and all those people who have supported YFU throughout the years. The State Department has also been of great assistance.

Each year the YFU continues to gain momentum. It is an organization for youth and an organization which operates at a youthful pace with a youthful spirit. I congratulate YFU on the fine work it has done and will continue to do.

THE LATE SENATOR CARL HAYDEN, OF ARIZONA

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, one of the men who I have always admired very much is the late Senator Carl Hayden of Arizona. His death last month marked the end of one of the most unusual careers in American politics. He was a distinguished and unusual man.

Senator Hayden began to represent his beloved State of Arizona in the U.S. Congress when that State came into the Union in 1912. He continued with his service in the Senate and had a combined service in the House and Senate of almost threescore years.

The value of public service is not how long we serve, but how well. Senator Hayden served well. It was my privilege to serve on the Committee on Rules and Administration for a number of years with Senator Carl Hayden. I marveled at his memory, his keen mind, his grasp at governmental affairs and world affairs. I often thought that he knew more about the operation of the U.S. Government than any man I have ever met.

Senator Carl Hayden was a kindly man. I never heard him speak harshly of anyone. If Carl Hayden participated in a matter it was for the purpose of helping.

The historians will have ample material in the life and works of Senator Carl Hayden for many volumes. There is so much to write concerning his accomplishments. I would not attempt it here. I merely wish to express my sorrow at his passing and my sympathy to those he has left behind.

The poet, Mattie Richard Tyler, of Washington, was a personal friend of Carl Hayden. Upon his passing she wrote the poem, "The Senate Patriarch Goes Home." Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the poem printed as a part of my remarks.

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

THE SENATE PATRIARCH GOES HOME—SENATOR CARL HAYDEN, 1877–1972

(By Mattie Richards Tyler)

One winter night, a few brief years ago,
I sat and listened to you reminisce.
Across the street, your Capitol was aglow
With lights; and you were such a part of this
That when you spoke of "going home real soon"—
To Arizona and your friends out there—
I wondered if your thoughts would drift each noon
To Congress, and your Senate desk and chair.

For fifty-six full years, you quietly served
The nation, and the state that you loved best.
Your path, so strewn with honors, never swerved . . .
Through dedicated work you met each test.
Your life is ended; but your work survives
And blossoms in the fields of countless lives.

A CLARIFICATION ON THE RECORD

Mr. BROOKE. Mr. President, some time ago a most controversial document was issued by Congressman DOWDY's House District Subcommittee concerning an FHA insured rehabilitation project, the Clifton Terrace Apartments located in Washington, D.C. Most of the charges made in that report have been contradicted by the findings of the General Accounting Office and the Department of Housing and Urban Development. Further, the report was disavowed by subcommittee members who never participated in, reviewed, or saw the report prior to its publication.

Yet the report stands as a Government document, and certain inaccuracies contained therein have never been officially refuted. I would like to set the record straight regarding a charge made against a former member of my staff who until recently was the general counsel to Housing Development Corp., the nonprofit sponsor of the Clifton Terrace Apartments.

The report made the claim that Miss Marilyn Melkonian had been employed by the Neighborhood Legal Services project, a federally funded program, at the same time she was employed on my staff. This information is not accurate. Miss Melkonian was employed by the Neighborhood Legal Services project from June 18, 1967, to August 31, 1967. She was not employed as a member of my staff until September 9, 1967. I hope this statement for the record will avoid any reference to the inaccuracies of this report in regard to Miss Melkonian in the future.

SUDDEN INFANT DEATH SYNDROME

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, on Tuesday, January 25 one of my constituents, Mr. Saul Goldberg, presented testimony on a little known subject before the Subcommittee on Children and Youth.

Mr. Goldberg is president of the International Guild for Infant Survival, Inc. of Baltimore, Md. The guild was started in November of 1964 by Mr. and Mrs. Saul Goldberg and now has more than seven chapters in the United States and one in Wales.

In his presentation before the subcommittee, Mr. Goldberg discussed the mysterious phenomena of sudden infant death, more commonly called crib death which claims the lives of 10,000 to 15,000 babies. This disease, as the name denotes, strikes suddenly and unexpectedly, and in light of present medical knowledge there is no known way to prevent it. Research has begun, theories advanced; however, very little is still known. I am certainly pleased that the subcommittee hearings were held, not only to bring a focus to this disease, but also to stress the fact that additional research is certainly needed. An example of the need for funding is evidenced by the campaign currently embarked upon in my State by the International Guild for Infant Survival to raise $100,000 for medical research. I will certainly support additional research and highly praise the fine work of the International Guild for Infant Survival.

I would also like to point out to my colleagues that the February 8 episode of "Marcus Welby, M.D." will feature an exploration of the sudden infant death syndrome. I congratulate ABC Television for this public service and recommend the program to my colleagues. I also recommend the moving testimony of Mr. Goldberg which follows and also the articles featured in the Baltimore Sun and the Washington Post on the Sudden Infant Death Syndrome.

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

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

STATEMENT BEFORE THE U.S. SENATE SUBCOMMITTEE ON CHILDREN AND YOUTH, COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE

JANUARY 25, 1972.

Thank you, Mr. Senator, for this opportunity to exercise my participation in our democratic form of government. Accordingly, I speak before you as a private citizen, as a father for his family, as a parent who has personally experienced the tragedy of Sudden Infant Death, and as President of The International Guild for Infant Survival and Chairman of the International Council for Infant Survival. In all these capacities, I thank you and the Committee for your interest in what we call Sudden Infant Death and for your holding this hearing. On behalf of everyone I represent here today, we greatly and gratefully appreciate your concern for the very lives of our young children.

I need not dwell on the characteristics and details of Sudden Infant Death for I would like to assume we all understand something of its nature and tragedy. But I would like to say a personal word for background purposes.

My family experienced our own Sudden Infant Death tragedy when we suddenly lost our daughter Suzanne on Wednesday, December 4, 1963, a scant 12 days after the tragic assassination of President Kennedy. If you can recall the magnitude of your own shock and our nation's grief at the loss of this great leader, then you have some insight into the magnitude of our own personal shock and grief at the loss of our normal, healthy, beautiful little 2-month-old girl! Multiply this by the thousands of similar sudden deaths of equally precious babies and you begin to obtain some idea of the disastrous proportions and extent of this major problem of infant mortality.

In trying to discover as much as possible about this unknown killer of infants, we were frustrated as individuals to learn that little or nothing was being done anywhere to get to the bottom of this phenomenon, and that very, very few people, including physicians and public health officials, knew anything about it. In fact, many never heard of it before, or had some misconception about it. So, in the true spirit of American togetherness, friends and strangers banded together for common purpose in pursuit of this killer in our midst.

And so The Guild for Infant Survival was founded in Baltimore in late 1964 . . . to fight this killer, to help solve the mystery of Sudden Infant Death, to eradicate it from the face of the earth and save the lives of thousands of infants here in our own country and around the world as well. From the beginning, we established three main purposes: to help families understand about Sudden Infant Death and its ramifications, to educate and arouse the general public to an awareness of its seriousness and scope, to support and encourage medical and scientific interest and activity in the study of this puzzling mystery.

The Guild for Infant Survival has grown to 10 affiliated autonomous groups, 25 regional representatives in various states and communities from coast to coast, plus personal or medical contacts in almost a dozen countries over the globe. The Guild is a membership organization of both stricken parents who know first-hand about Sudden Infant Death and those who have the good fortune to be spared but share our concern—who have a voice in what we do and how we do it. Their work is done on a voluntary, spare-time, unpaid basis. In addition to members and contributors, there are many who serve and support us in a variety of ways individually and through other groups and organizations, so that there are literally thousands of citizens involved with us.

In communities where Guild groups are most active, the problem of Sudden Infant Death is no longer unheard of. For people have come to realize that, instead of sticking their heads in the sand, or ignoring this problem, the way to solve a problem is to face it, honestly . . . squarely . . . meaningfully. At least 4 research projects have been given impetus due to the efforts of our Guild groups, and there may be more. We estimate that Guild contributions directly for Sudden Infant Death research now approximate $30,000 without large corporate, foundation, or public funds, donated by ordinary, wonderful people who really care about our kids.

The Guild reaches out its hand of friendship and its heart full of understanding to hundreds, perhaps thousands of "crib death" families. You can imagine how heavy the burden of self-guilt must hang over the family and anyone else with the baby at the time, and how important it is to relieve that unnecessary weight with information and compassion. Our Guilds bring these parents and the public in closer contact with researchers themselves and their facilities, sponsor meetings with health personnel, and held the first parent-medical conference in 1969.

We have succeeded in bringing our own state health officials to recognize Sudden Infant Death as a legitimate cause of death on medical certificates, to undertake special studies and statistical tabulations, and to call on us in time of need and cooperation. In Maryland, state appropriations to complete the research floor of the new Medical Examiners Building were obtained with Guild help so there would at least be a place in which research could begin, and in which it has.

Our Guild groups are satisfied that we can successfully aid and console the families of these young victims, provided we can expect the cooperation of medical authorities and public health officials, especially in verifying the serious extent of Sudden Infant Death. Much of this is also true when we reach out to the general public but the need for greater Government participation is more so. This is because the mass media which influence public knowledge and opinion so dramatically and extensively turn to those in a position to know and inform.

In the first few years of Guild for Infant Survival activity, it was very important for us to impress upon those we contacted that there was such a phenomenon as Sudden Infant Death and that it was serious. Although much correspondence was exchanged with Federal health officials and visits made to the National Institutes of Health, we could not obtain a relatively simple written statement acknowledging the true nature and extent of Sudden Infant Death. Nor could we find even one reference to this problem in any available Government publication on health, infant care, or mortality statistics. And I am speaking in general terms, not in specifics more difficult to come by. In fact, it wasn't until a year or two ago that we finally received statements in writing that were pertinent and helpful. I don't think these services of Government, which exist for public good, should be so withheld, and I certainly shudder to think that the National Institutes of Health has a "head in the sand" attitude.

Beyond this, most of the problems we have encountered lie in the direction of skimpy medical activity to stamp out this killer, and our intention as a Government to seriously pursue this goal. In order to ascertain the status of basic knowledge and information known about Sudden Infant Death, our Guild in Baltimore undertook a nationwide survey. A questionnaire concerning Sudden Infant Death was mailed to the chief health official of each of the 50 states and the District of Columbia in June 1971. Within 2 months or so, replies had been received from all but 9 states. Thirty-nine (39) states and the Distirct of Columbia returned completed questionnaires and two states submitted their information in letter form. I should like to refer to the preliminary analysis of this survey in this statement now.

It seems logical to assume that before we attack a problem, we should all understand what the problem is. This involves terminology, definition, description. In the 8 years of our involvement, there is still no uniform, accepted definition, no standardized description—and worse, no universally designated name or term. We are all familiar with the variety of names in current use: Sudden Infant Death, Sudden Unexplained Infant Death, Sudden Death Syndrome, Sudden Death in Infancy, etc. It is difficult to believe that we have yet to take this obvious initial step in official recognition.

Our questionnaire replies revealed 16 different names or phrases being used to identify what is essentially the same phenomenon. "Crib death" was most frequently named, by 20 of the 42 jurisdictions replying; Sudden Infant Death was second with 7 states. Nine (9) states used no official designation at all and 6 states were guided by the certified cause of death or pathological diagnosis. In only 14 states was a single designation employed, but there were still 7 different terms used among these 14 states! Nine (9) states used two terms and 4 states used 3. This illustrates a confusing situation in naming the problem we are talking about and trying to solve.

The Guild for Infant Survival recommends use of the term "Sudden Infant Death" in cooperation with other parent groups. To use "crib death" implies death in the crib, but this is not always true and may be misleading if officially adopted. It may, however, have value in colloquial usage. Sudden Infant Death is simple, direct, and easily understood by stricken parents and scientific researchers.

Along with a name should be a definition. No uniform or standard phraseology exists. I

understand that just recently the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development has circulated a suggested one. But earlier this year, the Guild delved into this shortcoming with our medical advisors and proposes the following working definition: The death of an ostensibly healthy infant or young child which occurs suddenly and unexpectedly and which remains unexplained after post-mortem examination.

Before any name and definition agreed upon can be of value, their use must be recognized and accepted by the state filing information. In our survey, 5 states replied that no term is acceptable. Twenty-seven (27) states said they did recognize and accept one of the terms but 8 more qualified their affirmative response; for example, only if no other cause could be found or if the certifying authority used it.

Another fundamental piece of information needed before a logical attack can be made on Sudden Infant Death is, we think, to know the frequency and its relation to other health problems and causes of infant mortality. We all know about the International Classification of Diseases and Causes of Death (Adapted) and its detailed classification of all health problems with accompanying code number identification. One would expect to find some specific category within this system for our subject today, Sudden Infant Death (or some related terminology). There is none. Yet if we look far enough, we find a catch-all category of ill-defined causes or conditions.

Our survey revealed use of two such categories in this section frequently mentioned by state health officials. The state of Indiana put it the best way: "Sudden Infant Death is recorded in accordance with the 8th Revision International Classification of Diseases and with instruction from the National Center on Vital Statistics. SID is classified in the Symptoms and Ill-Defined Conditions Category '795 Sudden death (cause unknown).' A crib death diagnosis is charged to '796.2 Found dead (cause unknown).' If a more specific cause is indicated the death is charged to that category; e.g., interstitial pneumonitis, axphyxia, etc. . . ." In our discussion here, I think it is agreed among the experts that Sudden Infant Death and crib death are one and the same. Yet the International Classification is used to split these into two parts (above). Note also that neither category makes any reference to age. Adults as well as infants can and do become tabulated in both classifications. In the Guild survey, 8 states use both categories, 18 states use one or the other, 4 states use some variation of the two, 2 use a supplemental number, a couple of states use the accidental death category (E913); one used other conditions of newborn (778.9) for crib deaths under 28 days. Thirty-one (31) states mentioned some code number, 5 mentioned none, 5 were indefinite. Mention was also made of the imprecise or vague specification as to age, as not being sufficient for Sudden Infant Death.

The Guild for Infant Survival believes it is important for the National Center for Health Statistics to officially propose before the forthcoming Revisions Committee of the International Classification of Diseases a separate and specific classification term and code number for Sudden Infant Death. With the Federal health authorities showing the way for the states—as formally proposed by resolution of the state assembly of California—this revision would be a monumental step in the right direction.

This special classification and coding is essential to the accurate state tabulations of crib deaths. Fifteen (15) states reported no official tabulation in state health statistics; 25 said they do, especially when age is considered, but noted variables. Minnesota responded when asked if SID's are tabulated in state statistics: "Yes but, the variations in methods of certification and coding lead to some confusion. ICDA 795 should include the total—but some are coded 796.2 for various reasons." Tennessee said: "Those rules for selecting and classifying the causes of death are quite sensitive to the manner in which the medical certification is completed. Thus, in interpreting data regarding cause of death it is important to remember that a slight variance in the statement of cause of death may result in an appreciable difference in the cause to which the death is assigned by using the standard rules."

North Dakota noted the extra effort required: ". . . No separate tabulation has been made of 'crib deaths' or 'sudden death of infants' other than the fact that these would be in the total of 'Ill-defined' causes. To tabulate differently would require individual examination of each infant death certificate by a qualified medical person which service is not available to the Division of Vital Statistics (N. Dak.) at this time."

The National Institute of Child Health and Human Development is fond of quoting statistics which we believe are, in reality, too low. References are continually being made to projections based on 2 to 3 sudden infant deaths per 1,000 live births, to rationalize estimates as low as 7500 and as high as only 12,000. We believe even the higher estimate to be too low in the overall significance of the problem. Our reasons are these: Projections for the entire country are based on only 2–3 study areas like Seattle and Philadelphia. Yet the Chief Medical Examiner of Maryland noted the Sudden Infant Death rate in Baltimore as 6 per 1,000 live births. Since we are told there is a correlation between Sudden Infant Death incidence and general infant mortality, it would seem that SID incidences would be higher in areas with greater infant mortality, as in the South, thus increasing the total annual number.

Then there is the problem of finding and tabulating every Sudden Infant Death. Even as successful and enlightening as we have been in Maryland, there are still occasions when there is no official record of a Sudden Infant Death which we have discovered privately, as through a hospital or the family itself or a relative or neighbor. It is likely these "hidden" cases are more frequent in less enlightened communities. It is not difficult to accomplish this, especially where affluence and influence coincide. Finally, no consideration of this syndrome can be complete without regard for the phenomenon of "near" Sudden Infant Deaths . . . when normal, healthy infants suddenly are found near death but for some unexplained reason pull out of this situation, recover and return to normal. Yet competent medical examination cannot explain this strange occurrence. These, too, should be included in the SID count. For all these reasons, our Guilds and our local advisors believe it is quite possible the frequency of Sudden Infant Death could reach as high as 25,000 infants/yr.

For all this concern, with all these uncertainties and lack of knowledge, relatively little research funding has been granted by the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development (NICHD) down through the years. Here again, we have never been able to ascertain the exact extent of research funding. This continuing inability to pin down specific information, which should be available to the public, may lead to suspicious conclusions.

As of last year, the Guild was able only to estimate the extent of specific SID research funding by NICHD at about $700,000 in the 8 years of Institute existence. It is also conceivable at the time that up to 200,000 American babies were lost to SID in 8 years.

Simple arithmetic reveals that only $3.50 per lost child was being spent. Even if we conceded the Institute's upper estimate of 12,000 SID losses per year, we would still be spending only about $7.00 each.

In an honest attempt to prove or disprove our $700,000 figure, we asked the Institute to provide us with a yearly breakdown of funding since its inception. It would seem logical that an index of research grants by title or specific subject would yield this data conveniently. Yet it took more than 2 months to obtain these statistics, and then only for the 1971 fiscal year. The information sheet listed 43 grants totalling $1.8 million relating to infant mortality/SID, but only one specifically for Sudden Infant Death of $46,000 (or $2–4 per child). In 1970, there was only one grant, for $33,000 ($1.50–$3 per child). Yet the total NICHR budget rose from $76 million to $94 million in 1971, with a $5.7 million increase for support of general child health research, which includes crib death.

It is our position that the problem of Sudden Infant Death is too devastating and horrible to be explained away by 43 funding grants which may indirectly relate to the problem—that the magnitude and significance of the problem are so great as to demand commensurate and specific funding.

This lack of substantial funding is further explained by Government officials by a lack of "meritorious research ideas" or "qualified researchers." There are many potential researchers ready and willing to investigate SID in new and potentially promising directions. Although they may not meet the established standards of scrutinizing study sections, these are respected men of competence and position in their own fields and are worthy of a chance to explore their theories. It just may be that such a bizarre problem may require a bizarre or non-conformist approach, instead of standard or restricted technique.

We say this for two good reasons: First, we must always keep in mind the lives which are lost every day. I find it indecent and inhuman to wait for just the proper meritorious ideas to come along for consideraion while our babies are being struck down before our eyes day in and day out. Second, the funds to support research are public funds, derived from us the taxpayers. The very fact that these same taxpayers in many numbers voluntarily and anxiously contribute their own monies to our private efforts to fund research serves as a mandate to public officials to put their taxes to use to save lives now!

Our proposal is sensible and meaningful: Establish a certain substantial sum of money earmarked specifically for Sudden Infant Death research. Invite all interested researchers to apply for funding. Then choose those most capable and promising for funding. Make the most of what there is now; don't wait for an ideal who may never come. Only in this way will we know that our Government really cares about our babies!

Down through the years, NICHD has calmed us with repeated phrases that Sudden Infant Death has a high priority for attention and action. That it is the greatest single killer of infants from one month to one year of age. And more. Looking back, however, relatively little has been undertaken and even less has been accomplished. It is almost as if there were no such entity as Sudden Infant Death if you search the records and literature . . . even though thousands of empty cribs, tiny graves, and broken hearts bear mute evidence of the total destruction of this killer in our midst.

Is this, then the record of a Government which serves the people? In seeking to solve every problem of man's development from prenatal care to geriatrics, does a problem like Sudden Infant Death get lost in the overwhelming responsibilities of this comprehensive Health Institute? Is Govern-

ment's priority and present preoccupation with birth control and population growth conflicting with the saving of the lives of newborn babies? The time has come for our Government to back up its words and intentions with dollars and sense! We spend millions in research to perfect birth control devices, but paltry thousands to save new human lives we love so much. Where is our sense of values?

Experience indicates that Government does not act on its own initiative to solve serious problems, but only reacts when some unexpected, disastrous episode compels it to positive action. Are these daily unexpected disastrous episodes too commonplace to attract urgent, serious action? Are these infant tragedies therefore being compounded by inaction?

We of The Guild for Infant Survival cannot keep silent and watch more children die in vain without lifting a finger and raising our voices. We cannot ignore these daily tragedies happening before our very eyes . . . watching these precious babies slip through our hearts and homes! And America cannot afford to sit idly by while millions of hours of manpower and talent which could be put to peaceful and productive purpose are buried forever.

These departed children can no longer speak for themselves . . . so we of The Guild for Infant Survival speak for them, so they shall *not* have died in vain. We come to plead for the lives of future generations who face this same horrible threat of sudden death at the very beginning of life.

No one can say who will be touched in the weeks and months ahead. We do know there will be many; unfortunately, far too many. How much longer will our babies—yours and mine—die so tragically and so unnecessarily? How much do we really value life itself?

Today, you have a golden opportunity given to very few: to save thousands of lives every year in every future generation of mankind . . . by considering and acting on what we have said here today . . . to speed the day when no more babies will die . . .

John Donne said it best:

"No man is an island, entire of itself. Every man is a piece of the Continent, a part of the main . . . Any man's death diminishes me, because I am involved in Mankind. And therefore never send to know for whom the bell tolls, it tolls for thee . . ."

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 26, 1972]

THE MYSTERY OF CRIB DEATH

Among the many baffling mysteries of the human body, few remain as persistently unsolved as crib death. The disease is known medically as sudden infant death syndrome (SIDS). Estimates vary on how many victims die every year; the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development believes between 7,400 and 10,500 occur annually, while two private groups—the National Foundation for Sudden Infant Death and the Guild for Infant Survival—put the figures between 10,000 and 20,000. Whatever the number, little argument exists that SIDS is a definite disease and is the number one cause of death in infants after the first week of life. Mystery is present because it can neither be predicted or prevented. The infant is usually under six months of age. Typically, the baby is healthy and normal, though sometimes a common cold may be present; he or she has been put to bed routinely but some hours later, with neither a cry or an indication of pain, is found dead.

On Tuesday, the Senate Subcommittee on Children and Youth held one day of hearings on crib death. One expected and much needed result of these hearings is that greater public attention will now be focused on this dangerous and widespread disease. Dr. Abraham Bergman of Children's Orthopedic Hospital in Seattle and president of the National Foundation for Sudden Infant Death, believes that the urgent problem about SID'S "is ignorance among the medical profession and lay public. In the vast majority of communities, parents who lose children to SIDS are treated as criminals . . . Many medical examiners and coroners are still calling the disease suffocation or a variety of other names." In addition to normal reactions of grief, parents of SIDS victims often suffer guilt or emotional pain unmatched by other diseases. "The toll of broken families around the country for sudden infant death is shocking," said Dr. Bergman.

As a beginning sign of congressional interest in SIDS, the hearings were useful. As Sen. Walter F. Mondale, the subcommittee chairman noted, it was only three years ago that crib death was finally identified and described as a specific disease. What needs to be done now is for NIH to examine its research posibilities, first to discover the cause of SIDS and then to see how it may be prevented. Neither goal will be easy to reach, but with annual deaths ranging in the 10,000 area, the reduction of infant mortality should at least be a major concern of both Congress and the government. No one can deny that SIDS is surely a major concern to tens of thousands of parents.

[From the Baltimore Sun, Jan. 30, 1972]

CRIB-DEATH STUDY NEEDS $100,000

A Baltimore-based organization dedicated to exploring the mysteries of sudden infant death has embarked on a campaign to raise $100,000 for medical research.

The drive is being led by Mr. and Mrs. Saul Goldberg, a Baltimore couple who founded the International Guild for Infant Survival in November, 1964, less than a year after the sudden, unexplained death of their 2-month-old daughter.

There has been little research into sudden infant death—also known as crib death—and its cause and prevention are unknown. A recent Senate hearing noted there are 10,000 deaths annually and that the federal government spent only $46,000 in 1971 for research into crib deaths.

In a typical situation, a mother enters her child's room in the morning and finds the infant dead in his crib. There is no clear medical reason for the child's death and the parents, wrongfully, often blame themselves for the tragedy.

In the Batlimore area last year there were 94 deaths attributed to the sudden infant death syndrome; statewide, the total was more than 150.

Because of the lack of a uniform reporting system, the failure of doctors to list the syndrome on death certificates and the lack of experience on the part of some coroners, the Goldbergs feel the problem is grossly underreported. They estimate the national death total at 25,000 annually.

For years, Mr. and Mrs. Goldberg said in a recent interview, they labored under the belief that, once made aware of the syndrome, people would identify with the tragedy and support research aimed at its elimination.

But this has not happened.

"CAN'T HIDE FROM IT"

"People clam up about it instead of reach-out to the problem," Mr. Goldberg said. "There is tragedy in this world, people must realize it, they can't hide from it," he added.

Consequently, the couple announced their intention to abandon the organization's "low profile" and begin soliciting help from charitable organizations, corporate foundations and "affluent and influential" persons in the community.

At the same time they are planning a campaign to attract donations from persons in stores, offices and shopping centers. They will do this through posters advertising a February 8 episode of the "Marcus Welby, M.D." television series in which the sudden infant death syndrome will be explored.

Mr. Goldberg takes credit for initiating the show in a letter he mailed to the show's producers in the summer of 1970 suggesting a program on crib death.

They have no deadline for obtaining the $100,000 but said most of it will go to Dr. Russell S. Fisher, the state's chief medical examiner, whose interest in crib death goes back 20 years.

Dr. Fisher, who participated in the interview, said the money will be applied to basic research on the problem.

MANY HAD MINOR INFECTIONS

Dr. Fisher suspects that the syndrome is connected with the development of the infant's immunological system to ward off infection and disease.

Most of the deaths occur in the third or fourth month of life and sharply drop after the eighth month, he noted. It is during this period that the baby loses the immunological system inherited from its mother and begins to develop its own system.

Sudden infant death may be due to a defect in the development of this system which would render the infant fatally susceptible to relatively minor infections, he said. Many crib death babies have had minor infections upon autopsy, he added.

If these defects could be spotted, Dr. Fisher said, all children would be examined at four months of age and, if they possess the defect, their immunological defense system could be bolstered, say, by serum injections from the mother.

Dr. Fisher said it would take $100,000-a-year for five years to hire a staff of immunologists and immuno-chemists to probe this theory. "We don't have the money to get the talent," he said.

Mr. and Mrs. Goldberg hope, at least, to get this project initiated.

JUVENILE DELINQUENCY

Mr. COOK. Mr. President, last week I received a letter from a constituent concerning the designation of the first week in February as "We Appreciate Our Young People Week" in Kentucky. Let me be among the first to applaud this attitude. A healthy respect and concern for the young people of this country is an important first step in the eradication of many of our juvenile problems. This recognition serves as a fitting introduction to my remarks today regarding current juvenile delinquency legislation.

Over the past 3 years my position on the Senate Subcommittee To Investigate Juvenile Delinquency has made me increasingly aware of the inadequate attempts on the Federal level to deal with the root causes of juvenile delinquency. The current overcrowding in our correctional facilities and courts is a direct result of our inexcusable neglect in the area. Undeniably, the most effective and efficient approach to any problem is to address its cause rather than simply its symptoms. For this reason I am convinced that a strong and broad program of delinquency prevention should be a major priority of this session of Congress.

The Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee has recently held hearings on two pieces of legislation in this area. Both are aimed at delinquency prevention and both have met opposition on the grounds that the authority to implement and

fund projects such as they propose already exists. This authority is scattered through a wide variety of types of legislation and effects a number of different agencies and bureaus. For the most part, these titles have received little, if any, funding or development. Therefore, while delinquency prevention programs have been recognized as important and authorizations provided for, they have not received the funds and priority which would make them viable, working programs.

This is a situation which I personally deplore. Until someone is willing to take the initiative in developing these various pieces of legislation into a broad and effective delinquency prevention program, I will feel compelled to support the scattered pieces of prevention legislation that come before this session of Congress.

My concern today, however, is with the one preventive approach which I feel holds the only real promise in dealing with the problems of today's youth. That approach is basically one of helping kids to help themselves. It is exemplified by the efforts of YDDPA, the Youth Development and Delinquency Prevention Administration set up in HEW under the Juvenile Delinquency Prevention and Control Act of 1968, in its organization of Youth Service Bureaus in special pilot projects throughout the country. As a concept, it is quite simple: To go into an area, determine what public and private services are then available to the youth of that area, and to set up a system whereby these various groups and agencies work closely together in their efforts, complementing and cross-referencing children in need to each other. It is the natural—and quite logical—approach. It has, however, pointed out striking deficiencies in certain types of services badly needed by youth in most of these pilot communities.

One of these areas is the provision of alternatives to the juvenile justice system, alternatives which supply young people with the understanding and counsel that will keep them out of the juvenile justice system. Innumerable young people each day find themselves in police stations, courtrooms, and detention centers across the country, the perpetrators of no real crime beyond that of status: The truant, the incorrigible, the neglected, the runaway. Neither the police, the judiciary or the welfare systems in most of these areas have the time or money to help these kids. Their problems unresolved, these young people are too often hurried home or into juvenile institutions, only to reglut police stations, courts, and correctional institutions with their return.

In my years as a county judge, I saw far too many of these young people accumulating unnecessary police records and making return visits to our juvenile justice system. Unquestionably, many of them did not even belong there to begin with. The need to broaden and strengthen our efforts to help these children before they become involved in more serious sorts of crime is evidenced each day, as our courts, police departments, and juvenile institutions become increasingly overburdened.

The Runaway Youth Act, which I originally cosponsored in November of last year, is such an attempt. Its thrust is delinquency prevention through the encouragement of alternatives to our existing juvenile justice system. It has the support of police departments, juvenile judges, social workers, and national and local private groups throughout the country. It is a simple and relatively narrow piece of legislation, authorizing funds to HEW for grants and the provision of technical assistance "for the purpose of developing local facilities to deal with the immediate needs of runaways in a manner which is outside the law enforcement structure of the juvenile justice system." I feel, however, that its impact in the area of delinquency prevention will be extensive.

For this reason, I wish to clarify a number of points regarding this bill which I feel to be important.

In the first place, the shelter to be provided is only temporary. We are not encouraging our young people to leave home but giving them the immediate understanding and counsel which they so badly need in adjusting to life and the pressures of growing up. These shelters are meant to help bridge the gap between parent and child and to provide our youth with a place to go when leaving home seems their only alternative. As recent hearing testimony has shown, the average runaway is under 14 and part of the white working class. He is not the disgruntled older youth of middle America seeking adventure. He leaves home, because something is very wrong there. The greatest service we can do them is to respect them and help them respect themselves.

This brings me to my second point. How do you help these youngsters help themselves? What sorts of counseling and services do you provide them? Each person and each situation is different. Likewise, each area of the country is different. The variety of projects which have sprung up at the local level in response to local needs is indicative of the type of programs that are needed, locally initiated, locally sponsored and tailored to local needs. I fully support the more comprehensive efforts of national organizations such as the YWCA and Travelers' Aid along this line. I do feel, however, that the most effective programs are those designed to fill a gap in available youth services on the local level, projects funded by both public and private community groups. It is my sincere hope, therefore, that this piece of legislation will eventually fund, on a limited basis, a wide variety of shelter homes and counseling facilities, encouraging local initiative in broadening and strengthening services available to troubled youth in any area.

This bill is meant to fund a broad range of programs, to complement existing services and projects and to retain flexibility in a locality's response to delinquency prevention outside its juvenile justice system. It does not offer any comprehensive solution to our juvenile problems; it encourages each locality to find its own answers. I believe it offers far more than a superficial glance at its title, the Runaway Youth Act, can convey. For this reason I urge both the Members of the Judiciary Committee and the rest of Congress to carefully consider its eventual passage.

To this end I ask unanimous consent to have included in the RECORD a number of letters and articles which I have received regarding the Runaway Youth Act.

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

BALTIMORE, MD.,
January 14, 1972.

Re: S. 2829, the Runaway Youth Act of 1971.

Senator MARLOW W. COOK,
U.S. Senate,
Committee on the Judiciary,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR COOK: I am in receipt of your letter of December 21, 1971 enclosing a copy of the above Bill which has been introduced by you and Senator Birch Bayh.

I have read the Bill carefully and all of its explanatory material and must say that I totally and wholeheartedly endorse this legislation. Statistics are hard to come by on how many runaway youths we have each year in a given community—those who come to the attention of the authorities are, I fear, merely the tip of the iceberg. As the presiding judge in the Juvenile Court of Baltimore City, I can say that the best estimate of the total number of runaways each year in our city would be several thousand.

I think it is readily apparent what the ramifications and consequences of this extensive problem are. It is a problem that has always been with any society, but I think that it is clear that it is one which has grown very sharply over the last number of years—a growth far out of proportion of the rising juvenile population. This can be attributed to a wide variety of factors—the increased alienation between the young and their elders, the drug culture, greater mobility, more maturity and many other factors. For the purposes of your Bill it is not as important to pinpoint the causes as it is to pinpoint the effects.

Each of these youngsters is troubled in his own way—some to a more severe degree than others—but each needs a kind, firm and understanding hand which the child does not feel is available at home and probably not in his school either. There is practically no other place where the child feels he can turn to reach out for this hand. The very meager facilities which exist for these children are taxed many, many times beyond the breaking point. These youngsters do not need punishment—they need sound and proper counseling and guidance. Failure to provide this will be to reject scores of thousands of fine young people each year and in so many of these cases cause them irreparable damage. It is only through the establishment of the type of resources which your Bill proposes that we can attempt to meet in a meaningful way the very real problems of our troubled youth.

Sincerely yours,
ROBERT I. H. HAMMERMAN.

YOUTH HELP CENTER,
Chicago, Ill., January 17, 1972.

DEAR SENATOR COOK: The Youth Help Center of the Grace Lutheran Church is presently in its fourth year of operation, and as such is the oldest runaway agency in the state of Illinois. I have been following the progress of your bill, and some of the hearings as reported in the newspapers.

Enclosed you will find some older literature that we have that describes some of the things you seek to know about our program. I am aware that you have done excellent research in your bill, as we have spoken with the people of Runaway House in Washington

about your bill. I do not wish to be redundant, and hope to make this letter short so that we are not tooting our own horn with data you have already encountered.

The bill is two years late. Chicago has always had large numbers of runaways, primarily from the suburbs. Lately, with the increase in community youth centers, primarily of drug orientation, there has been a decrease in the numbers coming through. The change has been from a white suburban youth of middle class parents to the white, urban youth of working class parents. The cases have been more complex due to more legal complications—from schools, from marital situations (unknown custody), and from past recorded with law enforcement officials. We have always had great cooperation from the local police.

From our annual report, you will notice that we are attempting to institute an approach similar to that of your bill with a group home. In 1969, the YHC operated a group home for 7 months, but was forced to close it due to inadequate funding. Our experience has been that without concrete temporary alternatives in housing to offer youth, so they have a reasonable chance to expect parents permission and some help, most will turn and go back onto the streets for their survival. I cannot overemphasize the need for the homes that your bill will provide for. Time and time again a youth's situation has crumbled due to the simple fact we were unable to provide him with an alternative living environment for only a few weeks, while he was able to put his own head back together without the pressures of the home environment.

This bill will begin to provide the alternatives that have so long been sought by many youth agencies around this city, and the staff of the Youth Help Center gives it our whole hearted recommendation. It is truly heartening for us to see some of our legislators who are real enough to have some contact with this real problem that is now beginning to affect even the working class youth in greater proportions.

Celebrate life!

MARK THENNES.

THE RUNAWAY PROGRAM, YOUTH HELP CENTER—GRACE LUTHERAN CHURCH

Although this program began as the Grace Lutheran Runaway Program, it has always crossed all lines of race, creed, or color, both in its staff as well as those it sought to help. It was renamed Youth Help Center Association in recognizance of the fact that it is, and always has been, non-ethnic and non-denominational in character.

Since June 1968, in an innovative action program Grace Lutheran Church Runaway Program has sought out and worked with more than 1500 runaway juveniles of all faiths and social backgrounds. Working with a nominal budget, this program included extensive utilizations of volunteer services, while providing emotional support and encouragement when a teen is afraid to seek help from established social agencies. By creating an atmosphere with which the teens could identify, we created a place where he (or she) could feel safe . . . a place where he could find help within the framework of a lawful society.

As word-of-mouth publicity spread among the young people, juveniles contemplating running away from their families began calling the center. Through these contacts, other innovative measures for runaway prevention were added to the program. Several hundred juveniles, not included in the actual runaway program, were given runaway prevention counseling, with referral to cooperating agencies when possible. The program has reached approximately 3000 young people, half of whom are runaway juveniles.

Key elements of the program include activities such as:

Counseling for runaways and pre-runaways.

24 hour manned crises phone.

Liaison with police and other agencies.

Drop-in center.

Outreach into the community.

Artistic, musical and cultural activities.

Youth centered folk services.

This program began because we saw juveniles in need who didn't have a place to go. We started with:

An almost instinctive approach.

A basic philosophy—contact and help. We added prevention and cure.

A philosophy that the helped must become the helpers, and we emphasized that fact during any counseling.

We had no:

Guidelines to follow because there was no successful long-term program dealing with alienated youth.

Money to give us time to analyze the dynamics when we were able to do what responsible established social agencies using traditional methods had been unable to do.

In today's society, as long as a juvenile refuses to stay at home he is either a fugitive or a prisoner. Neither circumstance is beneficial to anyone. Despite these deterrents, if a teen becomes sufficiently desperate about his home situation, real or imagined, he will run away from that situation.

Increased force and control will only lead to further overtaxing of present agency resources. It will result in more bitterness by young people toward adult authority in general . . . their parents and law enforcement people in particular. A runaway's respect for the law will be greatly enhanced when efforts are made to deal with his feelings and needs, instead of only his actions.

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 20, 1972]

ANN LANDERS: YOUR BASIC INCORRIGIBLE

DEAR ANN LANDERS: Our 17-year-old son left home last June because in his words he wanted to be a hippie. He lived with friends all over the country, bumming from one place to another, getting kicked out by parents regularly. Now he has come home, stone broke, hair down to his shoulders, smelling like a six-week-old hamburger.

My husband and I talked it over and decided he could live here but he'd have to clean himself up and stop running around nights. He had been out until 2 and 3 a.m. every morning with a couple of creepy kids who look and smell just like he does. Our son informed us in very plain language that he has no intention of meeting any of our conditions and we can't throw him out because the law says we are responsible for him until he is 21.

The entire family is in a constant state of tension because of this boy. He does whatever he pleases with no regard for anyone. What can we do? Please come up with an answer.—Lake George, N.Y. Parents.

DEAR L.G.: You have just handed me the most difficult question of the century. Thanks a lot.

First let me assure you that your son is as sick of himself as you are. He is angry, insecure, rudderless and miserable. A hostile kid is a troubled kid. Since there is no communication between him and you, I suggest an intermediary, someone the boy can talk to—a physician, a clergyman or a counselor. This boy needs therapy but it can't be forced on him. He must want it.

He is right when he says you cannot throw him out because he's a minor. You can, however, put him in a detention home—which I do NOT, repeat NOT, recommend—if he becomes unmanageable. Most detention homes are factories that produce hardened criminals. Your son's recalcitrance and hostility did not develop overnight so don't expect miracles. Be patient and remember that the child who is least lovable needs love the most.

CHICAGO, ILL.,
January 4, 1972.

Re: Senate Bill No. 2829, the Runaway Youth Act.

Hon. MARLOW W. COOK,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: We are extremely impressed with the depth of your interest in the problems of our youth population.

Looking Glass, presently a division of Travelers Aid, started about two years ago. Its origins, while small and all volunteer, grew quickly to include paid professional and paraprofessional staff augmented by a volunteer staff of 40.

Those of us who have been a part of Looking Glass since its inception have been astounded at its growth and can only account for it in terms of need. During the past 23 months, we have served over 2,000 adolescents and their families.

I am enclosing some background information about the center and a copy of a preliminary critique from Northwestern University for your review.

While our agency is located in a familial setting, we do not provide housing at the center location. We have found that the use of emergency foster homes (specialized in the care of adolescents) provides a positive experience during crisis and is helpful in further determining a plan for the youngster beyond the crisis point.

We feel the need for both kinds of alternatives, the runaway house and the use of runaway centers and foster homes. It would seem logical that in serving the complex needs of youth, more than one kind of program be developed in their interest. This we feel provides a better selection of alternatives than presently exist.

In terms of comments and criticisms on the Runway Youth Act as it presently is written, kindly allow me to comment point by point.

Under Section 2 beginning "The Congress hereby finds that—":

We are in general agreement with Sections 1, 2, 3, 4 and in specific agreement with 5 & 6. We have long felt that placing a "criminal status" on a juvenile with "runaway syndrome" is not appropriate, and that in some way this particular area of problem solving should not be under the jurisdiction of the police department and the courts unless there are specific acts of delinquency involved during the runaway episode.

Under Title I:

We fully support the narrative as described in Sections 101 & 102. Under specifics (a) (b) we would recommend the word "house" be changed to "program" throughout the Bill. As we indicated earlier, while we do not use a formalized "house" setting, we find our program using foster homes as a creative alternative to the institutionalization process which a network of houses might perpetuate. Furthermore, let me again reiterate the need for both our client and in-residence centers to serve the needs of adolescent youth.

In Section (2) of Section 102:

While we would agree that a maximum of 20 is appropriate in a shelter setting, we would like to point out that the involvement of foster parents facilitates a greater number of emergency placements at a lesser expense. Although most of our foster parents do not receive payment for care, when there is money available either through the natural parents or through the state Illinois Department of Children and Family Services, a payment not to exceed $3.50/night is made. Based on a cost accounting of in-residence centers, the average cost of sheltering a youngster in an in-residence center is approximtaely 40% more on a per diem basis over a year's period of time.

Again, we would support the development of an adequate plan according to the best interest of the child. We would like to point

out however, there are a small number of occasions when it is impossible to contact parents. We recommend that this Bill provide for *authorized licensed* child placement agencies not to be in jeopardy under the law when it becomes necessary for the agency to act in loco parentis because contact with parents within a given period of time is not possible.

Item (4):

Of course, while we support the context of the provision, our concern lies in how to achieve "proper relations" with the law enforcement personnel. With most youth agencies already considered suspect by police departments, we would hope legislation would not reinforce already reluctant attitudes on the part of youth serving agencies or the police department.

Item (5):

Again, while supporting this provision we would hesitate to see a limit placed on the distance from the center in terms of an involvement of youth and family in after care counselling or family therapy. It would seem more appropriate if the decision was made by the client and/or his family.

Item (6):

Our only recommendation would be to phrase the provision to include the word *confidential* so that the rights of clients and their families are not in any way placed in jeopardy.

Section (7):

While the importance of accurate data collection and research cannot be denied, our concern is that the word "goals" implies "concretes" which are not always visible during the time of contact in youth serving agencies. Long term speculation based on empirical study would indicate to us that "concretes" are not possible much before a service is about 3 years old. We feel the intent of such a provision needs clarification to prevent misinterpretation by personnel in the Department of HEW.

We have further comment on (8) and (9).

Sections 103–107 inclusive have our support with no comment at this time.

In terms of comments and recommendations on Title II:

While we recognize the need for comprehensive study, we would implore Congress not to duplicate existing studies. The Secretary of HEW should be ordered to gather all existing information and research presently being conducted nationwide and evaluate the findings before further study.

We would not be supportive of an appropriation of ½ million for primary research proposed which in fact may already exist. In fact, that amount of budget appropriation could adequately fund 4 or 5 centers such as Looking Glass in Chicago alone, with each center doing its own research and being able to facilitate services to 1–2,000 youth per annum each.

Again, in summation, comprehensive study of the runaway population is imperative. Beyond that, it seems that a great deal of study of the myriad of youth serving agencies that have sprung up nationwide in the past 3 years would be useful in further determining appropriate services to adolescent youth and families by the Department of HEW.

As a final comment, we feel that the origin and development of the Looking Glass/Travelers Aid model can serve as a model in other communities that do not choose to have a "house" per se in their locale. Our model, using a center location, and involving the participation of foster parents and a large group of volunteers in key positions of responsibility creates a setting in which service can be rendered and the community involved concurrently in working out problem situations in neighborhoods, schools and other youth programs.

In conclusion, we would hope to be invited to participate in hearings to the Committee should they take place, and that all the senators would use such hearings to further make the general public aware of the severity of the situation of runaway children nationwide.

Respectfully,

MRS. GERDA FLANIGAN,
Project Director.
MRS. BETTY GORDON,
Executive Director.

[From the Courier-Journal, Jan. 19, 1972]

PROVIDING CARE AND COUNSEL FOR RUNAWAYS

We don't hear so much these days about that phenomenon of the 1960's, the teen-age runaway, but it's been estimated that one million youngsters are still running away from home each year. And that's why Indiana's Senator Bayh and Kentucky's Senator Cook are sponsoring legislation in Congress that would provide $10 million for local government agencies or private non-profit groups to help these young people.

The idea is to set up a chain of "runaway houses" across the nation, places where the youths could seek temporary shelter and receive some counseling before being persuaded, one hopes, to return home and try again. The staffs also would try to see that the runaway and his family get more assistance after the return in an effort to cure the causes of flight.

Similar facilities already are in existence in some cities, but most are underfinanced and only scratch the surface of the problem. And as was evident from testimony given to Senator Bayh's subcommittee last week, programs like two in Southern Indiana could get a big boost from this kind of federal aid. A Clark County judge spoke of his rehabilitation work with juvenile delinquents, 10 per cent of whom are runaways, and a Jeffersonville probation officer told of the use made of the Clark-Floyd youth opportunity center by children who have left home.

Wherever the "shelter and counsel" approach has been tried, it has seemed to work. Every parent—past, present or future—must know in his heart that the two Senators are on the right track.

[From the Louisville Times, Jan. 13, 1972]

CLARK OFFICIALS SUPPORT BILL TO HELP RUNAWAYS

(By Frank Fox)

Clark County officials were to tell their juvenile delinquency story to a U.S. Senate subcommittee today, and they had a five-year report to back up their testimony.

Superior Court Judge Warren W. Martin Jr. and Chief Probation Officer Mrs. C. B. Barthold were to appear before a subcommittee investigating juvenile delinquency. Chairman of the group is Indiana Sen. Birch Bayh.

Bayh and Kentucky Sen. Marlow Cook are co-sponsors of a bill that would arrange housing and rehabilitation services across the country for apprehended juvenile runaways. The Indiana Democrat and the Kentucky Republican propose that the federal government grant funds to organizations outside of the law-enforcement structure and juvenile Justice System to deal with an "alarming increase" in juveniles leaving home without parental permission.

The bill, called the Runaway Youth Act of 1971, would be financed by the U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare annually, beginning in fiscal year 1973.

Judge Martin and Mrs. Barthold, who yesterday released portions of a report covering juvenile court activities in Clark County during 1966, 1970 and 1971, said they are in favor of the proposed bill. It closely parallels what his Superior Court—which has exclusive jurisdiction over juveniles in Clark County—has been doing for some time, Martin said.

In a joint statement prepared for the subcommittee meeting, Martin and Mrs. Barthold said that "the bill comes closer to the real needs of runaway children in this country than any other piece of legislation proposed up to this time."

Martin and Mrs. Barthold in their report to the subcommittee included data from 1966 through 1971 showing that the percentage of runaway youths they handled ranged from 7.7 per cent of the total caseload in 1969 to 18.5 per cent in 1967. According to the report, 10.9 per cent of the 1,426 juveniles handled last year by the Clark County probation office were runaways.

In the subcommittee report Judge Martin also described his court's recently established intensive probation and foster-home programs as "alternatives to incarceration" concepts. He feels these concepts should be considered by any agency or committee charged with setting up interstate shelter houses if the act is passed. "In fact, both programs are partially funded with federal money," Martin said.

Preliminary figures from the five-year comparative study show, among other things, the delinquent behavior by teenage girls increased in 1971.

Some other statistics the two Clark County officials were to present to the Senate subcommittee and which will be included in the annual and 5-year comparative study are:

The number of juveniles referred to the Clark County Juvenile Court during 1971 is up almost 90 per cent over the 1966 total and 16 per cent above the 1970 total. The increase in 1970 over 1966 was 66 per cent.

Decrease in commitment of youths appearing in Superior Court to correctional schools, hospitals, state farms, prisons and private institutions. Fifty-three were committed in 1966, 30 in 1970 and 26 during last year.

A slight decrease in the number of youths returned to correctional institutions. Ten were returned in 1966, 11 in 1970 and eight in 1971.

A 5 per cent decrease in male juvenile referrals during 1971 over the previous year, while the number of female referrals increased 5 per cent in 1971 over 1970.

A total of 72 juveniles placed in the foster-home or intensive probation programs.

SENATOR HAYDEN

Mr. PELL. I deeply regret the death of our former colleague, Carl Hayden.

I well remember when I first came to the Senate the kindness and wisdom of Senator Hayden. He gave me good advice and guided my early steps in this body. I think part of the reason for his kindness to me was because he served with my father in the other body where they had known each other and had been friends. If ever there was a Senator who followed his own adage of being a workhorse, and not a showhorse, it was Senator Hayden. I know that my admiration and affection for him was shared by all who came in contact with this fine old pioneer.

To his nephews and family, I extend my deepest sense of loss.

A MAN FROM ALASKA

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I would like to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article that appeared in the January 1972, issue of American Forests at page 26. This was entitled "A Man From Alaska" by James B. Craig. It concerned Mr. Burton W. Silcock, the present Director of the Bureau of Land Management. As some of my colleagues undoubtedly are aware, Mr. Silcock brought with

him, when he was appointed Director of the Bureau of Land Management, a vast experience in Alaska and particularly a considerable amount of expertise in the 49th State. His record in combating innumerable forest fires was most commendable. The acreage loss dropped considerably as his innovations and improved techniques were utilized to hold down the rampant destruction caused by massive forest fires.

As the article points out, Mr. Silcock was a pioneer in organizing the Helitack instant attack system. This was but one of his contributions to the preservation of our national lands in Alaska.

I am sure that Mr. Silcock will be equally effective in his new job.

I commend this article to my colleagues for their information.

Mr. President, I ask that the article be printed in its entirety in the RECORD.

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

A MAN FROM ALASKA

(By James B. Craig)

When Interior Secretary Morton last summer brought Burton W. Silcock to Washington and placed him in charge of the Bureau of Land Management, The American Forestry Association had more than ordinary interest in the event.

Forest protection is the number one plank in AFA's Program for American Forestry. When catastrophic fires swept Alaska in 1969, some man-caused as well as lightning strikes, the Association went to work to help strengthen BLM's fire-fighting apparatus in the State. The man who headed this effort was Silcock, for six years Alaska Director of BLM.

In 1969 fire losses in Alaska were appalling. A 14-year record of an average 923,078 acres a year was bad enough but in 1969 a total of 4,231,830 acres were consumed. Something definitely had to be done and something was done. While the number of fires did not decrease appreciably (511 in 1969, 504 in 1970) the acreage loss in 1970 was held to 118,237. While fire danger was not so serious in 1970, once explosive early season conditions let up due to rain, this was, nevertheless, a marked improvement and credit must be given to Mr. Silcock.

In 1969 when some fires burned for weeks at a time, AFA believed the principal thrust of a stepped-up control effort should be a strong air arm plus use of retardants and smoke-jumpers in a fire jurisdiction that extends 800 miles in one direction. The idea was to hit little fires quickly before they became big fires. This idea of instant attack, previously unknown in Alaska, proved to be part of the answer but a tactical air arm was not the whole answer by any means.

In a recent interview, Silcock conceded there is great tactical advantage in having a strong air arm in achieving early attack but he further indicated that air power will never supplant the Queen of Battles—well-trained fire-fighting infantry on the ground when it comes to winning Alaska's major fire engagements.

When fires are breaking out all over a big state, and spreading, a Fire Boss tends to run out of smoke-jumpers and airplanes and helicopters, Silcock said. Also it requires several days to drop a jumper, retrieve him, and get him started on a new assignment. While mobility is vital in winning the skirmishes, so is a well-trained army in winning the big engagements, Silcock said. As the forester described it, one visualized air power in Alaska fire fighting as being akin to Stonewall Jackson's cavalry in the Civil War—fast moving and fast striking. But Lee was always just behind with his main body of Virginians and other troops.

At any rate, Silcock, as field general of Alaska's fire-fighting forces, decided he needed more and better infantry as well as stronger and faster air attack. To get them, he sent his professional firemen into villages and hamlets all over Alaska to train native villagers to fight fires. He saw these people as a corps of satellite striking forces all over the state but concentrated on 12 special bases, always ready for immediate callup.

This effort has been successful, he thinks. More than 1,000 natives have been trained so far to serve as standby fire fighters. They are tough, know the country, and show keen interets in their work. That they are now recognized as a superb striking force was recognized in the lower Forty-Eight when 800 of them were imported to fight a forest fire in the Pacific Northwest.

In organizing the so-called Helitrack instant attack system, Silcock and his general staff saw three key thrusts: 1) improved communications; 2) standby crews of trained men; and 3) selection and placement of equipment, operators and supplies in the State's forested areas.

Silcock expressed some satisfaction with his improved communications network. Facilities in vehicles and in the towns and villages have been improved. Of substantial aid has been a series of "repeaters" placed strategically on mountaintops that are triggered by two high frequency FM channels at lower elevations, the batteries of which units are recharged by the sun. This has enabled the communications network to overcome the previous hurdle posed by the Alaska range.

While more vehicles and other fire-fighting materials are needed, the previous gap has been bridged to a degree with the result that more hardware is immediately available on short notice. The strategically-located fire-fighting infantry can be moved by marching, truck or helicopter as required.

"Right now, the attack pattern consists of air-flown retardants and jumpers to hit the small fires with the native villagers ready to move in if the skirmish becomes a battle" Silcock said. "But if fires are too close to centers of population or on extremely valuable land all the attack forces may converge at once."

When AMERICAN FORESTS asked him if he now had enough money, material and people to cope with Alaska fire emergencies, Silcock was guardedly optimistic.

"I think we are advancing about as fast as we can within the present limits of our own capabilities" he replied. "We *do* need more trained, permanent people up there and we need to fill out our equipment needs, more tankers, 'for example'."

Money presently is available in a pinch, he said. Regular fire appropriations inadequate for a major rash of fires can be filled out by supplemental appropriations. That would indicate the 1270 Regular Fire Appropriation for the state should be given more muscle. While some gaps exist, Silcock couldn't say enough for his own BLM fire personnel in Alaska and his native "army." They are superb, he said.

Born in 1922 in Burley, Idaho, Silcock, is a big, rangy man who earned three varsity letters at Utah State University in Logan, Utah, where he majored in range management. His first full-time federal position was in Texas in 1947 as a range conservationist with the Soil Conservation Service. He joined BLM in 1948 as a member of a field party in the Big Horn Basin of Wyoming. Since that time he has held a number of key posts in BLM and much of his work was concentrated on range management. He saw service in World War II.

Still feeling his way in his new post, he was reluctant to express views on some measures now pending in Congress including the Alaska native claims. But he has very definite views on BLM immediate and long-range basic goals.

First, BLM needs a new Charter in the form of an Organic Act that will enable the bureau to really practice multiple use management on its lands, he believes. He believes that the time for this action is now.

"The Public Lands are just being discovered," he said. "The horizons are very broad and our managers need new breathing room." he said. The implementation of the proposals of the Public Land Law Review Commission and other bills before Congress all point in the right direction, he feels. A new, modern look is a real necessity.

"Secondly, we've got to have planning" he said. "There is no more new land. We've reached both the Pacific and the Arctic."

This means that managers must become more people-oriented and that plans for land must be made before irreparable damage is done to both the land and the people on it.

BLM's so-called Multiple Use Bill expired in 1964. But Silcock points to the great progress that was made by BLM up to that time in Alaska alone. Complete land classification was carried out on the six million acres around Ilianna Lake and 22 million acres in the Copper River Basin. Unfortunately, similar programs in the White Mountains and Brooks Range areas were not completed prior to the expiration. Even so, a total of 70 million BLM acres in Alaska were classified for future use.

The need for planning for many areas, especially in Alaska, is due to the very fragility of some of the resources, he said. As regards people, he said he is always conscious of "vacant chairs" whenever he sits down to discuss needs and issues with any single type of resource user. If one does this any other way, he works with "blinders", Silcock said.

"There are always other people present whether they are physically there or not," he stressed. The public lands, he added, are going to be used "heavily" for practically every form of recreation activity.

What are his views on the proposed Alaska pipeline? "My hope is that if it's done, it's done right," he said. "And it's our job to see that it is done right if that is the decision." But if the pipeline is built, it should be above the ground and the needs of the fragile land and the wildlife thereon should be fully considered, he thinks.

Pointing to the pipeline dispute, Silcock recently told a western group that "the very existence of land creates conflicts." The North Slope is no ecological desert, he said, adding that "much of the vital habitat of migratory waterfowl depends on Alaska's water and tundra."

"When oil was found on the North Slope and development started, the approach was the same as elsewhere in the past", he said. "Heretofore, thousands of miles of pipeline have been installed in various areas with only the admonition to 'bury it well, fix the fences, and close the gates.' But now the public all over the country was concerned about various developments. Oil drilling offshore, transmission line locations, a proposed power plant installation in South Carolina, methods of timber harvesting and mining, and the proposed Alaska Pipeline were all coming under active scrutiny. The pipeline in particular aroused public interest, for it is a major undertaking with some unknown impacts on the environment—primarily the permafrost. But unfortunately, overall planning on the North Slope has received little attention. The North Slope has become an area of major attention and public concern because of the times, and even more so because of the size of the proposed development." There should be more uniformity, he believes.

Silcock said he supports the Administration and Secretary Morton in the proposal

to create a new Department of Natural Resources. In a modern age, government bureaus should not have different ways of doing things.

"We're dealing with the nation's resources and yet we have different procedures instead of the same procedures," he said. "I think you see a need for this sort of thing out in the field somewhat better than in Washington. In many small communities, you find two government offices managing land, sometimes the same resources, both with their own procedures, rules and ways of doing things. This is confusing."

Silcock is one professional who is not afraid of change. "I believe that change is constant" he recently told Interior's National Advisory Board Council at Boise, Idaho. "I believe it is constant even though the principles of representative government stand firm. For example, the Environmental Protection Act is now the law of the land. In applying the concepts of ecology to natural resources management programs, we are seeking a gradual and a natural evolution—always forward—never backward. To do this we must always consider the people and their needs.

"Change, or even the threat of change, brings out the self-protective reactions of people. We all dislike sudden changes that disrupt us. We who have worked with natural resources and with people all of our lives know that this is true. But this is a changing world and we must change with it. If we are to make progress, we must accept—even welcome—change.

"At times it seems that change is overrunning us. This is because the growth of our population and the growth of our technology have increased demands upon our resources many times over. To meet the challenge of change we need to quicken our reaction time and to sharpen our insights. The modern application of the concepts of Federalism requires that we make decisions as close to the land as possible and that in the very beginning we make them wisely. This is our goal."

With the nation's resource structure on the threshold of change, Silcock believes there has got to be more advance planning. Even with the best of advance planning, there still will be conflicts, he thinks. But he is equally convinced that if advance planning had been better in the past, the nation would be further ahead today in resolving conflicts, and the number of contentions would be fewer.

"Cooperative planning helps us and the public to effect change better and to accept change more readily. This lessens the impact of change," he said.

Meanwhile, Silcock is seeking advice from every strata of conservation activity and conservationists will discover that he is a good listener.

CRITICISM OF THE PRESIDENT'S VIETNAM SETTLEMENT PLAN

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, in recent days we have witnessed a well-orchestrated attack, no doubt composed and conducted by the White House, on one of the candidates for the Democratic nomination for President because he criticized President Nixon's recent proposals for a settlement in Vietnam, and offered some proposals of his own.

Of course, there is nothing really new about this attack. Those of us who have on occasion questioned the President's policies are accustomed to being accused of "jeopardizing the national interest." However, this most recent attack is notable for its harshness and the fact that it was led by the Secretary of State, who was later joined by several Republican Members of the Congress.

We have been through several so-called moratoriums on criticism of the administration, when we were told that any public voicing of differing views would be contrary to the national interest. Now, apparently the administration would like to quash any views contrary to its own, even among those who are seeking their party's nomination for the Presidency and thus have an obligation to make known their views on the most vital matters of the day.

We hear a great deal about the "national interest." If I have learned anything in recent years it is that the man in the White House thinks he is the sole arbiter of the "national interest."

I believe we ought to consider what the national interest really is. First, I am convinced that it is in the national interest for the Congress and the people to be fully informed about the foreign involvement and policies of its Government. This has not exactly been a characteristic of the present administration, nor of the preceding administration. As a corollary to having a well-informed public, I believe it is essential that those who aspire to the Presidency make every effort to make clear their views on these important questions.

I well recall that when Mr. Nixon was campaigning for the Presidency throughout the year of 1968, he consistently spoke of a "plan" for ending the war. He has had more than 3 years in office and has not ended the war.

Total American deaths in Vietnam are now about 56,000, of whom 46,000 were killed in action. About half of the American deaths have occurred since the presidential campaign of 1968. By March 1, nearly 1 million Americans will have been sent to Vietnam since President Nixon was inaugurated, and since he has come into office, 3 million tons of munitions have been dropped on Vietnam and another million on Laos and Cambodia. Therefore, I think it more than appropriate that his potential opponents make public their views on how the war can be ended. And we should be appreciative of the fact that some of the candidates are offering specific proposals, which is something Mr. Nixon should have been held to 4 years ago instead of escaping with a generality about a "plan."

I am somewhat surprised that the Secretary of State would be the leading spokesman in this attack. After all, he has been noted for his reticence to speak out publicly on foreign policy matters. When this administration has had something to say, it has usually been done in a "background briefing" by the President's assistant for national security affairs.

I also cannot help but note the strident tone of others who have joined in the Secretary of State's attack, including several members of the Senate. They have used terms like "gutter politics" and "blatant partisan purposes." Where could they possibly get the idea that there is anything political about the timing of statements and actions in regard to ending the war?

These various spokesmen for the administration resent any dissent and are apparently angered by any effort to carry out a honest and open dialog before the American people.

Let me recall the words of the President in his state of the Union address of January 20, 1972:

> There are more candidates for the Presidency in this Chamber today than there probably have been at any one time in the whole history of the Republic. And there is an honest difference of opinion, not only between the parties, but within each party, on some foreign policy issues and on some domestic policy issues.
>
> However, there are great national problems that are so vital that they transcend partisanship. So let us have our debates. Let us have our honest difference. But let us join in keeping the national interest first . . .

Mr. President, I submit that the national interest is not what one man says it is. This is not the concept on which our Constitution and our system is based. The previous administration floundered with its "politics of consensus" and its hypersensitivity to dissent. Incredibly enough, the current administration seems to be using a leftover "play book" for its "game plan."

I think Mr. Nixon was on the right track when he said, "So let us have our debates." But we cannot have a debate if only one voice is heard, if only one alternative is offered the American people, and if the executive branch and its supporters gang up to gag and impugn anyone who questions what the true national interest might be.

CARL HAYDEN

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I would like to pay tribute to a great American, a man whose memory will be cherished by the people of this Nation for many years to come.

Senator Carl Hayden devoted his life to his country. No man ever served his State and our Nation in the Congress for a longer period of time. He entered the House of Representatives in 1912, the year Arizona joined the Union as the 48th State. When he moved to the Senate in 1927, he continued to serve with distinction and dedication until his retirement 2 years ago.

Senator Hayden was a pioneer in the development of the great resource projects. It was his contribution to the establishment of dams that provided water and power to the South and Southwest, thus aiding in the growth and development of America.

Mr. President, at this point I would like to quote the late Senator Richard Russell which, I feel, capture the essence of this great American:

> I can say without fear of successful contradiction that he has never failed to fight the good fight for the things in which he believes. Never at any time has this man departed from his honest opinions under pressure from any source.
>
> No man has ever served as long in the Congress of the United States. He has been here for 56 years and under 10 Presidents. He has an unusual characteristic that enables him to complete this service—this unparalleled service—without ever having made an enemy or ever having had his motives questioned at any time. I cannot conceive of any finer or higher tribute to any man.
>
> He was impartial in dealing with people

whether he agreed with them or not and he always reflected an integrity which was transparent. He has a personality that not only commands the respect of all who know him but we have many men with secure places in history who value or have valued his friendship among their most treasured possessions.

Vast areas of new opportunities have been opened for countless Americans as a result of the vision and energy of Senator Hayden. Today, industry and commerce thrive on once barren landscapes, and vineyards and gardens bear bountifully on what was sterile land when this man came to the Congress.

Mr. President, it was my privilege to serve with Carl Hayden for over 20 years. His record of accomplishment is an impressive one; he will be long remembered by both his colleagues and this Nation.

I join with the other Members of this body in mourning the passing of this great American.

QUORUM CALL

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TUNNEY). Is there further morning business?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The second assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TUNNEY). Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is concluded.

FOREIGN ASSISTANCE AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS, 1972

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TUNNEY). Under the previous order, the Chair now lays before the Senate H.R. 12067, which the clerk will state.

The second assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

H.R. 12067, making appropriations for foreign assistance and related programs for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending question is the amendment of the distinguished Senator from Illinois (Mr. STEVENSON), amendment No. 865, on which there is a time limitation of 20 minutes, with 10 minutes to each side.

STATUS OF PENDING BUSINESS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 minute on the bill, on behalf of the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. PROXMIRE), to ask unanimous consent that H.R. 12067 remain the pending business until disposed of or until 2:30 p.m. today, whichever is the earlier.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECESS SUBJECT TO THE CALL OF THE CHAIR

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that time may be equally charged against both sides on the bill with respect to a recess on which I am about to make a motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in recess, subject to the call of the Chair, with the understanding that the recess not extend beyond 12 noon today.

The motion was agreed to; and at 11:05 a.m. the Senate took a recess, subject to the call of the Chair.

The Senate reassembled at 12 noon when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. STEVENSON).

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States, submitting nominations, were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Leonard, one of his secretaries.

PLANS FOR BICENTENNIAL CELEBRATION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BENTSEN) laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia:

To the Congress of the United States:

"Seafaring is necessary," says the Latin inscription on an old building in one of the great European port cities; "mere living is not." This same spirit of movement, venture, and quest animates the whole sweep of America's story—from its discovery by men who lived for sailing, to its founding as a nation by men who lived for liberty, to its modern maturity as the world's preeminent power—and it will do so still, 4 years hence, when we observe the Bicentennial of American Independence. The Nation could not if it wanted to, and should not if it could, drop anchor somewhere in 1976 and savor the occasion at leisure. By its very nature it can only speed through the year as through any other, under full sail, on into a new century.

The central challenge of our Bicentennial preparations, therefore, is to plan for an observance "on the move." Many groups—public and private, national and local—have already devoted several years of creative thought and effort to meeting this challenge. The common goal to which all subscribe has nowhere been stated better than in the 1970 report of the celebration's official planning and coordinating body, the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission (ARBC): "to forge a new national commitment—a new spirit for '76—a commitment which will unite the nation in purpose and dedication to the advancement of human welfare as we move into Century III of American National Life."

We can best forge such a spirit, the Commission went on to recommend, by approaching the Bicentennial as an occasion both for understanding our heritage better and for quickening the progress toward our horizons—not just in one chosen location or a few, but in every State, city, and community. The Commission's goal and the principles deriving from it have my strongest support, and I have followed with interest the ARBC's further work as well as that of the individual Bicentennial Commissions already set up or now being formed by each State and territory. Puerto Rico, and the District of Columbia.

THE BICENTENNIAL IN WASHINGTON

Since the Federal Government has special responsibility for District of Columbia affairs, my closest contact has been with the planning effort now underway here in the District—and I have found its progress thus far most impressive. And so it should be. For while no one city will dominate this truly national anniversary, Washington—which was built to be the Capital of the Republic born in 1776 and seat of the Government constituted in 1787, and which has been in many ways a center of the hopes of all Americans in all generations since—has a unique role to play. As its plans are made known, they may well serve as a stimulus and an example for the equally important plans being made in thousands of other communities. *Both to ensure that Washington itself is ready for 1976 and to spur Bicentennial activity all across the country, I shall outline to the Congress today an action plan for Federal partnership in the District of Columbia's Bicentennial observance.*

My proposals follow two basic themes. One is the quest for quality of life—today's name for the age-old aspiration which Jefferson at the Nation's birth called "the pursuit of happiness." Here is the very essence of a Bicentennial celebrated "on the move." The past success of this quest, its present vigor, and its future prospects will provide a telling measure for our self-assessment as the great milestone nears. Such a theme's immediacy will call up exertion as well as congratulation—not only a birthday party but an actual rebirth.

The second theme which I would stress is dual excellence for Washington. In choosing which Bicentennial projects to pursue among myriad worthy possibilities, an old question arises again and again: Washington for Washingtonians, or Washington for all Americans? A kind of civic schizophrenia has troubled this city from the earliest days of its double existence as both a national capital and a community in its own right. Solutions going to both extremes have had their advocates—yet there is a better answer than either making thousands of people reside neglected in a strictly Federal city that is "a nice place to visit," or making millions of other people receive their governance from a narrowly provincial and self-centered capital where officials and visitors are classed as outsiders.

The Bicentennial Era, I am convinced, is the right time for Washington to gain a new and more expansive sense of itself.

and to find in its dual identity an opportunity for dual excellence unparalleled among American cities. The seat of government can excel as an exemplary living city, at the same time the home of 750,000 local residents excels as a gracious host to fellow citizens and foreign visitors who may number 40 million during 1976 alone.

The projects proposed in this message, then, treat quality of life in the Nation's Capital as indivisible. They aim for dual excellence, in the conviction that a more livable city is a more visitable one, and vice versa. For the most part, they emphasize physical construction—not by any means because public works are the sum total of our Bicentennial intentions for the District, but only because building time is already becoming critically short. Activities of many other types, such as commemorative events, pageantry, and social and cultural programs, which will of course be essential to the human dimension of the Bicentennial but which require somewhat shorter lead-times, are also being planned. Reports on these activities and, in many cases, requests for approval and funding will be submitted to the Congress as we move toward 1976.

One further note on Bicentennial concerns not mentioned here but certainly not forgotten: It is my feeling that nothing we could do for the District of Columbia during the next 4 years would be more meaningful or more appropriate to the Spirit of '76 than granting this city and its people first-class status: voting representation in the Congress. I am encouraged by the apparently warmer climate for this reform on Capitol Hill in 1972, and it will continue to have my support.

FORT LINCOLN NEW TOWN

Speaking at the National Archives last summer in a ceremony inaugurating the Bicentennial Era, I described an unusual painting which hangs in the Roosevelt Room across from the Oval Office in the White House. The scene portrayed is the signing of the Declaration of Independence—but for some reason the canvas was never finished, and many of the figures in the crowded hall are just sketched in, or left blank. The symbolism of this, I said, is that "the American Revolution is unfinished business, with important roles still open for each of us to play." A broad cross-section of District of Columbia citizens have now begun playing their roles in the continuing drama by serving on Mayor Washington's recently formed Bicentennial Assembly and Bicentennial Commission. We in the administration found the work of the old local Commission quite valuable in formulating our own plans for 1976, and we look forward to working closely with the reorganized, two-level planning group in the future.

One of the strongest strains of community opinion identified by local representatives like these is a commitment to revitalizing the urban heart of this Washington area. This, not flight to the suburbs or complacent satisfaction with the status quo, seems to arouse hope and determination at the neighborhood level. At the same time it seems a most appropriate cornerstone for a Bicentennial program designed to lift the quality of Washington life.

Accordingly, I shall initiate immediate Federal action to move ahead on plans for building a new town at Fort Lincoln in Northeast Washington. Fort Lincoln, over 300 acres of open land which received its name as a military post a century ago and which was long the site of the National Training School for Boys, offers an ideal chance to create not just another urban project where homes are razed and the human factor is designed out, but a totally new community planned around people. More than 4,000 dwellings for families of varied incomes are envisioned—three-quarters of them owner-occupied, to provide an anchor of stability in the development.

Innovative public transportation and communications systems and experimental educational programs would help knit the community together. Both the installation of these features and the construction work itself would be used as demonstration settings for some of the social-benefit technology applications which I proposed in my State of the Union message. Also integral to the new town would be a Federal employment center for 5,000 to 10,000 employees, and a possible satellite campus for the Federal City College. The development would be financed through public-private partnership, with the initial Federal investment (supplemented by District contributions which will need approval by the Congress) likely to be matched several times over in related private investment.

"The city lives!"—a rallying cry which meets with considerable skepticism in some quarters today—would be the assurance forcefully offered to Washingtonians and the world by a Fort Lincoln town occupied and operating in 1976. We are determined to make it happen.

NEIGHBORHOOD SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT

The Fort Lincoln idea is not new, but the impetus behind it is—a neighborhood, community-based impetus, with which I am delighted to associate this administration. *In order to demonstrate our support for this kind of bootstrap Bicentennial initiative, we shall ask the Congress to make available several million dollars in Federal funds to supplement the local funds set aside to carry out the social development project proposals which will be gathered by the local Bicentennial Commission and Assembly in neighborhoods all over Washington beginning this spring.* None of these latter projects will approach the scale of Fort Lincoln, but most will be no less soundly rooted in ordinary people's knowledge of their own needs. The process of listening and response, as well as the project implementation itself, will make for a healthier and more progressive city.

We are also increasing our efforts to assist in redevelopment of the inner-city areas devastated by the riots of April 1968. Two recent ground-breakings give evidence that the work is moving ahead, but also remind us of how much is left to do. The job, of course, is not the Federal Government's alone, but we must and shall contribute our full share and see the obligation through at an accelerated pace.

MORE COMMUNITY PARKS

One frequently voiced need is for more parkland—not just in the ceremonial center of the city, but out in the residential sections as well. *Planning is now underway for a joint Federal-District park development program focusing on underused, publicly owned land near the Anacostia River, close to some of the District's most crowded neighborhoods.* New recreational facilities will be constructed, to permit intensive use of the sorely needed new parks by Anacostia residents. Also within the Anacostia Basin, improvements will be carried out at the National Arboretum. *Another major green-space project planned for completion by 1976 is the Fort Circle Parks, 17 outposts of the Army's old defensive system around the periphery of the District of Columbia, some dating back as far as the War of 1812.* Strips of parkland are to link all the forts into a continuous belt containing bike trails, hiking paths, community recreation facilities, and campsites. Further, the District and the Interior Department will cooperate in rehabilitating and upgrading smaller parks in many areas of the city. I ask the Congress to approve the funds requested in my 1973 budget to move all of these projects forward on schedule.

A NEW DOWNTOWN CENTER

I also support, as vital to the kind of development momentum Washington must have to hold its head up among American cities in the Bicentennial Era, the District government's intention to construct a major convention center-sports arena complex near Mount Vernon Square.

This project would help to counter the centrifugal forces which are pushing both the leisure activities of local people and the major gatherings of out-of-town visitors away from the centers of many major cities. It would mean new business and investments and jobs for blocks around. And it would inject new life into nearby neighborhoods—provided, of course, that the legitimate concerns of merchants, working people, and residents in those neighborhoods receive fair consideration in the planning and location process. The scope of Federal assistance, however, should be appropriately limited, since I believe that a development largely local in function and benefits should have substantial local financing as well.

FOLLOWING THROUGH: EDUCATION AND TRANSPORTATION

New communities, new parks, new focal points for downtown business—all will help Washington carry through the ARBC's "Horizons '76" theme of honoring our founding principles by forging a better future with them. So too will two other ongoing District efforts, for which congressional assistance requested during the last session is still much needed: our public colleges and our Metro subway system.

Washington Technical Institute is proceeding with plans for buildings at its new permanent location on the north side of the former Bureau of Standards site in Northwest Washington. Federal City College remains in scattered lease space throughout the city despite ex-

plosive enrollment growth in the past 4 years; it hopes to occupy a campus of its own in and around the old District Library building north of Mount Vernon Square, as well as satellite locations elsewhere. *The Congress can help to expedite these campus development efforts by enacting the D.C. Capital Financing Act, which makes special provision for funding college construction through direct Federal grants rather than through Treasury loans as at present.*

In my D.C. message urging this action last April, I noted that WTI and the new International Center which is to share the Bureau of Standards site will in the future symbolize "side by side the Capital City's dedication to human development and to international understanding." Action by the Congress late in 1971 cleared the way for actual sale to foreign governments of lots at the International Center to begin last week. By 1976 the cluster of new chanceries there will be a pride to Americans and foreign guests alike. Let us now make sure that the District's public colleges will also be a showplace in the Bicentennial year. Ample and balanced opportunities in higher education are essential, if we are to convince millions of 1976 student visitors that the District takes care of its own.

Metro, and all of the other elements which with it will comprise a balanced modern transportation system for greater Washington, are central to Bicentennial plans for the District. We need the pride of achievement in areawide cooperation which the system will give all communities taking part. We need its people-moving capacity to cope with visitor traffic which may average up to 100,000 people daily throughout the anniversary year. *I am today renewing the commitment of all the agencies and resources of the Federal Government toward maximum progress on the entire transportation system—subway, freeways, bridges, parking, and support facilities—before 1976.* The action of the Congress in December to support continued Metro funding was enormously heartening to the people of the Capital region; it gave, in fact, a glimmer of hope to beleaguered commuters everywhere. The grim Thanksgiving prospect of a great many excavated streets to fill back in has now become the far brighter prospect of at least 24 miles of operating subway—the most modern anywhere—by 1976. *Urgently needed now is prompt approval by the Congress of Federal guarantees for Metro revenue bonds—the next essential step to getting the trains running.*

TO WELCOME 40 MILLION GUESTS

Both the sheer visitor volume anticipated at the height of the bicentennial observance, and the important goal of eliminating a "them and us" polarity between city residents and their guests from around the world, dictate that past patterns which have made the Mall and its immediate environs a sort of "tourist ghetto" must now go. All of Washington must be made not only hospitable and attractive to the visitor—which the proposals just outlined should go far toward achieving—but easily accessible as well. *I have directed the Secretary of Transportation to coordinate interagency action plans for supplementing those subway lines in service by 1976 with a coordinated network of other public transportation on which visitors can move from fringe parking areas (to be developed under these plans) to points of interest nearer the city center.*

At the hub of this network should be a new National Visitors Center in and around Union Station. Such a facility, desirable for all years, becomes indispensable as we look to the Bicentennial. *I have therefore charged the Secretary of the Interior, in consultation with the Secretary of Transportation, to take immediate action to move the National Visitors Center out of the talk stage, and to prepare new proposals for bringing it to completion by 1976.* When Union Station was built early in this century at the height of the railroad era, one of its express purposes was to permit removal of an unsightly terminal and tracks from the east end of the Mall. Its rehabilitation in the seventies as the Capital's principal reception and orientation point for travelers on all modes of ground transportation would be most appropriate, and would once again relieve the Mall and downtown areas of much traffic congestion. An "air rights" parking garage for buses and visitors' cars, convenient public transit connections, and a central information facility tied in with a citywide tourist guidance and information system would be the major features of the project.

Here is an opportunity for public and private resources to combine to fill a Bicentennial need. Notwithstanding the collapse of previous railroad financing plans for the Center at the time of the Penn Central bankruptcy, I have asked Secretaries Morton and Volpe to seek substantial railroad participation as they formulate the new proposals. I shall submit these to the Congress as soon as possible, with hopes of rapid approval.

Another step which should promote smoother tourist flow to major attractions is construction of a Metro station at Arlington National Cemetery. This station, for which planning funds are requested in my new budget, would speed movement from Washington over to the Arlington shrine, which by 1976 will be enhanced with numerous improvements including a new Memorial Chapel and columbarium. At the same time it would offer the arriving visitor one more convenient transfer point from private to public transportation on the way into the Capital itself.

BICENTENNIAL GARDENS

Moving in toward the center of the city, what will the 1976 visitor find along the Mall? *Most strikingly new and charming, perhaps, would be a park and recreation center called Bicentennial Gardens, which I propose be developed in the open land along Constitution Avenue between the Washington Monument and Lincoln Memorial.* Since the last of the old World War I "tempos" were removed from the West Mall in 1970, we have explored many alternative plans for developing in their place facilities for people of all ages, incomes, and interests, residents and tourists alike, to enjoy.

The Bicentennial Gardens plan, which will soon be ready to present in detail but which of course remains open to the ideas and desires of those for whom it is intended, might be called an American cousin of Copenhagen's beloved Tivoli. It follows the present contours of the land on a low profile in keeping with other Mall developments. A restaurant, smaller eating areas, an open-air theater, a bandshell, an area for ice skating, a children's play area, fountains, gardens, a boating lake, and walking paths are examples of the kind of features that might be included. There could be underground parking to accommodate tour buses, a terminal for the tourist trams, and a visitors center in the middle of the Gardens. With such a development, the Mall's attractions would be better balanced and dispersed, evening activities now concentrated in the Smithsonian Quadrangle would have a second focal point, and mingling of Washingtonians and visitors in a pleasant year-round setting would be encouraged. Quality of life for everyone in the Capital would be enhanced.

THE MALL IN 1976

The three major monuments and memorials in easy reach of Bicentennial Gardens are to be renovated and improved in a 4-year Park Service program beginning with this year's budget now before the Congress. Another facelifting project along the whole length of the Mall, and on the Ellipse as well, will reconstruct roadways, add walks, bikeways, plantings, and fountains, and provide for a new Ceremonial Drive. This work too is budgeted for fiscal year 1973 and beyond, to be completed by 1976.

The Mall east of the Washington Monument should also have a new look for the Bicentennial. Besides the Hirshhorn Museum and National Gallery of Art addition which are now being constructed, there will be a handsome new building for one of the Mall's oldest tenants, the Smithsonian Institution. *This structure, which will house the National Air and Space Museum with exhibits ranging from Kitty Hawk to Hadley Rille and with a former astronaut in charge, can be ready in 1976 if the Congress will move now to approve FY 1973 construction funds for it; the plans are nearly complete.* The Smithsonian also plans restoration of the historic Arts and Industries Building to its original 1880s appearance, as a fit setting for the Nation's Centennial exhibits which it displayed following the Philadelphia Exposition nearly a century ago and will display again for the Bicentennial, and construction of a major new "Nation of Nations" exhibit in the Museum of History and Technology to illustrate America's multi-cultural tradition. Both projects are the subject of FY 1973 budget requests.

A fourth important undertaking by the Smithsonian—not on the Mall but rather a part of the effort to give the bicentennial activities metropolitan scope—is the Bicentennial Outdoor Museum planned for old Fort Foote, Maryland, on the Potomac in Prince Georges County. The restored fort is to serve as the scene for re-creation of Revolutionary events such as encampments, war-time life, and

parades for 1976. *I ask prompt congressional action on legislation to approve the Bicentennial Outdoor Museum and to authorize appropriations for planning it.*

REALIZING A VISION: PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE

As L'Enfant's majestic expanse of Mall provides an axis along which Washington visitors can honor and relive the American past, so Pennsylvania Avenue, leaving the Mall by the new reflecting pool in front of the Capitol and angling away from it a long mile up to the White House, forms the main axis of government activity shaping the American present and future. This avenue, then, also demands attention as we move to dress up the heart of the city for our two hundredth birthday. *By 1976, let us complete the great Federal Triangle office complex in the spirit of the McMillan Commission's original vision 70 years ago. Let us build at its center a Grand Plaza worthy of the name, by transforming what is now a parking lot into a people-oriented park for government workers and visitors to enjoy.* (Visitors will also benefit from the new information and orientation center to be opened in the Great Hall of the Commerce Building by 1976, intended to introduce citizens to the activities of all the executive departments and agencies.) I have requested funds in my budget for fiscal year 1973 to move forward on the Federal Triangle and Grand Plaza projects; with the cooperation of the Congress the work will begin in the near future.

The north side of Pennsylvania Avenue, and with it many blocks of the downtown area, can also be revitalized or well on the way by the time we celebrate the Bicentennial. The FBI building now rising north of the Avenue symbolizes half of the answer—Federal construction—and can stand completed and in use by 1976 with continued congressional support. A further appropriation for this project is included in my new budget requests.

The other half of the answer for Pennsylvania Avenue is coordinated development planning which will mobilize the private sector and help bring commercial and residential activity back to this part of the city. The heart of Washington must not become so dominated by Federal buildings that it sits abandoned and lifeless on evenings and weekends. The two Presidents before me initiated steps to prevent this, and to make the Avenue instead a corridor of lively and varied activity, public and private—and my administration has continued to press this effort. In September 1970 I announced my strong support for a legislative proposal to establish a development corporation to accomplish the needed revitalization. Since then the proposal has been substantially modified in a good faith effort to accommodate all interests and segments of opinion. *Once again, I urge the Congress to act quickly and favorably on the Pennsylvania Avenue Bicentennial Development Corporation bill.*

When I first expressed support for the corporation plan nearly 17 months ago, I called it "an opportunity to fulfill, in this city, at this time, a magnificent vision of the men who founded our Nation, and at the same time to create a standard for the rest of the Nation by which to measure their own urban achievement, and on which to build visions of their own." It is not an opportunity that waits forever, though; of the time available between that 1970 statement and the beginning of the Bicentennial year, more than a fourth is already gone. Every month that passes without this legislation further dims our chances of giving all Americans one birthday present they ought to have—a Capital "main street" to be proud of.

THE NEXT FOUR YEARS

Both local and Federal plans for the Bicentennial celebration here in the Nation's Capital are far from complete at present. It is right that they should continue to evolve and expand as we move toward 1976. This message, however, attempts to set the tone and theme for Federal participation over the course of the next 4 years, and also to convey some of the aspirations of Washingtonians themselves without presuming to dictate what those aspirations should be.

The various levels and jurisdictions of government in the Washington area are well organized to follow through on the proposals I make today and to supervise further planning. The American Revolution Bicentennial Commission, with its distinguished bipartisan membership headed by David J. Mahoney, continues to provide excellent national leadership. The District government is well served by the responsive local Assembly and Commission structure to which I referred above; Mayor Washington is also establishing liaison with suburban planning bodies and with State officials of both Virginia and Maryland. The massive and diverse physical construction effort outlined in this message has been coordinated through a full-time District of Columbia bicentennial task force within the General Services Administration, until recently headed with great skill by Administrator Robert Kunzig. Now that Mr. Kunzig has become a Federal judge, I shall ensure that this coordination work is carried forward at the same high standard.

Under such direction and with the support of the Congress, we can achieve our Bicentennial goal of dual excellence in the District of Columbia, and we can realize by 1976 a dramatic improvement in the quality of Washington life for all whose physical or spiritual home this great Capital is. And by so doing we can help to inspire and encourage the preparations of other communities all across the country for a truly magnificent Bicentennial.

RICHARD NIXON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 4, 1972.*

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session, the Presiding Officer (Mr. BENTSEN) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(The nominations received today are printed at the end of Senate proceedings.)

ORDER FOR FURTHER TRANSACTIONS OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate return to the consideration of routine morning business with statements therein limited to 3 minutes, for a period not to exceed 6 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from California (Mr. TUNNEY) is recognized for 3 minutes.

EMERGENCY UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION

Mr. TUNNEY. Mr. President, contained in the appropriations bill we are debating today are desperately needed funds for the unemployment trust fund to carry out the Emergency Unemployment Compensation Act. This act signed into law just 4 weeks ago to provide emergency relief to hundreds of thousands of jobless persons in States with severe unemployment.

The act provides an additional 13 weeks of emergency unemployment compensation for workers who have exhausted all regular and extended benefits. These benefits are available in States where the unemployment rate, counting both insured unemployed and those who have exhausted unemployment insurance, exceeds 6.5 percent.

Mr. President. This new emergency program took effect 3 days ago on January 31, 1972. At the present time, 14 States—Alaska, California, Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, Michigan, Nevada, New Jersey, New York, Oregon, Rhode Island, Vermont, Washington, and Puerto Rico—have unemployment rates exceeding the 6.5 percent trigger. Thus, jobless persons in those States who have exhausted all benefits are now eligible for emergency aid to reduce the terrible hardships they suffer. These are people who have been out of work for over 10 months—many of them for a year or even more. In California alone there are over 300,000 persons who fall in this category.

Mr. President, virtually all of the States eligible for this new program have begun to implement it immediately by using their own funds to pay these benefits until Congress acts to appropriate the money to reimburse them as provided in the new law. The President has requested funds in his budget message for payment of these benefits but until we appropriate the funds, the States are forced to advance their own money.

Through the efforts of Senator MAGNUSON and others among us, the Appropriations Committee has agreed to speed up funds for these emergency benefits by including an appropriation in the bill before us. This action will assure that no delays occur in relieving the severe hardship of the many thousands of people who have exhausted all other sources of aid. And it will prevent them from being reduced to the terrible indignity of welfare. I therefore urge the Senate to enact this measure as quickly as possible and I urge the Senate conferees to

keep the grave urgency of these funds before them as they meet in conference with the House.

Mr. President, the need, unfortunately, is especially critical in California because the Reagan administration is refusing to pay these desperately needed emergency benefits until Federal money is actually delivered. Such callous disregard for the hardship of thousands of jobless persons is inconceivable to me, but nevertheless, it is the reality which exists in California. This kind of hard-hearted pennypinching may be understandable from one who pays no State income taxes, but I do not think the Congress should allow it to happen.

By passing this bill today we can help prevent a needless hardship to 300,000 people in my State alone. In addition, we can relieve from all of the eligible States the burden of carrying this program on their own resources until we act on a supplemental bill in March. I urge that we do so immediately and I ask my colleagues in the Senate to join me in appealing to the House of Representatives to accept this very humanitarian amendment in conference.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that morning business again be closed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

FOREIGN ASSISTANCE AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS, 1972

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill (H.R. 12067) making appropriations for foreign assistance and related programs for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, and for other purposes.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum and ask unanimous consent that the time for the quorum be charged equally against both sides on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered; and the clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BENTSEN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment (No. 865) of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. STEVENSON). Who yields time?

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. President, I yield myself such time as I may require.

The amendment restores $50 million to the appropriation for the relief of refugees in East Pakistan. The authorizing legislation in both the Senate and the House has provided $250 million in assistance for the refugees. That same amount was requested by the President in his budget. The appropriation bill so far provides only $175 million. In other words, the amount authorized has been reduced by $75 million.

As I understand it, the reason for the cut is an assumption that adequate food is available in Bangladesh for the people of that nation, and that a $175 million contribution by the United States is a fair share of what it is assumed will be a multinational contribution of about $650 million.

In turn, I will explain the reasons for my amendment. Only now are the full dimensions of the relief needs in Bangladesh emerging. Only now, and somewhat dimly, are the horrors, of the recent past and the consequences of those horrors, becoming evident. Food is available in Bangladesh both from external and internal sources. But that is not the most serious difficulty facing the people of the new nation. The difficulty is that neither food nor other commodities can be distributed because the transportation system, never adequate, is now in shambles. Barges are needed, trucks are needed, bridges are needed, as well as food, medicine, and clothing. Shelter is needed and must be supplied. The transportation system must be repaired before the monsoons begin in late April.

The dimensions of the need far exceed the $650 million international effort assumed in this appropriation and upon which the $175 million is figured. The need is now, if it is not already too late, to help the millions of innocent victims of the atrocities in Bangladesh.

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. STEVENSON. I yield.

Mr. FONG. Would the Senator from Illinois accept an amendment to his amendment to raise the amount from $225 million to $250 million?

Mr. STEVENSON. I certainly would accept such an amendment. In fact, I had very much hoped, at the outset, to submit an amendment in a form which would release the full amount, which would make available $250 million, itself an amount completely inadequate for the needs of the people in Bangladesh. I would welcome such an amendment as the Senator from Hawaii proposes and be grateful for it.

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, I offer that amendment.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the yeas and nays have not been ordered. I think the Senator from Illinois can modify his amendment to make the amount $250 million.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Illinois so modify his amendment, or is he asking that a modification be offered?

Mr. STEVENSON. I ask that the amendment be so modified.

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be a cosponsor of the modification.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois has a right to modify his amendment, and the Senator from Hawaii is added as a cosponsor.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I have spoken with the Senator from Illinois about this amendment. First, I wish to explain to the Senate why the committee did not provide the $250 million to begin with.

We recognize that this is one of the saddest—probably the most tragic—human catastrophes, in modern times. More people are suffering, dying, and starving to death in this part of the world than at any other time, probably, in human history.

These citizens of Bangladesh are a people who have suffered what I think ought to be categorized as genocide. They have no property and no food. They were desperate before; now they are literally dying of great need.

The United States is, of course, in dire financial straits. We discussed that in some detail yesterday. I am very reluctant to approve any increase in the bill. But in spite of that, under these tragic circumstances we should be able to allow $250 million or perhaps even more. We simply felt that there had not been adequate detailing of how much money could be spent in the immediate future or the exact purpose for which it would be spent. This is particularly true considering the enormous amount of Indian rupees in counterpart funds that might be used.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Would the Senator from Wisconsin advise the Chair on whose time he is speaking?

Mr. PROXMIRE. On the time in opposition to the amendment.

For this reason, because this proposal is something that does seem to require clarification, we felt that the sound and sensible approach was to provide $175 million, and then, as the year went on, to provide additional funds if the administration could make a case that more was needed.

However, the Senator from Illinois has made a direct, personal survey of the situation and has provided some information I did not know of before. I do not think that I or many other Senators ever knew about the desperate need for dollars. The money will be made available until expended, so it is not something that has to be expended rapidly over 4 months.

Under the circumstances, I am happy to join the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. FONG) in supporting the amendment of the Senator from Illinois. I think it is not only the humane thing to do, but the right and moral thing to do. We would not put any kind of dollar sign at all on human suffering and human life. This is the kind of investment that ought to be made in foreign aid.

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes.

We in the committee felt that $175 million was not enough, but we were waiting for the supplemental bill to come up so we could add to it. Since the distinguished Senator from Illinois has asked for the $250 million, I am very happy to go along with it.

It is also estimated that we will send Public Law 480 food to East Pakistan. She will need 1½ million tons of grain a year over and above what she produces, which is about 11 million tons.

So over and above the amount which we will be providing in the foreign assistance bill will be the amount which will

be sent to East Pakistan through Public Law 480, which will cost from $65 million to $170 million.

I would like to call the Senate's attention to what we have done in regard to the Pakistani tragedy. As of January 24, 1972, according to the State Department, all the governments of the world contributed $243,959,762 and the international voluntary agencies contributed $59,222,286, or a total of $303,182,048. These contributions were in cash, in counterpart funds, and in goods such as food, medical supplies, clothing, blankets, and so forth.

I want to call the attention of the Senate to the U.S. contribution. The U.S. contribution was $90,057,000, and our voluntary agencies contributed $10,700,000, a total of $100,757,000, almost $101 million. In other words, the U.S. Government and U.S. voluntary agencies contributed one-third of the total world contribution to assist the Pakistani refugees in India.

Over and above that $101 million, the United States delivered $65 million in food and other essential relief, or over two-thirds of the $947 million the United Nations records as pledged by all countries.

So when we add the $65 million for East Pakistani relief to the $101 million, which was for Indian-Pakistani refugee relief, we have a total sum of $166 million which the United States has either provided or has pledged to use in East Pakistan and in India for East Pakistani relief.

This does not include additional U.S. contribution of food from earlier programs which arrived during mid-1971.

As against the $166 million which the United States and its various voluntary agencies have contributed, I would like to draw to the attention of the Senate what the U.S.S.R. has contributed. The U.S.S.R.'s contribution consisted of a portion of 100 million doses of smallpox vaccine, worth $1 million, 100,000 tons of rice, $20 million, and other commodities, $1,100,000, or a total of about $22 million, as compared with $166 million delivered by the United States.

So we have done a commendable job in this regard, and we have been in the forefront in helping our friends in East Pakistan in their tragedy.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, as I understand it, when the Senator from Illinois yields back his time and the Senator from Hawaii and I yield back our time, it will be possible for the Senator from Arkansas to offer a perfecting amendment. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. PROXMIRE. As far as I am concerned, I yield back my time.

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, I yield back my time.

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. President, I have just one further word of gratitude to the distinguished Senator from Hawaii and the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin for their recognition of the depth of suffering in Bangladesh and for their recognition of the U.S. moral responsibility in that part of the world—a moral responsibility which results from our having supplied Pakistan with some of the arms and military equipment by which the suffering and atrocities were caused.

There is in this amendment a limitation which restricts the U.S. contribution to 40 percent of all contributions from whatever sources. It is certainly my intent in offering this amendment that the administration make reasonable assumptions of the contributions of other nations and, on the basis of those assumptions, go forward with the distribution of aid right away, before it is too late, when the monsoons begin in April. The alternative to wait until other nations have made their contributions in order that we can calculate the amount we may contribute, would destroy the effectiveness of this assistance.

I am prepared to yield back my time.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, may I say I strongly endorse the principle. It makes sense. These are people who need help now. We should not base what we are doing on what the others are going to do, but should go ahead with ours, and we should move promptly.

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, I yield back my time.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I yield back my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time on the amendment has been yielded back.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment to the amendment and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment to the amendment will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk read the amendment to the amendment, as follows:

Before the quotation marks at the end of the amendment insert a colon and the following: *"Provided further,* That the funds appropriated under this paragraph shall be deducted from the sums provided under this title I".

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes.

When the Foreign Relations Committee first approved the authorization of $250 million for Pakistan refugee relief, it required that the money be taken out of other programs—the same as I propose with this amendment. But the committee's action was later reversed through use of Senator MUNDT's proxy.

For the last several years Congress has earmarked funds for population control programs—$125 million is earmarked for this fiscal year. Earmarking is an effective way for Congress to set priorities for the spending of foreign aid funds.

Earmarking for refugee relief will force the executive branch to rethink its aid priorities and result in additional emphasis on the side of humanitarian aid. This is the only justification for foreign aid that makes sense to most American taxpayers.

This approach will result in reducing the total in this bill for the regular foreign aid and military sales programs by $175 million, from $2.264 billion to $2.089 billion.

If my amendment is adopted, the total amount in this bill for the regular foreign aid program will still be $200 million more than Congress appropriated for the 1970 fiscal year. We had a $13-billion deficit in the administraitve budget that year. This year it is expected to be $45 billion—more than three times as much, and yet we are increasing the amount for foreign aid.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield to the distinguished chairman.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I would like to support the Senator from Arkansas. I think this is a sensible and wise amendment. In doing so, I ask the Senator from Hawaii if he will handle the time in opposition to the amendment since I support it.

I think the amendment is sensible for several reasons. It would provide needed aid for Bangladesh. It would provide what is needed for this terrible disaster. As I understand the amendment, the funds would have to come out of other parts of title I of the bill.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is correct.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Including the parts which the Senate has increased against the determination of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is correct. The $100 million is increased, yes.

Mr. PROXMIRE. It seems to me that is a sound way to operate. I think the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee is offering an amendment which reconciles our moral obligation to assist the people in Bangladesh as much as we possibly can with the urgent need to do all we can to hold down our expenditures at a time when we are running an enormous deficit.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I thank the Senator from Wisconsin. Just to reiterate what he has said, this amendment would not decrease the amount which would be available for this purpose, which the Senator from Illinois has requested. It would merely require that it come out of funds that are appropriated under title I.

I want to make one other comment. There is no limit, of course, to Public Law 480 funds—that is really commodities—which would be available. That is a big element for helping on problems in the food area. There is nothing, as far as I know, that would limit the availability of this assistance for the refugees.

I am bound to make one other point about a comment of the Senator from Illinois. He says we are morally responsible because we have supplied arms.

If Senators will look at the record of our supplying arms, it is very difficult to find any place in the world of any consequence in which we have not supplied some arms. If we look at this military aid program—it has been cut back a little—but look back over the years, and there are very few countries, unless one looks to Chad, perhaps, or Mali. I am not sure whether we have sent anything into Chad, though I expect we have. I use Chad only as one of the more remote and less controversial countries. I am not sure whether we have sent anything into the Maldive Islands, and I am not sure whether we have sent anything into Mauritius, but there are at least 80 or

so countries to which we have supplied arms.

So for anything that happens, under this theory, almost anywhere in the world, we are morally responsible to pick up the tab for reconstruction, rehabilitation, and so on. I really do not accept that kind of argument, that we are morally responsible for everyone's ills. I do accept that we have been extremely stupid, shortsighted, and misguided in the program of supplying arms all over the world. I will accept that argument, and maybe we should pay something for it, to pay for our sins. We are going to have to pay an awful lot, I expect, in Southeast Asia, for the extent to which we have destroyed those countries.

As far as India and Pakistan are concerned, fortunately, we did not destroy those countries ourselves; all we did was give them the vehicle, the means to do it themselves; but the motive, that is, the final causative factor, as they would say in a court of law, would be the Pakistanis themselves. They did not have to use those arms to murder those people. That was their decision, and we did not give them to them with the idea that they would use them for that purpose. We gave them to them for use against the Russians, against communism. This is a part of the ideological obsession that started back in 1947 and 1948. That was the reason we were giving them to them, to contain communism wherever it might raise its ugly head.

There is no evidence that Mujib was Communist, or that the revolution in East Pakistan was a Communist revolution. So they violated the understanding with which we gave them the arms. Of course, they had already violated it when they used them against India.

We certainly did not give them to them to use against India; but under this broad generalization that, having given them arms, they used them against India, then we ought to be responsible for all the ills of India, because they certainly caused India to spend a lot of money, and certainly did a lot of damage, in the war that they fought several years ago.

My amendment does not affect the amount available for the refugees. But there the problem should no longer be as great as it once was because, as I understand from reading the newspapers, many of the refugees are returning. It will be primarily an aid program to Bangladesh; and I do not have any objection to that, although, to keep our lines straight, we ought to authorize aid to Bangladesh.

The fact is that our Government has not yet recognized the existence of Bangladesh. We had a meeting yesterday afternoon to discuss this in an executive session of the Committee on Foreign Relations. There is a resolution sponsored by the Senator from South Carolina and others to recognize Bangladesh, but the fact is that our Government has not recognized Bangladesh. Nevertheless, this is, in fact, a program of aid to Bangladesh. That is what it will amount to. I only point that out as one of the reasons why we ought to take a close look at the matter.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me so that I can ask for the yeas and nays on the pending amendment?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I also ask for the yeas and nays on final passage.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. My question is, I assume that this aid to Bangladesh the committee chairman is referring to is really to the people of Bangladesh or what was formerly East Pakistan, rather than the Government of Bangladesh, which does not exist as far as the United States is concerned at the present time; is that correct?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is right, we do not recognize it, although I understand that a number of countries recognized it today.

But as I have pointed out, it seems to me that things have changed, that this is no longer a refugee program primarily, as it was presented in the committee when we passed on it. This aid will now go more to a country known as Bangladesh.

Mr. AIKEN. What the Senator means is aid to the refugees and the suffering people who are now in what was formerly East Pakistan, but is now called Bangladesh. It is the people he is thinking of, not the government, it is not?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Well, that is true of all these governments. I mean, even if it is a development loan or anything, it is the people we are thinking of; the government is only the vehicle through which the loans are made or sought. I agree that in all these programs, it is the people whom we consider as the final recipients of our largesse.

Mr. AIKEN. Yes. My chairman has been a very strong advocate of multilateral assistance to various peoples in need in different parts of the world. That would apply to this additional assistance to the needy people, the suffering people of what is now Bangladesh as well?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Well, I do think it is better administered through——

Mr. AIKEN. I personally think that. While I am in favor of relieving the suffering, I think it should be done on a multilateral basis rather than a unilateral basis, although that is directly contrary to my belief as to how we should deal with Latin American countries.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield on that point?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Well, let me point out that——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time the Senator from Arkansas yielded himself has expired.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

The conference report on the authorization for refugee aid reads:

> Such assistance shall be distributed to the maximum extent practicable, under the auspices of and by international institutions and relief agencies of United States voluntary agencies.

That is the requirement. Purely because of administrative problems, if nothing else, we are going to have to do it with the cooperation of that government. Governments do not usually welcome outsiders coming in without even asking "by your leave." But that does not bother me very much.

Mr. AIKEN. Would that not be up to the various organizations with whom we deal, whom we work through?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I imagine the Government of Bangladesh will have something to say about it.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I would like to point out that the Stevenson amendment does contemplate a very important element of international assistance, and provides that the United States shall not give more than 40 percent of the assistance. I realize that does not make it multilateral, but it does require that other countries enter into this assistance.

Mr. AIKEN. Well, until we recognize the Government of Bangladesh, until it has been established as a government, and more than 10 or 15 countries have recognized it, it seems to me that we should deal through the multilateral organizations in that and probably other parts of Asia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's 2 additional minutes have expired. Who yields time?

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Hawaii yield me 3 minutes?

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, how much time do we have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Hawaii has 15 minutes remaining.

Mr. FONG. I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. STEVENSON. I thank the Senator from Hawaii.

Mr. President, there is no way in which this aid could be provided except through multinational agencies. Without recognition of Bangladesh, the United States will not and cannot establish bilateral relationships which could be used to distribute this assistance to the people of Bangladesh. So, until that time, all the moneys appropriated by this bill would have to be funneled to the people of Bangladesh through such agencies—all of them multilateral—as the United Nations, UNICEF, the International Red Cross, and the International Rescue Committee.

I am hesitant about embarking on a moral discussion, but the point should be made that the moral responsibility is to people who are suffering and in need. It is a responsibility which has been recognized by countries throughout the world. The United States, it seems to me, has a special responsibility in this case, not only because we did—to a rather limited extent—provide some of the arms which were used by Pakistan with which to commit atrocities in Bangladesh, but beyond that, and more significantly, we did nothing in Pakistan to restrain the regime of Yahya Khan from murdering the Bengalis, at the same time we were

restraining the Indians from liberating the Bengalis. That is what, in my mind, makes this a moral question and, to a degree, a moral responsibility of the United States.

I have to oppose the substitute amendment because, as I understand it, its effect would be cut other programs in this bill by a quarter of a billion dollars.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair points out to the Senator from Illinois that this is a perfecting amendment, rather than a substitute amendment. It merely adds additional language. The Senator has been referring to it as a substitute amendment.

Mr. STEVENSON. I thank the Chair for the correction. My remarks apply to the perfecting amendment.

If the administration did decide to make available funds—under my amendment as perfected—to the people of Bangladesh, it would then take the funds from other programs for which Congress has appropriated moneys; and in so doing, it seems to me, it would be effectively overcoming the clear intent of Congress. It is a back door way of giving the administration far more power over funds appropriated by Congress for the programs established in our authorizing and appropriating legislation.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a clarification?

Mr. STEVENSON. I yield on the Senator's time.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The administration is not forced to spend this money for that purpose. They do not have to spend it.

Mr. STEVENSON. That is my point.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I mean, under the Senator's amendment. My amendment does not change that aspect of it. They can impound it as they want. They have impounded $12 billion. The Senator's amendment does not make them spend it. There is no way to make them spend it. The Senator is making the point here that in some way my amendment changes the pressure upon them to spend it for this purpose. If the administration does not want to spend it for that, even if my amendment is not adopted, they do not have to do so.

All I want to do is to clarify the matter. I do not want to leave the Senate under a misapprehension as to the effect of it.

Mr. STEVENSON. The effect of my amendment is to provide $250 million for the relief of refugees. The effect of the perfecting amendment would be to require that all that sum of money come out of other programs. That is my point. The effect of the perfecting amendment is to cut back other appropriations for foreign aid by $250 million.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. But they do not have to spend it, under the Senator's amendment. If their sense of priority is not the same as the Senator's they will not spend it, under his amendment, either.

Mr. STEVENSON. I understand that. But I offered my amendment as an addition, not a diminution, in the bill. Therefore, I still must oppose the perfecting amendment of the distinguished Senator from Arkansas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FONG. I yield 1 minute to the Senator.

Mr. AIKEN. It is my understanding that if the amendment of the Senator from Illinois is agreed to, the funds would have to be deducted from some other appropriation which is contemplated by title II. That means that if we voted to increase the aid for the people of Bangladesh by $50 million, it could be taken out of the $175 million which is already included in the bill.

It could be taken out of the Alliance for Progress, for which we voted yesterday, and could nullify our vote of yesterday, or it could be taken out of development loans. Certainly, it would not come out of administrative expenses. Possibly it could be deducted from military assistance. But if it is the purpose to take take it out of military assistance, I think it should be so specified. Otherwise, the amendment offered by the Senator from Arkansas could completely nullify the amendment proposed by the Senator from Illinois; or it could nullify or could repeal the vote which was taken on this floor yesterday.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired. Who yields time?

Mr. FONG. I yield 1 additional minute to the Senator.

Mr. AIKEN. With this bill going to conference, I think it would be better to accept the amendment of the Senator from Illinois, because we would undoubtedly make some adjustments in the conference committee, anyway.

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, I yield myself 3 minutes on the amendment.

I vigorously oppose this amendment. This is as devastating an amendment as I have ever seen.

Mr. AIKEN. Which one?

Mr. FONG. The amendment by the distinguished Senator from Arkansas.

This amendment would destroy the whole foreign aid bill. Its destruction effect on our foreign assistance program is equivalent to that of a nuclear bomb.

Let us look at what the Senator has done. He would undo everything we have done so far, everything that the Foreign Relations Committee has done, everything that Congress has done.

Under title I, the fiscal year 1972 appropriation was $1.1 billion. The budget estimate was $1.6 billion. The authorization—and the distinguished Senator from Arkansas is chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee—was $1.2 billion. The continuing resolution which we operated under, and are still operating on, is $1.2 billion. The House passed $1 billion under title I, and the Senate Appropriations Committee recommended a little over $1 billion. By addition of the $100 million which went for the Alliance for Progress, from $50 million to $150 million, that raised the figures from approximately $1 billion in the Senate bill to $1.1 billion.

Let us see what this does. It takes out the $175 million which is already in the bill for Pakistani relief, reducing it to $925 million. Then, if the Administration decides to take the $250 million for Bangladesh relief, it reduces it another $250 million, to $675 million.

So what we will have is $675 million in title I as distinguished from the amount of approximately $1 billion as reported by the committee, as distinguished from $1.2 billion as passed by Congress in the authorization bill.

So, I say, Mr. President, that what the distinguished Senator from Arkansas (Mr. FULBRIGHT) has done has been really to put a nuclear bomb in the bill. He is really trying to destroy the whole bill.

I do not know what his intentions are, whether he intends to give any money to Bangladesh at all. He may not want to give any money to Bangladesh. But in the authorization provisions we have, the sum of $250 million is earmarked for Bangladesh relief.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BENTSEN). The time of the Senator from Hawaii has expired.

Mr. FONG. I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Hawaii is recognized for 2 additional minutes.

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, I do not know whether he wants to give any money to Bangladesh, whether he wants to provide nothing for the Alliance for Progress, whether he wants to provide nothing for worldwide technical assistance, or whether he thinks no money should go to American schools and hospitals abroad, no money to international organizations and programs, no money to the Alliance for Progress, no money for develoment loans, because the money would have to come from all those figures which we have worked so diligently and so carefully to bring before the Senate.

Every item has been carefully worked on before the Appropriations Committee presented the bill to the Senate.

Now we are here debating on one amendment. Are we going to increase the amount we want to give to Bangladesh relief from $175 million to $250 million, or are we not? If we want to, then let us vote for that.

If we do not want to do so, then let us vote against it.

But, let us not say that if we give $250 million to Bangladesh relief we will force you to take the increase, which is another $75 million plus $175 million, which we have already appropriated under the bill according to the action of the Appropriations Committee, and say that all of that will have to come out.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Hawaii has expired.

Mr. FONG. I yield myself 1 additional minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Hawaii is recognized for 1 additional minute.

Mr. FONG. So you can see, Mr. President, that I do not know what is the real intent of this provision by the distinguished Senator from Arkansas. If his intent is to "gut" the whole bill, then it will work. If his intent is to reduce the amounts going to all the other programs then, I think, he has done a great disservice to put in that amendment.

I ask my colleagues to vote against the

amendment because it is a devastating amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Hawaii has expired. Who yields time?

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished Senator from New York (Mr. JAVITS).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I must say that I do not particularly enjoy these repeated forays with my chairman. I am only sustained by the fact that he is a thoroughly skilled parliamentarian and that I hope to be with him in many other struggles if he will forgive me on this one.

I must, Mr. President, in good conscience, identify with the position taken by Senators FONG, AIKEN, and STEVENSON with regard to this particular amendment.

We went through this particular approach in the committee as well. It is clear that if we do not agree basically with the proposition that a sum of money of roughly $2,900 million should be devoted to foreign aid and that that is a fair application of our priorities, then, of course, we have an absolute right to find every way we can to cut it down. This is one way to do it. As the Senator from Hawaii has stated, it is an atom bomb placed in the bill, but it is a way to do it, and it is a perfectly proper way to do it. But if we are satisfied with the overall budgetary situation, in spite of all of our troubles, trying not to be hardhearted or to have the hard feelings of a rich man walking along the streets of the world, which is a lot poorer than we are then we have got to devote something to the cause of world relief and world assistance. All other developed nations who are far poorer than we are engaged in such programs.

I know of nothing that would commend itself to us for humanitarian action more than the dreadful tragedies which have afflicted those people of the Indian subcontinent—especially in view of our own rather touchy relationship—in their efforts to disenthrall themselves from those who have been barbaric to them; to wit, the Government and Army of West Pakistan.

Under these circumstances, one can speak of this in human and personal terms.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. JAVITS. Will the Senator from Hawaii yield me 1 more minute?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time in opposition to the amendment has expired.

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute on the bill to the Senator from New York.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York is recognized for 1 additional minute.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, may we have order in the Senate so that the Senator may be heard?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will please come to order.

The Senator from New York may proceed.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, if it appeals to our hearts that these people who have been so terribly and tragically decimated by flood, conflagration, war, and fraticide shall now get help from us, with feelings from our hearts of generosity, the money should certainly not, and I repeat, not come out of the—if we do it and do it that way—other development assistance and humanitarian programs we have in title I of the bill. Each must stand or fall on its own.

In spite of our own troubles in this country, we are not so poor that we cannot heed our consciences and say that we cannot afford this money to help these people.

I strongly urge that the perfecting amendment be defeated and the Stevenson amendment be sustained.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BENTSEN). The Senator from Arkansas (Mr. FULBRIGHT) has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I do not know that I can add anything, especially as there is no one here to listen except those already committed—which is the usual situation on the floor of the Senate.

For the RECORD, though, I should point out, on the question of our moral obligation that we should help Bangladesh because we gave arms to Pakistan, that Nigeria, for example, was given arms by us. They had an insurrection there and a lot of people were killed. I guess we should have had an amendment to the bill to pick up the tab or provide some relief for that.

We have also given arms to El Salvador, Honduras, and so forth—as a matter of fact, I have a list in my hand of 46 countries to which we have given arms. This is grant military aid. Many more countries we have given what are called sales—they are not really sales, but a kind of sales. and so forth. Thus, the idea that we are responsible for everyone does not appeal to me.

All my amendment would provide is that if we want the Government to do it, we should give so much money up to $250 million. They may still do so. The difference between my amendment and that of the Senator from Illinois is that mine takes it out of the money available under title I of the bill. That is the only difference.

Neither does the amendment of the Senator from Illinois force the administration to spend this money on this problem. It simply authorizes them to do so. If they think, in their idea of priority, that it comes above in importance to other items in the bill there is great and wide power to transfer. The President has much discretion to change the spending levels a great deal.

All my amendment seeks to do is not to increase the overall amount of the bill, because this country is in such dire financial straits.

So, that is all there is to it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time on the amendment has expired.

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 minute on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Hawaii is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, I want to call the attention of my colleagues to the fact that the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas, if agreed to, would deduct another $175 million from the amount we already voted on in the committee on the committee bill.

We have $175 million for Pakistani relief. Now, the Senator from Arkansas proposes that we will take $250 million from all of the programs. So, that means that we will take $175 million out.

I say this will really gut and destroy the whole bill.

I urge my colleagues to vote against the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has expired. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I announce that the Senator from Georgia (Mr. GAMBRELL), the Senator from Alaska (Mr. GRAVEL), the Senator from Indiana (Mr. HARTKE), the Senator from Washington (Mr. JACKSON), the Senator from Washington (Mr. MAGNUSON), the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. MCCLELLAN), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. MCGOVERN), the Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. MCINTYRE), the Senator from Utah (Mr. MOSS), the Senator from Maine (Mr. MUSKIE), the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. RANDOLPH), the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BAYH), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CHURCH), and the Senator from California (Mr. CRANSTON), are necessarily absent.

I further announce that the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. HARRIS), the Senator from Iowa (Mr. HUGHES), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. JORDAN), the Senator from Montana (Mr. METCALF), the Senator from Virginia (Mr. SPONG), are necessarily absent.

I also announce that the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. MCGEE), the Senator from Nevada (Mr. CANNON), are on official business.

On this vote, the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. MCCLELLAN) is paired with the Senator from Washington (Mr. JACKSON).

If present and voting, the Senator from Arkansas would vote "yea" and the Senator from Washington would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Alaska (Mr. GRAVEL) is paired with the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. MCGOVERN).

If present and voting, the Senator from Alaska would vote "yea" and the Senator from South Dakota would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. RANDOLPH) is paired with the Senator from Georgia (Mr. GAMBRELL).

If present and voting, the Senator from West Virginia would vote "nay" and the Senator from Georgia would vote "yea."

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Washington (Mr. MAGNUSON), would vote "nay."

Mr. GRIFFIN. I announce that the Senator from Colorado (Mr. ALLOTT), the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. BAKER), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. BELL-

MON), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. HATFIELD), the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. HRUSKA), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. SAXBE), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. TAFT), the Senator from Texas (Mr. TOWER), and the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. YOUNG) are necessarily absent.

The Senator from South Dakota (Mr. MUNDT) is absent because of illness.

On this vote, the Senator from Oregon (Mr. HATFIELD) is paired with the Senator from Texas (Mr. TOWER). If present and voting, the Senator from Oregon would vote "yea" and the Senator from Texas would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 24, nays 45, as follows:

[No. 33 Leg.]

YEAS—24

Allen	Eagleton	Long
Anderson	Eastland	Mansfield
Bentsen	Ellender	Miller
Bible	Ervin	Montoya
Burdick	Fannin	Proxmire
Byrd, Va.	Fulbright	Stennis
Byrd, W. Va.	Goldwater	Symington
Cook	Hollings	Talmadge

NAYS—45

Aiken	Dole	Mathias
Beall	Dominick	Mondale
Bennett	Fong	Nelson
Boggs	Griffin	Packwood
Brock	Gurney	Pastore
Brooke	Hansen	Pearson
Buckley	Hart	Pell
Case	Humphrey	Percy
Chiles	Inouye	Ribicoff
Cooper	Javits	Roth
Cotton	Jordan, Idaho	Schweiker
Curtis	Kennedy	Scott
Smith	Stevens	Tunney
Sparkman	Stevenson	Weicker
Stafford	Thurmond	Williams

NOT VOTING—31

Allott	Hatfield	Moss
Baker	Hruska	Mundt
Bayh	Hughes	Muskie
Bellmon	Jackson	Randolph
Cannon	Jordan, N.C.	Saxbe
Church	Magnuson	Spong
Cranston	McClellan	Taft
Gambrell	McGee	Tower
Gravel	McGovern	Young
Harris	McIntyre	
Hartke	Metcalf	

So Mr. FULBRIGHT's amendment was rejected.

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the amendment was rejected.

Mr. GRIFFIN. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question recurs on the amendment, as modified, of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. STEVENSON) (putting the question).

The amendment, as modified, was agreed to.

PRIVILEGE OF THE FLOOR

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Norvill Jones, of the staff of the Foreign Relations Committee, be permitted to remain on the floor during the remainder of the consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PUBLIC SAFETY PROGRAM

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 11, between lines 8 and 9, insert the following:

SEC. 114. None of the funds appropriated or made available pursuant to this Act to carry out part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 shall be used for continuing public safety programs of the Agency for International Development.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, on my amendment, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I yield myself 10 minutes.

In its illustrative 1972 budget, the Agency for International Development requested $29,423,000 for carrying out public safety programs in more than 25 countries of the world. Of that $5,455,000 was to be from technical assistance, $20,573,000 from supporting assistance, and $3,400,000 from supporting assistance loans.

The proposed program and the detail of its financing are set forth in the table which I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

Countries and regions	Supporting assistance	Technical assistance	Supporting assistance loans
Southeast Asia:			
South Vietnam	$11,148,000		
Laos	425,000		
Thailand	9,000,000		
Philippines		$800,000	
Africa:			
Regional		100,000	
Congo (Kinshasa)		1,016,000	
Ghana		106,000	
Liberia		203,000	
Nigeria			$3,400,000
Tunisia		125,000	
Near East and South Asia: Pakistan		250,000	
Latin America:			
Bolivia		115,000	
Brazil		174,000	
Colombia		340,000	
Costa Rica		$198,000	
Dominican Republic		370,000	
Ecuador		135,000	
El Salvador		56,000	
Guatemala		377,000	
Guyana		99,000	
Honduras		171,000	
Jamaica		96,000	
Nicaragua		91,000	
Panama		203,000	
Uruguay		225,000	
Venezuela		200,000	
Total	$20,573,000	5,450,000	$3,400,000
Grand total			29,423,000

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, over the years, I have come to realize that U.S. participation in the highly sensitive area of public safety and police training unavoidably opens the door to those who seek to identify the United States with every act of local police brutality or oppression in any country in which this program operates. It matters little whether the charges can be substantiated; they are made almost daily; they are widely circulated; they obtain credibility in some quarters; and they inevitably stigmatize the total U.S. aid effort.

I believe that in undeveloped areas of the world, the costs of public safety programs are better left to be underwritten from local resources and the U.S. assistance effort directed toward less sensitive and better justified areas of concern. As a move in this direction, my amendment would eliminate all public safety programs funded from technical assistance grants and development loans. This action would not, however, bar public safety programs in Southeast Asia, for which $20,573,000 in supporting assistance funds is requested, and concerning which I will not comment at this time.

That program has been widely publicized in a different connection.

While I question the need for continuing this highly controversial program, the Agency for International Development has testified in strong support of these activities which involve the operation of the International Policy Academy and the stationing of 335 public safety advisers abroad. Having achieved the limited objectives for which they were established, public safety programs in 23 countries have been terminated since 1962.

Public safety programs in Chile and Jordan were terminated in fiscal year 1971 and ongoing programs in Brazil and Korea will be concluded by the end of fiscal 1972. In trying to justify this program's continuance, an AID official has made the following observation which should be considered in passing judgment on the program:

Violence has been a common factor in many of the world's societies and one which frustrates the effort of the people to realize their aspirations and also of governments in attempting to govern. Violence has been chosen by special interest groups, political factions and elements at both extremes of the political spectrum. Based on the recent experience of the 1960s, it is clear that during the decade of the '70s the task of governments in these societies will be much more important during this period. This importance lies not only in the civil security forces' ability to protect the lives, property and basic human rights of the citizens, but in their ability to create a climate for orderly change. Violence perpetrated by any group in society should be prevented and suppressed.

In several countries, which have requested

and are receiving Public Safety assistance, there are reports and allegations that some members of the police forces engage in illegal activity in the conduct of their business. We do not condone and do deplore this kind of behavior which is antithetical to the objectives of the Public Safety program and to the modern concept of law enforcement which the program attempts to inculcate at all levels in police forces it aids. The best chance for overcoming this lack of professionalism is the conduct of police operations is through technical assistance and training provided by the Public Safety program.

U.S. Public Safety assistance is a low cost, low profile activity. Given adequate resources, it *can* be effective in influencing police leadership toward the professional and humane use of their resources and it *can* assist in the development of police abilities to prevent serious threats to internal order.

Unfortunately, there is a difference between can and is. I question the effectiveness of these programs in light of the adverse effects that result from our being so closely associated with local police brutality and consider further involvement in these programs to be against the best interests of the United States.

We have troubles enough with police/community relations in our own society. I suggest that our Government's efforts would be better directed to this, and our own crime problem, rather than to trying to teach foreigners how to run their police departments.

Mr. President, the overall effect of this, together with other aspects of our program, is to identify this Nation with the preservation of the status quo in all respects in all the developing countries, in which there are many people who believe that some changes in their economic or political systems are warranted. The United States is identified in nearly every respect with the preservation of the status quo in any effort to improve the lot of the people in those countries.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. This amendment was brought to the attention of the full committee, and we agreed that, because it was controversial with many people, it should be brought up on the floor rather than put in by the committee.

I think it is necessary for us to stop our aid in public safety programs because, as the Senator from Arkansas has said, not only do they become clearly identified with suppression of human rights, but also with the most reactionary and military regimes.

It is true, as the Senator from Arkansas said, that they may serve a useful purpose, but what the Senator from Arkansas would do in his amendment would be to provide that public safety programs and the police forces of those countries be run with local tax funds in accordance with the way the local governments want to set priorities.

I know what resistance there would be in this country to having a Federal police force. People would resist such a move. I know some people say the FBI is that. I do not think so. I have great respect for the FBI. I think it has done a marvelous job. But if we had a Federal police force supported with Federal funds, we would be concerned with all the effects that would have on the civil liberties of the people of our country.

What we are saying is that U.S. AID funds should be used to help countries without becoming involved with their police forces. These have violated human rights time and time again in the most brutal and tragic ways—Brazil is the most conspicuous example. There is no reason why the United States should unnecessarily be identified as the country which is supplying the police force to maintain order.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I thank the Senator.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I support the Senator's amendment.

Once again, I ask the Senator from Hawaii if he will control the time in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I appreciate the support of the Senator.

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, I yield myself such time as I may need.

I rise in opposition to the amendment. The main thrust of these funds, under the public safety programs, is to have an efficient civil security force in the countries that are just developing. Many of these countries do not have an efficient police force and they need to have trained men to stop the inception of riots and the inception of other criminal activities.

Since 1954 the United States has provided assistance to police organizations around the world through the foreign economic assistance program. We must remember that we have only 4 or 5 more months left of fiscal year 1972 and that we have been operating on a continuing resolution to take care of the programs which are now in existence.

The primary thrust of this program has been to develop the institutional capability of civil security forces to maintain peace and order so that economic and social development can proceed and the affairs of government can be conducted within a constitutional framework.

By providing this assistance, civil police capabilities have been improved, thus permitting recipient governments to cope with internal disorders in their earliest phases rather than having to use military force when such disorders reach an unmanageable level.

Some police actions have been described as brutal. Many police forces in our own country, likewise, have been accused of police brutality. But the main thrust of this program is to see that the recipient countries have efficient police forces so they can nip insipient disorders in the bud, so they do not have to resort to military force later.

This program has been working very well, and it has been phasing out. During this same period the program level for assistance to 30 countries outside Southeast Asia has been reduced from $7.98 million in 1967 to $5.45 million in fiscal 1972.

Mr. President, we are talking about a very insignificant sum of money—$5.45 million to 23 countries.

Which countries and what amounts are we talking about? For example, for the Congo, $1 million; for Ghana, $106,000; for Liberia, $203,000; for Tunisia, $125,000.

Certainly these countries need to upgrade their police forces.

Likewise, we are appropriating for Jordan, $65,000. For Pakistan, $280,000. For Bolivia, $115,000. For Brazil, $174,000.

So it can be seen that the amounts appropriated for these countries are modest.

To abruptly terminate all assistance to countries other than those in Southeast Asia at this time would be very unwise and could waste a large part of the limited investment already made in those countries.

The expenditure of this amount of money is for equipment, for training, for bringing their people over to take a look at our police forces so they may learn from us, and for sending our technical advisers to these countries. So Senators can see that most of the money appropriated under this program is for expenditures for our technicians, and for foreigners to come to our country to learn what is happening here.

This is particularly true in terms of the major effort now being mounted to attack the worldwide problem of international narcotics control. AID's public safety program will play a key role in the total U.S. Government effort. It is imperative that civil police institutions be strengthened in order that individual country narcotic control laws can be enforced effectively. Specific plans for assistance to various countries are now being formed in coordination with the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs and the Bureau of Customs. Fourteen of these countries are now receiving some type of public safety assistance through AID.

Latin American is also rapidly becoming a major conduit for international narcotics traffic into the United States. Six countries, all in Central America and the Caribbean area and which are now receiving public safety assistance, may also require assistance in narcotics control.

In addition, the Congress has now enacted legislation—section 481 of the Foreign Assistance Act—which authorizes the President to conclude drug control agreements with other countries and to furnish assistance to any country or international organization for drug control purposes.

Mr. President, the significant impact of this restriction would be to force the closing of eight international police academies, where nearly 90 percent of the students expected during fiscal 1972 will come from 23 countries. It will result in the abandonment of public safety efforts to work with any but three countries in Indochina. Such assistance must be authorized in the Foreign Assistance Act and appropriated in part I of the Foreign Assistance and Related Programs Appropriations Act. Therefore, any effort to eliminate public safety activities outside Southeast Asia is contrary to a congressional view expressed so recently.

Opportunities for preventing further spread of international narcotics traffic and growth of related law enforcement

problems cannot be disregarded. Although the United States cannot enforce the narcotics laws of another nation we do have a responsibility to assist in an area of national urgency through training and improved organization under the public safety program.

Mr. President, I think we would be doing a very sad thing if we were to disallow the use of this money for public safety programs. It would be most tragic because the main thrust of this program is to really give to the developing countries a good civil police security force in order to hold down the trafficking in narcotics, to nip subversive elements in the bud, and to protect constitutionally developed and elected governments.

So I oppose the amendment very vigorously, Mr. President.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield me 2 minutes?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, from year to year I have been a very strong supporter of our foreign aid program. I have done so because I have always believed that the effort was made in the spirit of brotherhood, and not in a self-seeking way to promote the prestige or enlarge the image of America throughout the world. We have spent billions of dollars in order to accomplish that.

But I dare say the program that we are talking about now, that has been outlined by the Senator from Hawaii, has been counterproductive. We are talking about a civil police force—First of all, this is a national concern. It is a matter of the sovereignty of the particular nation involved. Those people should furnish their own police forces. They should train their own policemen.

No one is advocating here that they do away with their policemen. All we are saying is, it is not the business of the United States of America to create a police force in any nation to guarantee the tenure of any specific dictator or any particular government. Frankly, in many instances, as the Senator from Arkansas has pointed out, we have been identified as being against a sound reform movement that might be salutary in that particular country.

We have said time and time again that America should not be the policeman of the world, and yet we are policemen by proxy here. I do not see why the United States of America should maintain an international police school. For what purpose? The first thing any nation does to protect its own security is to build up a good, formidable police force. To say that if we withhold this aid these police forces will go out of existence is something I just cannot believe at all. I say very frankly I think this is one part of the foreign aid bill that does irreparable harm to the foreign aid program as a whole.

We have seen instances time and time again where these civil police forces, as they are called here, have really become stormtroopers. We have had our experience with Hitler, who, piecemeal, wanted to suppress this and suppress that. Finally he wound up as a dictator and brought us into World War II.

I say if we are going to cut this foreign aid bill at all, this is the one best place to cut it, and I shall vote for the cut.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 minute.

As I have stated, the amounts of money here are used for the purpose of securing equipment, of sending advisers overseas to teach police work, and to have the students of recipient countries come over and learn some of our police techniques. We are not trying to set up police states in these countries. We are just teaching them advanced methods of civil security and public safety, and that is all we are doing for them.

This work is being phased out. We have operated under the continuing resolution now for approximately 7 months, and we have only 5 months to go. The program outside of Southeast Asia involves around $5 million. It is being phased out, and this is no time for us to cut it.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. FONG. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. The Senator uses the expression that this is for "civil security protection" reasons. What do we mean by that? It certainly is not protection against an invader. It is an internal affair.

Mr. FONG. It is an internal affair.

Mr. PASTORE. Is it our business to get mixed up in it?

Mr. FONG. Many of our programs involve internal affairs. We have gotten into the matter of helping people who are starving and who are sick——

Mr. PASTORE. Oh, but that is a different matter. We want to put food in empty stomachs. I just voted against the Fulbright amendment that would affect the award of money to feed the starving people in Bangladesh. But there is no analogy between food and police.

Mr. FONG. We have sent our advisers over there, and we have brought their people over here, to study educational methods. This is nothing but a question of education.

Mr. PASTORE. That is not the way I have heard it. I have been with this program for a long time, and this is one element of the program with which I have become very weary. I think it is wrong to support this type of program. All that these security guards have been able to do is protect the bastion of authority in their particular State. Any time anyone speaks out against that authority, he goes to jail, sometimes without trial, and America is being blamed for it in many instances.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, as I recall the days and the hours and hours spent in the Foreign Relations Committee——

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. COOPER. During all the time we put in on this measure in the Foreign Relations Committee, to the best of my recollection this subject was not mentioned. I may be in error, but I do not recall it.

I know that this has been referred to as a program which might prevent police brutality. I would like to say it is purely an educational program, in the same way that the FBI trains people, and in the same way as this Congress has appropriated money to assist in training local police. There is evidence of police brutality all over the world, and I am sure it exists in this country. But I think that countries which have systems such as ours, and the more advanced countries in Europe, would be more likely to educate and train these people in ways which would prevent police brutality. I think that is correct.

Also, we are engaged now in a great program throughout the world to try to bring narcotics and drug traffic under control, and this will be one element of the training which will be undertaken. I think many subjects have been discussed here which might be of much more importance, but this is important.

I do not go on the assumption that all our police are brutal. I would think it would be better to train these forces in the use of more humane methods. It is basically an educational program.

I hope the amendment will be defeated.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 5 minutes.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. President, I agree with the sentiments of the Senator from Rhode Island. It reminded me of a rather symbolic experience.

I think one of our first involvements in South Vietnam was a thorough public safety project in which we employed Michigan State University. I believe it is the same university of which the present Administrator of AID was president. We were engaged in teaching them police organization. Mr. Fishel of that school became very friendly with Mr. Diem.

One thing led to another. Diem spent time in the Maryknoll Seminary in New York State and became acquainted with some important figures in this country. He went back and we helped make him president and gave him a police force, and we are still there protecting his people.

It is rather interesting that out of this kind of program grew that very long and intimate connection with South Vietnam.

It is a very important program. It involves us in the internal affairs of many countries. But, for the life of me, I do not understand why the Senator from Hawaii feels that we should become involved in the creation of the local police forces of these countries. I think it now involves 25 countries. It is no small matter.

We already train army officers in more countries than that. We become identified with their police forces and whatever people think of their police forces. We know in this country how popular

police forces are. I support our police forces. But we know that in many parts of this country the police are very controversial. I think it is most unfortunate, but that happens to be human nature. We also have become identified with foreign army officers. We bring thousands—and we have brought tens of thousands—of army officers to this country, to train them.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield myself 1 additional minute. We bring them here to teach them our most modern methods of how to stifle any kind of disorder of insurrection. That, in its proper context, is an essential part of an organized society.

I agree with and I underscore what the Senator from Rhode Island has said. Essential as these activities are to organized society, they are essentially local, and a big country like ours should not inject itself into those activities. We are being accused by our enemies all over the world of being of an imperialistic nature, seeking new and more subtle ways than, say, the British to control every part of the world we can by investments, by training of their military people, by training of their policemen, and other means.

So I think it is against our interests to keep this program in operation. It is not just a matter of money or saving money. It is against our interest.

I want to correct a misapprehension that I think was implicit in a comment just made, that my amendment to the amendment of the Senator from Illinois reduced the amount for the suffering or starving, or what have you, of people. My amendment did not reduce the amount. It only provided that the amount provided should come out of the overall amount in the bill. There was flexibility for the administration to take that amount from other less important activities. I did not want the record to show that I reduced the amount.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. It is a question of how one construes the flexibility. My belief was that it might have to be taken out of a more essential program, and I considered it a limitation in that respect. But I do not pretend for one moment that my heart is any bigger than that of the Senator from Arkansas. I hope he understands that.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I thank the Senator.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. FONG. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time on the amendment has been yielded back.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legisative clerk called the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I announce that the Senator from Georgia (Mr. GAMBRELL), the Senator from Alaska (Mr. GRAVEL), the Senator from Indiana (Mr. HARTKE), the Senator from California (Mr. CRANSTON), the Senator from Iowa (Mr. HUGHES), the Senator from Washington (Mr. JACKSON), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. JORDAN), the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. MCCLELLAN), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. MCGOVERN), the Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. MCINTYRE), the Senator from Utah (Mr. MOSS), the Senator from Maine (Mr. MUSKIE), the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. RANDOLPH), the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. ELLENDER), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CHURCH), and the Senator from Washington (Mr. MAGNUSON) are necessarily absent.

I further announce that the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. MCGEE) and the Senator from Nevada (Mr. CANNON) are on official business.

On this vote, the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. ELLENDER) is paired with the Senator from Washington (Mr. JACKSON).

If present and voting, the Senator from Louisiana would vote "yea" and the Senator from Washington would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. RANDOLPH) is paired with the Senator from Washington (Mr. MAGNUSON).

If present and voting, the Senator from West Virginia would vote "yea" and the Senator from Washington would vote "nay."

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. MCCLELLAN) and the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. MCGOVERN) would vote "yea."

Mr. GRIFFIN. I announce that the Senator from Colorado (Mr. ALLOTT), the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. BAKER), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. BELLMON), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. HATFIELD), the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. HRUSKA), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. JORDAN), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. SAXBE), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. TAFT), the Senator from Texas (Mr. TOWER), and the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. YOUNG) are necessarily absent.

The Senator from South Dakota (Mr. MUNDT) is absent because of illness.

On this vote, the Senator from Oregon (Mr. HATFIELD) is paired with the Senator from Texas (Mr. TOWER). If present and voting, the Senator from Oregon would vote "yea" and the Senator from Texas would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 37, nays 34, as follows:

[No. 34 Leg.]

YEAS—37

Allen	Fulbright	Pell
Anderson	Harris	Proxmire
Bayh	Hollings	Ribicoff
Bentsen	Humphrey	Spong
Bible	Inouye	Stennis
Brooke	Javits	Stevenson
Burdick	Kennedy	Symington
Byrd, Va.	Mansfield	Talmadge
Byrd, W. Va.	Metcalf	Tunney
Chiles	Mondale	Weicker
Cotton	Montoya	Williams
Eagleton	Nelson	
Ervin	Pastore	

NAYS—34

Aiken	Eastland	Pearson
Beall	Fannin	Percy
Bennett	Fong	Roth
Boggs	Goldwater	Schweiker
Brock	Griffin	Scott
Buckley	Gurney	Smith
Case	Hansen	Sparkman
Cook	Hart	Stafford
Cooper	Long	Stevens
Curtis	Mathias	Thurmond
Dole	Miller	
Dominick	Packwood	

NOT VOTING—29

Allott	Hatfield	McIntyre
Baker	Hruska	Moss
Bellmon	Hughes	Mundt
Cannon	Jackson	Muskie
Church	Jordan, N.C.	Randolph
Cranston	Jordan, Idaho	Saxbe
Ellender	Magnuson	Taft
Gambrell	McClellan	Tower
Gravel	McGee	Young
Hartke	McGovern	

So Mr. FULBRIGHT's amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Berry, one of its leading clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 2097) to establish a Special Action Office for Drug Abuse Prevention and to concentrate the resources of the Nation against the problem of drug abuse, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

FOREIGN ASSISTANCE AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS, 1972

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill (H.R. 12067) making appropriations for foreign assistance and related programs for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, and for other purposes.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WEICKER). The clerk will report the amendment.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Arkansas (Mr. FULBRIGHT) proposes an amendment:

On page 2, line 6, strike out "$165,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$140,000,000".

On page 4, lines 11 and 12, strike out "$150,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$100,000,000".

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT—TIME LIMITATION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time on the pending amendment be limited to 20 minutes, the time to be equally divided between the sponsor of the amendment and the ranking minority member.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, although the bill reported by the Appropriations Committee is a far better bill than that passed by the House, it did not reduce the total enough. And now even the committee's modest cuts have been partially offset by the Senate's vote to add $100 million for the Alliance for Progress.

I offer an amendment to reduce the amount for worldwide development loans by $50 million, from $150 to $100 million, and that for worldwide technical assistance by $25 million, from $165 to $140 million.

My amendment would reduce the total in this bill for the regular foreign aid and military sales items, titles I and II, from $2.339 billion to $2.264 billion. This is still $375 million more than Congress appropriated for these same programs in the 1970 fiscal year. I remind my colleagues that in fiscal year 1970 we had a budget deficit of only $13 billion. The official estimate for the administrative budget deficit this fiscal year is $45 billion, and, judging from past experience, likely to go much higher. My amendment will reduce that massive deficit by $75 million.

The new money appropriated by this bill is, by no means, all that will be available for development lending and technical assistance. Repayments on past loans, carryovers and funds from other sources which will be available for new loans under terms of this bill total $281 million, which, when added to the $100 million in new money allowed under my amendment, will make a total of $381 million for loans outside of Latin America. There will also be $15 million more available for technical assistance, to be added to the $140 million in new money proposed by my amendment, making a total of $155 million. I might point out that the administration suspended further lending to India and Pakistan and for those two countries alone $330 million in loans was proposed for this fiscal year. That action should be taken into account in determining how much the Senate provides for the loan program.

As of December 31, 1971, only $59 million has been obligated for development loans under the continuing resolution authority. At this rate the $281 million that would be available under my amendment will last, not just for the rest of this year, but for another 2 years. And, as for technical assistance, only $95 million was committed in the first half of the fiscal year. My amendment would, thus, require only a slight cutback in the current spending rate. There is no reason whatsoever for glutting the foreign aid pipeline further.

I call attention, also, to the fact that the committee has included a separate item of $125 million for population activities, which have heretofore been funded out of the development lending and technical assistance programs. In effect, this action frees $125 million in loans and grants that would otherwise be used only for population activities. My amendment will reduce these programs to reflect, at least partially, this change in the source of funding.

Mr. President, I do hope that the Senate will support this very modest reduction in these two items.

Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Hawaii is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, I oppose this amendment very vigorously.

The amendment would reduce the amount of the worldwide technical assistance from $165 million, which the Appropriations Committee has recommended, to $140 million.

The amount in 1971 was $166,750,000.

The budget estimate requested by the administration was for $232,929,000. The authorization was $175 million.

This is the authorization which was just passed last week.

The continuing resolution which we have been operating under for the past 6 or 7 months was $165,272,000. The committee recommended $165 million. This amendment would reduce that by $25 million.

Mr. President, when the President of the United States recommended that we follow the Nixon doctrine in our worldwide policy, he told us in no uncertain terms that we must provide more technical assistance to our allies and friends. Instead of providing more assistance to our allies and friends, this amendment would cut down the technical assistance that will be given to our allies and friends at a time when we are reducing our military assistance to them, we say, "You must take care of yourselves militarily. We will give you all the help we can to bolster your economy to see that you remain viable." This amendment on the other hand would cut down the amount so that we will be offering these countries, after we withdraw from these countries militarily and in many other ways, less than we have been offering them previously.

As I have said, in fiscal 1971, we appropriated $166 million. The amendment seeks to reduce that amount to $140 million, whereas the committee had agreed on a sum of $165 million. The other part of the amendment deals with the Development Loan Fund, on which we have agreed on $150 million. The amendment seeks to reduce that amount by $50 million, or to $100 million.

I invite the Senate's attention to the fact that the fiscal 1971 appropriation—that is, the appropriation last year—was for $420 million. The budget estimate as presented by the administration was for $400 million. The authorization was for $250 million. We have been operating under a continuing resolution providing $550,779,000. The House appropriation on this item was $250 million, and the Senate has cut the House appropriation by $100 million. This amendment seeks to cut the House appropriation by another $50 million.

In other words, this amendment, if agreed to, will gut the Development Loan Fund appropriation, and we will be unable to make loans which I believe have been negotiated and which we have committed ourselves to make.

This amendment, like all other amendments, again seeks to cut down, so that our program will be ineffective in our worldwide commitments as to what we can do to strengthen the economy and viability of the countries that need help.

I ask Senators to reject the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Do Senators yield back the remainder of their time?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. FONG. I yield back the rest of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has been yielded back. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The second assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I announce that the Senator from Georgia (Mr. GAMBRELL), the Senator from Alaska (Mr. GRAVEL), the Senator from Indiana (Mr. HARTKE), the Senator from California (Mr. CRANSTON), the Senator from Iowa (Mr. HUGHES), the Senator from Washington (Mr. JACKSON), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. JORDAN), the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. MCCLELLAN), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. MCGOVERN), the Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. MCINTYRE), the Senator from Utah (Mr. MOSS), the Senator from Maine (Mr. MUSKIE), the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. RANDOLPH), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CHURCH), the Senator from Washington (Mr. MAGNUSON), and the Senator from Georgia (Mr. TALMADGE) are necessarily absent.

I further announce that the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. MCGEE) and the Senator from Nevada (Mr. CANNON) are absent because of official business.

On this vote, the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. MCGOVERN) is paired with the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. RANDOLPH).

If present and voting, the Senator from South Dakota would vote "nay" and the Senator from West Virginia would vote "yea."

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Washington (Mr. MAGNUSON) and the Senator from Washington (Mr. JACKSON) would each vote "nay."

Mr. GRIFFIN. I announce that the Senator from Colorado (Mr. ALLOTT), the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. BAKER), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. BELLMON), the Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. COTTON), the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. HANSEN), the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. HRUSKA), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. JORDAN), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. SAXBE), the

Senator from Ohio (Mr. TAFT), the Senator from Texas (Mr. TOWER), and the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. YOUNG) are necessarily absent.

The Senator from South Dakota (Mr. MUNDT) is absent because of illness.

If present and voting, the Senator from Ohio (Mr. TAFT) and the Senator from Texas (Mr. TOWER) would each vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 29, nays 41, as follows:

[No. 35 Leg.]

YEAS—29

Allen	Eastland	Montoya
Anderson	Ellender	Nelson
Bentsen	Ervin	Pastore
Bible	Fulbright	Pell
Burdick	Gurney	Proxmire
Byrd, Va.	Hart	Spong
Byrd, W. Va.	Hollings	Stennis
Chiles	Inouye	Symington
Cook	Long	Thurmond
Eagleton	Mansfield	

NAYS—41

Aiken	Fong	Percy
Bayh	Goldwater	Ribicoff
Beall	Griffin	Roth
Bennett	Harris	Schweiker
Boggs	Hatfield	Scott
Brock	Humphrey	Smith
Brooke	Javits	Sparkman
Buckley	Kennedy	Stafford
Case	Mathias	Stevens
Cooper	Metcalf	Stevenson
Curtis	Miller	Tunney
Dole	Mondale	Weicker
Dominick	Packwood	Williams
Fannin	Pearson	

NOT VOTING—30

Allott	Hartke	McIntyre
Baker	Hruska	Moss
Bellmon	Hughes	Mundt
Cannon	Jackson	Muskie
Church	Jordan, N.C.	Randolph
Cotton	Jordan, Idaho	Saxbe
Cranston	Magnuson	Taft
Gambrell	McClellan	Talmadge
Gravel	McGee	Tower
Hansen	McGovern	Young

So Mr. FULBRIGHT'S amendment was rejected.

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was rejected.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, on Wednesday I introduced an amendment to the foreign assistance appropriation bill which increased the amount for the Alliance for Progress Development Loan from $50,000,000 to $150,000,000. In my haste to submit the amendment for consideration, I inadvertently left out the distinguished Senator from Minnesota (Mr. HUMPHREY) as an original cosponsor. I, therefore, ask unanimous consent that Senator HUMPHREY be listed as a cosponsor on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CALIFORNIAN SERVES ETHIOPIA

Mr. TUNNEY. Mr. President, in authorizing and appropriating funds for the Agency for International Development, Congress has critically appraised the Agency, its purposes, its functions, and its effectiveness. This is our continuing responsibility to the citizens of this country. A number of us have urged our colleagues to continue their commitment to encourage economic and social development of the lesser developed countries.

I recently had the opportunity to visit with a constituent of mine, Daniel J. O'Laughlin, of San Leandro, on his return from 5 months' work with credit cooperatives in Ethiopia, and what I learned has only reinforced my conviction that development funds, some of which AID is channeling increasingly through and to private organizations, are are a wise and useful expenditure of the taxpayers' dollars.

I understand that the Ethiopian credit cooperatives themselves initiated this particular project. There are only 11 of them, and they have been loosely organized in the Ethiopian National Thrift and Credit Promotion Committee, with headquarters in Addis Ababa. Through Catholic Relief Services, the committee had secured funds to hire its first employee, a fieldman, whose responsibilities were to train the directors, treasurers, and committee members of these credit cooperatives.

Last spring the committee asked Volunteer Development Corps, headquartered here in Washington, to send an experienced volunteer to work with the committee's fieldman and to train him on-the-job in his responsibilities. VDC is funded partly with contributions from United States and overseas cooperatives and partly with a grant from AID. On the recommendation of Credit Union National Association and the World Council of Credit Unions, VDC asked Mr. O'Laughlin to volunteer his services to help the committee.

Mr. O'Laughlin is ideally qualified for this assignment. He holds a bachelor of science degree in business administration from St. Mary's College near Oakland (1963) and a master of science degree in business administration from Golden Gate College in San Francisco (1971). As a Peace Corps volunteer in Ghana in 1967–70, he had helped organize credit unions and a national credit union federation. Afterward, the World Council of Credit Unions asked him to help reorganize two large community credit unions in Liberia, and following his return to the United States, under the direction of California Credit Union League, Mr. O'Laughlin organized credit unions among low-income families in the San Francisco Bay area.

I understand that CUNA granted Mr. O'Laughlin leave with pay, and that as a VDC volunteer he went to Ethiopia in August to train the committee's first employee and to help the committee standardize accounting and other forms. VDC provided his travel to Ethiopia, his lodging, meals, and clothing care. The committee provided his travel within the country, a place to work, and secretarial assistance.

VDC had originally intended he stay 3 months. Indeed, VDC asks none of its volunteers to serve a longer assignment. However, I am advised that before these 3 months were up, the committee asked Mr. O'Laughlin to stay 2 months more: first, to organize and conduct a training seminar for leaders of potential, as well as existing, credit cooperatives and second, to help organize a permanent, dues-paying league of Ethiopian credit unions that can take its place in the African confederation of thrift and credit societies and in the World Council of Credit Unions. He agreed. In his 5 months of volunteer service, Mr. O'Laughlin feels that he saw these objectives achieved.

As a result of the seminar, Mr. O'Laughlin told me, the Ethiopians understand that they have the knowledge and skill to operate their own credit and thrift societies and that they can generate through the savings of even their very poor members most of the loanable funds these societies require.

Mr. President, I draw certain conclusions from Mr. O'Laughlin's experience that may be useful in our continuing evaluation of the Agency for International Development and its annual appropriations.

First, both in title V and title IX of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, Congress has directed the Agency to use cooperatives as a means of assuring maximum participation of the people of the developing countries in their own economic development. My constituent's assignment in Ethiopia indicates that the Agency is carrying out the policy of Congress.

Second, I am glad to see the Agency grant funds to an organization like Volunteer Development Corps that encourages U.S. citizens to volunteer their talents and experience to help people of the lesser developed countries move forward economically. The volunteer spirit has contributed tremendously to America's development—in our schools, in our churches, in our communities, in our politics, in our cooperatives and credit unions, and in many other organized aspects of our daily life. This volunteer spirit is a foundation of our greatness as a nation, and I am glad AID encourages it.

Third, my constituent's experience indicates that the Agency's funding of direct, cooperative-to-cooperative assistance is a wise and effective use of its resources. A private organization in Ethiopia requested help of a private organization in the United States, and the U.S. organization provided it. Neither our Government nor the Ethiopian Government was involved, except as Mr. O'Laughlin and the committee chose to involve them. Congress knows the Ethiopians wanted this help, because they asked for it and because they committed certain resources. It was not something foisted upon them, not something provided because an official in Addis Ababa or Washington felt these people ought to have it.

Fourth, by using organizations such as Volunteer Development Corps, the Agency can maximize the usefulness of its appropriated dollars. For United States and overseas cooperatives contribute substantially to VDC's administrative costs. U.S. cooperative technicians volunteer their services, either as retirees or as employees on leave with pay. The overseas cooperative itself must provide some services. And VDC's sponsoring organizations contribute the

time and talents of their top officials to VDC's administration.

These sponsoring organizations include Agricultural Cooperative Development International of Washington, D.C., American Institute of Cooperation of Washington, D.C., Credit Union National Association of Madison, Wis., Foundation for Cooperative Housing of Washington, D.C., League Insurance Group of Detroit, National Council of Farmer Cooperatives of Washington, D.C., and National Rural Electric Cooperative Association of Washington, D.C.

I commend to my colleagues the experience of my constituent, Mr. O'Laughlin. It indicates at least one of the directions we should move if our annual appropriations for overseas development are to be increasingly useful and effective.

THE PEACE CORPS

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, as a member of the Senate Appropriations Committee, I fully support our recommendation for an appropriation of $77.2 million to finance Peace Corps operations for this fiscal year. This is the full amount authorized earlier by the Senate and the minimum needed in my judgment to sustain and support this operation at this time.

I strongly urge each of my colleagues to join in support of this modest, but vitally needed, appropriation.

At this point in the fiscal year, any lesser amount would require the Peace Corps to begin immediately calling back large numbers of volunteers working overseas and to withdraw its participation in programs it has pledged to support in several countries.

Already the Peace Corps has taken drastic steps to comply with the temporary spending authorization imposed by the Congress last month: including suspending any further invitations to the increasing number of Americans wishing to join the Peace Corps. And this had to be done at a time when applications are running 40 percent higher than a year ago; higher, in fact, than at any other time in the past 5 years.

We again see a paradox in the sense of priorities of some who would deprive a program that has long since proven its value and that enjoys wide public support, of the relatively small amount of money it needs to operate effectively. Not only do we remove a measure of hope which the Peace Corps represents to the people of developing countries, but we also deny an opportunity to serve in a practical manner to the many idealistic Americans of all ages and backgrounds who desire this opportunity.

From my own State of Illinois, alone, there are now 443 men and women serving in such countries as Fiji, Tunisia, India, Malaysia, and Liberia, helping the people of these countries to improve their schools, increase their agricultural production, reduce disease, and generally build the basis for a more peaceful world society. Their work is vital—not only to the people of those countries—who see the volunteer as representing the concerns of all Americans for the betterment of their lives—but equally to the individual volunteer who finds purpose in helping others. It is significant to note that the most recent sampling of public opinion concerning the Peace Corps showed that 93 percent of Americans feel that volunteers become "more useful citizens" as a result of their service.

Probably no Member of the Senate has visited more Peace Corps volunteers in the field over the past decade than I, having been privileged to study Peace Corps volunteers at work in many countries of Latin America, Asia, and Africa. I can personally vouch for their devotion and energy under conditions of severe hardship. They ask but little and they receive but little; but they give of themselves a great deal. Teaching and working, many times in remote inaccessible villages; many times they are out of contact with developed civilization for months on end.

But these dedicated volunteers will return to our country with a far better understanding of the world in which we live and will be far better equipped to contribute constructively to our own country.

I know of no better investment that we can make abroad. I hope that my colleagues will join with me in a strong vote of confidence for one of the finest overseas efforts that our country has ever undertaken.

Mr. TUNNEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD some remarks prepared for delivery by my colleague from California, with three editorials which he asks to have included with his remarks.

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

STATEMENT OF SENATOR CRANSTON

Mr. President, I know this body is aware, the Peace Corps is one of America's finest contributions to international understanding and goodwill. I myself had the privilege of being associated with the Peace Corps as an evaluator in November, 1965. It would be tragic if, as a result of Congressional logjams over Foreign Assistance Act funding, the Peace Corps were to have no alternative except to bring home half its 8,000 volunteers and shut down its operations in 15 countries.

That, however, might very well be the unfortunate consequence if the Peace Corps were to receive an appropriation of $72 million, the annual rate at which it is currently authorized to spend under the continuing resolution. That must not be allowed to happen.

I do not mean to take issue with the Foreign Relations Committee action which led to the reduction of the Peace Corps' FY 1972 appropriation of $5 million less than was requested by the administration. I have the greatest respect for Chairman Fulbright, and I know that he and the Committee very carefully studied the Peace Corps program and its ability to economize before recommending the reduced authorization figure. However, the Peace Corps is confronted with the virtually impossible task of attempting in the last half of this fiscal year to make up for a cut of some $10 million from the basic level of spending under which it was operating—quite properly—for the bulk of the first half of this fiscal year. To achieve such an enormous net annual reduction would force something like an across-the-board 25% slash in spending in the last half of this fiscal year—one month of which is already past.

It is not the fault of the volunteers serving overseas and the host countries which they are serving that the Congress has been so delinquent in passing the Foreign Assistance Appropriations Act. Yet, it is exactly those volunteers and the host country nationals with whom they serve that will be sorely penalized if anything less than the full authorziation is appropriated for the Peace Corps. Programs have been planned and promised, host country decisions have been made in reliance on those plans and promises, and volunteers have unselfishly dedicated a portion of their lives—and, in some instances, health and safety—to carry out these programs and meet our international commitments.

It would be a foolhardy economy effort to reduce Peace Corps funds by a few million dollars at the very real risk of purchasing international bad will of an incalculable dollar value. Everything possible must be done to prevent reduction of the appropriation below $77.5 million.

California continues to lead the nation in the number of its citizens, young and old, who have joined the Peace Corps to lend their talents and skills to the people of developing countries. At present, 1,214 of the Peace Corps volunteers and trainees are Californians. That is 15 percent of the worldwide total. California has contributed by far the largest number of volunteers from any one state—as has been the case throughout the Peace Corps' history. Since the Peace Corps was founded in 1961, more than 8,000 Californians have served as volunteers.

Across the nation, as in California, Americans who want to help others are turning to the Peace Corps. Applications are at a five-year high. It would be folly for us now to close the door on those who wish to serve, and to deny their aid to the nations that seek their help.

Therefore, I congratulate the Appropriations Committee for its full funding recommendation of $77.2 million and urge the Senate to approve the full amount. Then it is absolutely essential that the Senate conferees hold firm to the full $77.2 million figure as the expression of the Senate's high regard and strong commitment to the Peace Corps.

[Editorial from the San Jose Mercury, Jan. 13, 1972]

PEACE CORPS IS WORTH SAVING

Congressional wrangling over funding for the Peace Corps has just about put that agency out of business. It would be a disservice to America—and the world—to let the Peace Corps die.

However, unless a House-Senate conference committee can agree on a $77.2 million budget for the agency within a few weeks, the Peace Corps will begin terminating 4,000 of its 8,000 volunteers. Programs may be cancelled in as many as 15 underdeveloped nations.

The Peace Corps was one of the brighter products of a generally dismal decade, the Sixties. It would be too bad if the Peace Corps were to be allowed to die just as the Seventies are getting under way.

[Editorial from the Press-Telegram, Long Beach, Calif., Jan. 14, 1972]

AN UNWISE ECONOMY

Congress has so far refused to give the Peace Corps the $82-million appropriation requested by President Nixon.

As a result, the corps is planning to recall 4,000 of its 8,000 volunteers and to cancel programs in as many as 15 countries. Applicants for Peace Corps service are still being accepted, but no new volunteers will be signed up before July 1 unless Congress acts to restore funds for the agency.

Few American government efforts abroad have met with anything like the success of the Peace Corps. Under Democrats and Re-

publicans alike, it has proved the United States to be a good neighbor around the world.

It would be tragic if the Peace Corps were to become the victim of quarrels in Congress over foreign aid. The House of Representatives appropriated only $68 million for the corps, although both houses had passed an authorization bill setting the level of Peace Corps financing at $77.2 million. In the last hour before it adjourned, Congress passed a resolution to give the Peace Corps a budget of $72 million.

That budget level is not adequate to sustain present corps activities. Joseph H. Blatchford, director of ACTION, the agency that oversees the Peace Corps, says the planned cuts will have to take effect unless Congress appropriates at least the full $77.2 million it had earlier approved.

Congress should do at least that. The corps has little more than half of the number of volunteers it had during its peak years in the 1960's. Rather than let it fall victim to a new isolationism, Congress should provide funds and encouragement for the Peace Corps to continue and expand.

[Editorial from the Los Angeles Times, Jan. 20, 1972]

PEACE CORPS FUNDING

The Peace Corps was not the least casualty of the congressional assault on the foreign aid bill late last year. President Nixon had asked $82 million to continue and expand the work of the overseas agency. The Senate authorized, but did not appropriate, $77.2 million. The House voted only $68 million. A final figure has yet to be decided by a conference committee. Meanwhile, uncertainty over how well it will be funded has forced the corps to halt all new recruitment and prepare plans for dropping half of its 8,000 members.

Such an action would be a misfortune for the United States, as most members of Congress agree. The Peace Corps continues to get good marks in both the House and Senate. The problem is that its budget became a victim of the anger, frustration and confusion which marked the general attack on foreign aid funds. Ironically, the threat to the Peace Corps comes at a time when an increasing number of persons are eager to serve in it, and when its popularity in foreign lands seems especially high.

The Peace Corps is too valuable an instrument of American foreign policy to be downgraded. Congress should assure it adequate funding through support for the Senate's $77.2 million authorization, and soon enough so that the drastic cutbacks threatened by delay can be cancelled.

[Appendix I]

PEACE CORPS OUTLINE OF "BUDGET CRISIS" FACTS

I. *Why a "crisis":* Peace Corps' current budget situation constitutes a genuine "crisis" for three major reasons:

1. *The slow pace of Congressional appropriation action.* We are now in the 7th month of the fiscal year. Peace Corps does not have an appropriation. The sequence of Congressional actions—and Peace Corps' response to the needs established by each step—were as follows:

The President's June 1971 amended FY 1972 budget request to Congress—*$82.2 million*—was the level of spending authorized by Congress in July, via a "continuing resolution."

Peace Corps spending in the first quarter of the fiscal year was, correctly, at this $82.2 million rate ($20.5 million).

Last October Congress approved a new, lower spending "authorization" at $77.2 million for the FY.

Peace Corps quickly and rigorously cut spending rates. Heavy reductions were made in staff, operating budgets world-wide were cut to barest operating minimums.

However, the 2nd quarter (Oct., Nov., Dec.) spending rate did not reflect savings from these decisions. This is because Peace Corps' budget is a "people" budget (no large grants made; no heavy spending for large equipment, etc.). There is a necessary time lag between the announcement of personnel reductions and the departure of personnel/actual cost savings.

In December, Congress set a still lower temporary annual spending rate for Peace Corps, of $72.0 million via still another "continuing resolution." This was apparently the result of a temporary compromise between the House appropriation figure passed at $68.0 million, and the $77.2 million authorization figure.

2. *The "magnificent effect" of a reduction in annual* budget, which occurs if *all* of the reduction must be taken during the last few months of the year.

As an example of this principle, a 10% reduction in *annual* budget has the *effect* of a 40% reduction in operation, if the whole amount must be taken in the *last quarter.*

Similarly, let us suppose that Peace Corps appropriation for FY '72 is passed at a low level of $72.0 million. This would be a 12% reduction from the President's June '71 request for $82.2 million, on an *annualized* basis. However, the reductions required in the last three months of the year (fiscal year) to *come in at* $72.0 million would mean a 37% *reduction* in operations during those months.

Thus, even though Peace Corps had acted dutifully in response to each *prior* cut, it would face the need to concentrate *all* of any *further* cut into a short end-of-the-year period, with consequent profound difficulty.

3. *The absence of "Fat" in Peace Corps now.* The fall, 1971 reductions trimmed Peace Corps "admin" capacities to the irreducible minimum.

The only remaining way to save money is by cutting overseas programs. This means disrupting ongoing programs in overseas countries, by bringing volunteers home in the *middle* of their tours of duty, just when their effectiveness is beginning to peak.

II. *How the Crisis can be Resolved*: The necessary steps are:

(1) When the Congress reconvenes, the Senate must appropriate at the $77.2 *million* level; and

(2) In the House-Senate *conference,* the Senate must *sustain* its $77.2 million position.

The danger is that some sort of compromise might be accepted by the Senate Conferees, between the Senate (potential) $77.2, and the House appropriation figure of $68.0. If such compromise were to occur, Peace Corps programs would be the victim.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending business remain the pending business until disposed of.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I would like to have a short colloquy with the Senator from Wisconsin to clarify the effect of the item of $125 million for population programs which appears on page 2, lines 22 through 24.

This is the first time that there has been a separate appropriation item for population programs. In the past this work has been financed through the earmarking of funds from, primarily, the loan and technical assistance programs. The authorization bill for fiscal 1972 earmarks $125 million for that purpose, the same as the individual appropriation item in this bill. But the House appropriation bill contained only $50 million for this item and, in the normal course of events, the conferees will probably agree on an amount somewhere in between.

Yet, in my opinion, the language in the authorization act will still control. It reads: "Of the funds provided to carry out the provision of part I," of the Foreign Assistance Act, "for each of the fiscal years 1972 and 1973, $125,000,000 shall be available in each such fiscal year only to carry out the purposes of this title," meaning the title authorizing population control programs. The Foreign Relations Committee wanted to insure that at least this sum would be devoted to the population problem.

Does the Senator agree that this language in the authorization act is still controlling and that, regardless of the amount of the appropriation item that is finally agreed to in conference, a total of $125 million must be used by AID for population activities in this fiscal year?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Arkansas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas has already used 2 minutes.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield the Senator 2 additional minutes.

Mr. President, it is my understanding that the intention of the Appropriations Committee in providing $125 million for population control was that that amount should be available for population control exclusively. As the Senator points out, there is only $50 million for this item in the House bill. But regardless of how the conferees compromise on this amount the full $125 million will be available for population control, because of the controlling language in the authorization bill. If necessary, it would have to be taken from other funds, but it would certainly be available, and for population control.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I thank the Senator. That was my understanding, and I appreciate that clarification.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks a current military assistance program table, with those few items which have been classified deleted, simply to illustrate the extent of our continued support of military regimes in so many different countries.

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

GRANT MILITARY ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

	Undelivered balance Mar. 31, 1971	Program fiscal year 1971	Illustrative program fiscal year 1972
Latin America:			
Argentina	$494,000	$801,000	$897,000
Bolivia	837,000	825,000	666,000
Brazil	2,656,000	906,000	892,000
Chile	2,236,000	803,000	856,000
Colombia	1,783,000	972,000	844,000
Dominican Republic	1,686,000	759,000	539,000
Ecuador	760,000	763,000	645,000
El Salvador	509,000	415,000	374,000
Guatemala	493,000	543,000	336,000
Honduras	594,000	403,000	467,000
Mexico	23,000	87,000	107,000
Nicaragua	354,000	583,000	568,000
Panama	150,000	258,000	173,000
Paraguay	645,000	419,000	387,000
Peru	1,428,000	697,000	792,000
Uruguay	693,000	521,000	400,000
Venezuela	265,000	933,000	734,000
Regional military costs	101,000	438,000	191,000
Total, Latin America	15,706,000	11,126,000	9,868,000
Africa:			
Congo (Kinshasa)	196,000	440,000	477,000
Ethiopia	11,593,000	12,000,000	12,790,000
Ghana	13,000	53,000	50,000
Liberia	290,000	513,000	500,000
Libya	1,000		
Morocco	806,000	801,000	
Mali			27,000
Nigeria	53,000	200,000	100,000
Senegal		48,000	50,000
Tunisia	2,377,000	4,480,000	
Regional military costs	12,000	50,000	100,000
Total, Africa	15,340,000	18,585,000	19,009,000
Europe:			
Austria		8,000	6,000
Denmark	754,000		
Norway	205,000		
Portugal	2,338,000	1,035,000	1,000,000
Spain	$38,051,000	$25,000,000	$13,000,000
Regional military costs	503,000	193,000	57,000
Total, Europe	41,851,000	26,243,000	14,082,000
Near East and South Asia:			
Afghanistan	50,000	200,000	250,000
Ceylon	144,000		
Greece	41,068,000	20,000,000	19,875,000
India	2,915,000	220,000	300,000
Iran	8,883,000	2,433,000	942,000
Jordan	9,599,000	30,164,000	
Lebanon	303,000	5,070,000	(220,000)
Nepal	11,000	13,000	26,000
Pakistan	44,000	220,000	85,000
Saudi Arabia	170,000	674,000	
Turkey	155,337,000	100,000,000	99,770,000
Regional military costs	5,000	17,000	19,000
Total, Near East and South Asia	218,529,000	159,011,000	167,000,000
East Asia and Pacific:			
Burma	854,000	66,000	
Cambodia	106,551,000	185,000,000	200,000,000
China (Taiwan)	34,194,000	20,017,000	19,500,000
Indonesia	12,431,000	17,996,000	24,990,000
Korea	243,673,000	290,802,000	239,400,000
Malaysia	57,000	224,000	134,000
Philippines	27,214,000	16,996,000	17,000,000
Regional military costs	64,000	99,000	76,000
Total East Asia and Pacific	425,037,000	531,200,000	501,100,000
Subtotal regional and country programs			711,059,000
Classified countries			
Nonregional	44,468,000	28,835,000	20,441,000
Grand total	760,931,000	775,000,000	731,500,000

Note: Area totals may not add due to rounding.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, will someone yield me 5 minutes in opposition to the bill?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I yield the Senator 5 minutes on the bill.

Mr. ERVIN. When I had the privilege of being a student at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, I sat at the feet of a very wise professor of geology, Collier Cobb, who remarked on on occasion that wise men learn by the experience of others and fools learn by their own experience, but the majority of mankind learn neither by the experience of others nor by their own.

I would have to say that those who have created and managed the fiscal policies of the United States during late years certainly fall into this third category. Shakespeare warned us through one of the characters in Hamlet:

> Neither a borrower nor a lender be, for borrowing dulls the edge of husbandry, and loan oft loses both itself and friend.

Our country has lost many loans and friends in scattering the patrimony of our people among 125 foreign nations. Those who administer our financial affairs do not seem able to understand, despite our said experience in this respect, that "loan oft loses both itself and friend." We have spent approximately $140 billion as the principal in foreign aid programs. Since virtually every penny of this money was obtained by deficit financing, the cost of our foreign aid program in interest on the money we have obtained by this deficit financing has run to more than $100 billion additional.

In other words. the United States has persistently borrowed money to give it away and the end of this folly is not in sight. If an individual were to borrow money to give it away, his family and his friends would institute an inquisition in lunacy and procure the appointment of a guardian to manage his affairs. But if an American politician advocates borrowing money to give it away, he is likely to be elected President, or Senator or Member of the House of Representatives. If he does not attain any of these offices, he is almost certain to become Secretary of State.

I rise to make these remarks and to express the hope that sometime the United States will regain a small amount of fiscal sanity and exercise a small amount of fiscal responsibility. I must confess, however, that this hope is rather forlorn. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield for a question?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I am happy to yield.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Would the Senator from Wisconsin tell the Senate the total amount of the bill upon which the Senate will now vote, as amended by the Senate?

Mr. PROXMIRE. As amended by the Senate, the total amount would be $3,073,635,000.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. If the Senator will yield me 1 minute, I will point out——

Mr. PROXMIRE. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. That that is more than the authorization bill of $2,914,870,000 that the Senate voted down on October 29. Although the items are somewhat different, the total dollar figure in today's appropriation bill is $159 million greater than the total dollar figure which the Senate voted down on October 29, 1971.

Mr. President, it seems to me, in determining our generosity to foreign countries, that we must have in mind our own financial situation at home. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a table showing our financial situation.

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

DEFICITS IN FEDERAL FUNDS AND INTEREST ON THE NATIONAL DEBT, 1954-73 INCLUSIVE

[Billions of dollars]

	Receipts	Outlays	Surplus (+) or deficit (−)	Debt interest
1954	62.8	65.9	−3.1	6.4
1955	58.1	62.3	−4.2	6.4
1956	65.4	63.8	+1.6	6.8
1957	68.8	67.1	+1.7	7.2
1958	66.6	69.7	−3.1	7.6
1959	65.8	77.0	−11.2	7.6
1960	75.7	74.9	+.8	9.2
1961	75.2	79.3	−1.4	9.0
1962	79.7	86.6	−6.9	9.1
1963	83.6	90.1	−6.5	9.9
1964	87.2	95.8	−8.6	10.7
1965	90.9	94.8	−3.9	11.4
1966	101.4	106.5	−5.1	12.0
1967	111.8	126.8	−15.0	13.4
1968	114.7	143.1	−28.4	14.6
1969	143.3	148.8	−5.5	16.6
1970	143.2	156.3	−13.2	19.3
1971	133.7	163.7	−30.0	20.8
1972 [1]	137.8	182.5	−44.7	21.2
1973 [1]	150.6	186.8	−36.2	22.3
20-year total	1,916.3	2,141.8	225.5	241.5

[1] Estimated figures.

Source: Office of Management and Budget and Treasury Department.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Do the Senators yield back the remainder of their time?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WEICKER). All remaining time having expired or yielded back, and the bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass? On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. BROCK (after having voted in the negative). On this vote I have a pair with the Senator from Texas (Mr. TOWER). If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea." If I were permitted to vote, I would vote "nay." I therefore withdraw my vote.

Mr. LONG (after having voted in the affirmative). On this vote I have a pair with the senior Senator from Georgia (Mr. TALMADGE). If he were present and voting, he would vote "nay." If I were permitted to vote, I would vote "yea." I therefore withdraw my vote.

Mr. INOUYE (after voting in the affirmative). On this vote I have a pair with the Senator from Georgia (Mr. GAMBRELL). If he were present and voting, he would vote "nay." If I were permitted to vote, I would vote "yea." I therefore withdraw my vote.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I announce that the Senator from California (Mr. CRANSTON), the Senator from Indiana (Mr. HARTKE), the Senator from Alaska (Mr. GRAVEL), the Senator from Iowa (Mr. HUGHES), the Senator from Washington (Mr. JACKSON), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. JORDAN), the Senator from Washington (Mr. MAGNUSON), the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. MCCLELLAN), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. MCGOVERN), the Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. MCINTYRE), the Senator from Utah (Mr. MOSS), the Senator from Maine (Mr. MUSKIE), the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. RANDOLPH), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. GAMBRELL), and the Senator from Georgia (Mr. TALMADGE), are necessarily absent.

I further announce that the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. MCGEE), and the Senator from Nevada (Mr. CANNON) are absent because of official business.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Washington (Mr. MAGNUSON) would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Washington (Mr. JACKSON) is paired with the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. JORDAN).

If present and voting, the Senator from Washington would vote "yea" and the Senator from North Carolina would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Iowa (Mr. HUGHES) is paired with the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. RANDOLPH).

If present and voting, the Senator from Iowa would vote "yea" and the Senator from West Virginia would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. MCGOVERN) is paired with the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. MCCLELLAN).

If present and voting, the Senator from South Dakota would vote "yea" and the Senator from Arkansas would vote "nay."

Mr. GRIFFIN. I announce that the Senator from Colorado (Mr. ALLOTT), the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. BAKER), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. BELLMON), the Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. COTTON), the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. HANSEN), the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. HRUSKA), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. JORDAN), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. SAXBE), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. TAFT), the Senator from Texas (Mr. TOWER), and the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. YOUNG) are necessarily absent.

The Senator from South Dakota (Mr. MUNDT) is absent because of illness.

If present and voting, the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. HRUSKA) would vote "nay."

The pair of the Senator from Texas (Mr. TOWER) has been previously announced.

On this vote, the Senator from Colorado (Mr. ALLOTT), is paired with the Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. COTTON). If present and voting, the Senator from Colorado would vote "yea" and the Senator from New Hampshire would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Ohio (Mr. TAFT) is paired with the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. HANSEN). If present and voting, the Senator from Ohio would vote "yea" and the Senator from Wyoming would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 45, nays 23, as follows:

[No. 36 Leg.]

YEAS—45

Aiken	Fong	Percy
Anderson	Griffin	Proxmire
Bayh	Harris	Ribicoff
Beall	Hart	Roth
Bennett	Humphrey	Schweiker
Bentsen	Javits	Scott
Boggs	Kennedy	Smith
Brooke	Mathias	Sparkman
Buckley	Miller	Stafford
Case	Mondale	Stevens
Chiles	Nelson	Stevenson
Cooper	Packwood	Thurmond
Dole	Pastore	Tunney
Dominick	Pearson	Weicker
Eagleton	Pell	Williams

NAYS—23

Allen	Eastland	Hollings
Bible	Ellender	Mansfield
Burdick	Ervin	Metcalf
Byrd, Va.	Fannin	Montoya
Byrd, W. Va.	Fulbright	Spong
Church	Goldwater	Stennis
Cook	Gurney	Symington
Curtis	Hatfield	

PRESENT AND GIVING LIVE PAIRS, AS PREVIOUSLY RECORDED—3

Brock, against.
Long, for.
Inouye, for.

NOT VOTING—29

Allott	Hruska	Moss
Baker	Hughes	Mundt
Bellmon	Jackson	Muskie
Cannon	Jordan, N.C.	Randolph
Cotton	Jordan, Idaho	Saxbe
Cranston	Magnuson	Taft
Gambrell	McClellan	Talmadge
Gravel	McGee	Tower
Hansen	McGovern	Young
Hartke	McIntyre	

So the bill (H.R. 12067) was passed.

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the bill was passed be reconsidered.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist on its amendments and request a conference with the House of Representatives thereon, and that the Chair be authorized to appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer (Mr. WEICKER) appointed Mr. PROXMIRE, Mr. MCGEE, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. MCCLELLAN, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. FONG, Mr. BROOKE, and Mr. YOUNG conferees on the part of the Senate.

EXTENSION OF DATE FOR TRANSMISSION OF A COMMITTEE REPORT

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I send a joint resolution to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration. It has been cleared on both sides.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, may we have order in the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will please come to order. Senators not participating in this discussion will please take their seats or retire to the cloakroom.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, with all respect, would the Chair withhold his ruling?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The ruling is withheld.

Mr. JAVITS. I wish to state that it was understood the EEOC bill would immediately follow the measure which has just been passed. I have no objection whatever to this joint resolution, but I wish to preserve our rights respecting the bill.

I will not object, but I wish to note that I understood the EEOC bill would be taken up immediately following adoption of the resolution.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if the Senator from New York will yield, I wish to corroborate what he has just said. He has been very diligent all day in making certain that this would be the case, and I want to assure him that once this joint resolution is passed, we will return to the pending bill.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, let me say that I only asked that we take up this resolution now because I knew it would take only a couple of minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Wisconsin?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 196), which was read the first time by title and the second time at length.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution is open to amendment.

If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S.J. RES. 196

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the joint resolution entitled "Joint Resolution extending the dates for transmission of the Economic Report and the report of the Joint Economic Committee", approved December 22, 1971 (Public Law 92-216; 85 Stat. 778), is amended by striking out "March 10, 1972" and by inserting in lieu thereof "March 28, 1972".

EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 1971

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair now lays before the Senate the unfinished business which the clerk will state.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

S. 2515, to further promote equal employment opportunities for American workers.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Carolina kindly withhold that request?

Mr. ERVIN. I withhold the request.

Mr. JAVITS. Just so I can make a short statement.

Mr. ERVIN. Of course.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the manager of the bill, the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. WILLIAMS), and myself as the ranking member of both the committee and the subcommittee from this side, are engaged at the moment in hearing witnesses in opposition to the bill dealing with the west coast dock strike.

Having consulted with the leadership, I believe it is fair to say it was a duty which we have which is entitled to at least a few hours that it will take this afternoon. I understand that Members who wish to speak on the EEOC bill, of course, will be free to do so but I would also hope that the leadership would accommodate the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. WILLIAMS) and myself so that there are no votes or other actions taken which would be materially related to the future of the bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, let me say that I am fully in accord with what the distinguished Senator from New York has just said. I realize that they have Harry Bridges and representatives of management before the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare this afternoon. Those hearings have been interrupted twice already. There will be no further votes today and I want to assure the Senator that even though he and the chairman will be absent, their rights will be fully protected, but I do not anticipate any difficulties whatsoever. I might say that we expect to adjourn shortly anyway.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, may I state that there is no necessity at all for the distinguished Senator from New York (Mr. JAVITS) asking that the majority leader protect his rights. He knows full well that no advantage will be taken of him.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I was sure of that but I thought we had to make sure about the pending business and I wanted the RECORD to be made clear on it.

DRUG EFFORT ADVANCED BY UNANIMOUS HOUSE VOTE

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, as chief sponsor of the Drug Abuse Office and Treatment Act of 1971 it is a source of tremendous satisfaction to me and to the Senate cosponsors of S. 2097 to view the responsible and timely action taken yesterday by the House of Representatives in approving by a unanimous 380 to 0 vote, a companion bill to concentrate the resources of the Federal Government in an all-out effort against drug abuse and drug dependence.

In one of the truly remarkable examples of bipartisan cooperation, the Senate passed S. 2097 last December 2, hardly more than 5 months after its introduction, by a vote of 92 to 0.

That vote taken together with yesterday's House action confirms that there is not even a scintilla of opposition to the clear need to revamp the Federal drug effort for the purpose of controlling narcotics abuse in this Nation and assisting its victims to lead more meaningful lives outside of the oppression of addiction.

The measure that was approved by the House, while differing from the Senate bill in several respects, provides an excellent basis for conference action. As such, it is a tribute to the tireless efforts of Congressman PAUL ROGERS of Florida, chairman of the Subcommitte on Public Health and Environment of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. Indeed, all of the members of that subcommittee deserve especial praise from this chamber, including, of course, Congressman ANCHER NELSEN of Minnesota, the distinguished ranking minority member of the subcommittee, whose intensive work in this field is well known to all of us. Congressman HARLEY O. STAGGERS of West Virginia, chairman of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, and my good friend WILLIAM L. SPRINGER, its ranking minority member, are also to be commended for expediting full committee action on this critical legislation, characterized by the President himself as "emergency legislation."

As with the respective Senate committees involved, Chairman ROGERS' subcommittee held numerous days of hearings and journeyed far and wide to ascertain the extent of the drug problem and what most needs to be done to counteract it. I think it more than coincidental that in certain fundamental respects our analyses of the problem and the legislative formulas we have arrived at to address the problem are markedly similar. The basic difference, I would say, involves the extent of new Federal moneys that are needed in this effort—the Senate having proposed $1.8 billion over 4 years and the House $413 million over 3 years.

I do not mean to minimize the importance I attach to the authorization for these funds, but I am confident that when we compare notes in committee, we will be able to satisfactorily resolve this issue.

Several other omissions in the House bill that I personally regard as especially significant include the following:

First, a provision by which the President is directed to prepare a comprehensive national drug abuse strategy that encompasses both effective law enforcement against illegal drug traffic and effective health programs to rehabilitate the victims of drug abuse. The strategy is to be developed through the establishment of a high-level strategy council consisting of the Director of the Special Action Office, the Attorney General, the Secretaries of Health, Education, and Welfare, State, and Defense, the VA Administrator, and such other officials as the President may designate. The Director of the Special Action Office would be authorized to provide whatever services are required in the preparation of such strategy. Thus, in that capacity, the Director would have a key role in pulling together the information, reports, studies, and evaluations which will form the basis of the Council's deliberations;

Second, a provision by which the Director of the Special Action Office would assist the Veterans' Administration in assuring that all veterans receive treatment and rehabilitation services for drug abuse without regard for the nature of their discharge and without regard to whether their drug dependency was service connected. Such services would include inpatient and outpatient care irrespective of any prior inpatient treatment, psychiatric care, counseling, vocational training, or other rehabilitation services, and the funding, setting up, or operation of residential halfway houses;

Third, a provision by which the Director of the Special Action Office shall consult with and be consulted by the Attorney General in the scheduling of drugs under the Comprehensive Drug Abuse Prevention and Control Act of 1970; and

Fourth, the establishment of a National Institute for Drug Abuse within the National Institute of Mental Health of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

The need for a strategy council, to which I referred above, is highlighted by an outstanding account by Stuart Auerbach appearing in the Washington Post of January 28, 1972, and entitled "Pot Plan Gets a Bad Trip." The article documents the self-defeating, bureaucratic discombobulation which has resulted from the absence of a clear national policy on research and experiments involving marihuana, heretofore classified as a dangerous drug under the Controlled Substances Act of 1970. We are indebted to Mr. Auerbach for his investigative skill in digging out this story, and I ask unanimous consent that the article be reprinted in the RECORD, following my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. (See exhibit 1.)

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that an excellent article by Peter Osnos reporting from Saigon, appearing in the Washington Post of February 2, 1972, entitled "Prog-

ress Seen in Drive to Curb GI Drug Use in Vietnam," be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. (See exhibit 2.)

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, particularly disturbing in his account is the observation that there has been a large-scale drop in the number of servicemen who have voluntarily turned themselves in to Army officials for treatment. Osnos attributes this to:

> . . . the belief that there is nothing to be gained any more by doing so since the notation made on the permanent medical record is the same as if one were caught. Under a previous amnesty procedure, no record was kept at all. That was quietly changed last August. Medical records are supposed to be confidential but soldiers fear they will be used against them should they ever apply for a government job or seek a security clearance. There seems to be good reason for the fear. Senior officers conceded that there might well be circumstances in which the substance of a medical record would be released to outside government agencies, including the FBI.

If Mr. Osnos is correct in his observations, then I think we have real reason to be concerned. I therefore intend to ask Dr. Jaffe, presently serving as Director of the Special Action Office pursuant to Executive order, to report to me on this matter.

Again, I congratulate Chairman ROGERS and his subcommittee and look forward to prompt action by the conferees on these two bills in order that the Federal drug program can be reoriented and made more effective. If we are able to deal with this parasitic dependency of illicit drugs that is afflicting our cities and suburban rural areas, that is nurturing crime, that is gnawing at individual and societal well being, that is preying upon our youth, that is ravaging our educational and military institutions and that is inflicting immeasurable pain and hardship on families and communities across the country—then we will have performed an invaluable service to this Nation.

Mr. President, I should like to add that from my own deep personal feeling about this matter, I do happen to know that in the tragedy that occurred in our own family, there was some evidence that it was drug addiction that caused the perpetrator of the crime to seek additional revenue.

I also have received evidence in the past few weeks in my own State of the way in which this tragedy reaches different families. The vice president of a Chicago company had a son who came back from Vietnam on drugs. Through special effort extended by David Packard, we found this young man who had left the service and was lost to his family and friends and community as a whole. He was found. taken back into a veterans' rehabilitation program. His dishonorable discharge has been reversed. As a result of the rehabilitation that has taken place, he is not only back in college, but has also assumed a part-time job and has been saved as an individual. All of this has transpired within a few months. ever since the Defense Department started treating this as an illness rather than a crime. That is the happy story.

The sad one is that in Henry County, Ill., a few weeks ago, I talked with a father who had just buried his son, a 19-year-old boy who was on marihuana and who had taken with that marihuana a hard drug that proved lethal within 24 hours.

It is hard to realize that this tragedy has spread from the city into the suburbs and is directly responsible for a dramatic increase in crime in the suburbs, particularly in the city of Chicago with which I am familiar.

Mr. President, this does not affect only those on drugs or those who are tempted to go on drugs or experiment with drugs, but it also affects everyone in the country concerned with the dramatic increases in crime, 50 to 75 percent of which is in the area of street crime involving mugging, robbery, and larceny or whatever it may be. It is directly related to drug abuse.

It is with great satisfaction that I can say that we have seen the problem, worked cooperatively with the administration and in record time will send to the President for his signature a bill that has passed both House and Senate. I am confident that in conference the differences can be quickly resolved.

EXHIBIT 1

POT PLAN GETS A BAD TRIP

(By Stuart Auerbach)

Dr. Nathan S. Kline was brainstorming one day last year about ways to help some of his severely depressed patients.

Marijuana, he thought, might be just the thing to fill the gap between the time a depressed patient begins treatment and the time drugs in current use take effect—generally two to three weeks. During that time, the severely depressed patient runs a great risk of committing suicide.

"I have a clinical intuition that marijuana might be useful," Kline said recently. It was this same kind of "clinical intuition" that led to his pioneering research 20 years ago in the development of tranquilizers.

Kline thought that a very small dose ("not even enough for a good pot party") of tetrahydrocannabinal (THC), the active ingredient in marijuana, would be enough to help his patients.

Last July he wrote the Food and Drug Administration for permission to use THC in a limited clinical trial—on 10 patients, over 21 years of age and excluding women of childbearing age.

He was told to supply more information about his proposed test to a joint committee of the FDA and the National Institute of Mental Health. And he was told he needed a license from the Justice Department's Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs to use marijuana before he could get the FDA's approval.

Kline, who is a psychiatrist and pharmacologist, had no doubts about getting approval. Indeed, in 1970 at the request of NIMH he had carried 1,600 grams of marijuana and 12.11 grams of hashish into the United States from Nepal.

To do that he needed the approval of the BNDD, which he received in sextuplet. When U.S. Customs asked Kline if he had anything to declare, he replied, "Yes, 1,600 grams of marijuana and 12.11 grams of hashish."

The BNDD agents had faith in Kline this time too. Their inspection of his New York City office showed that the locked cabinet he uses to store drugs is strong enough to protect the marijuana from theft.

But they said he needed an OK from the state Narcotics Commission before they could give him the approval that the FDA required before letting him go ahead with his clinical trials.

That was a litle harder. The state narcotics agents said Kline needs a 900-pound specially built safe to hold the THC. So he spent $450 and bought the safe.

The state agents told him one more thing—they could give their approval for him to keep marijuana until he had the FDA's license to run the experiment.

"That," he said, "puts me back at the beginning of the circle."

The FDA won't give its approval without an OK from the BNDD. The BNDD won't say yes without the approval of the state Narcotics Commission. And the State Narcotics Commission requires FDA approval before it will say yes.

There is one possible way out. The joint FDA–NIMH committee on medical experiments with mind-altering drugs will be meeting and it could give its approval to Kline's proposal.

But the committee's next meeting is in November.

"It's stupid," said Kline.

"One of the most important scientific questions we have to answer at this time is whether THC is or is not dangerous, and whether there are or are not side effects from it, and whether it has any clinical applications.

"How we are ever going to find out in this lifetime is beyond me," he said.

EXHIBIT 2

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 2, 1972]

PROGRESS SEEN IN DRIVE TO CURB GI DRUG USE IN VIETNAM

(By Peter Osnos)

SAIGON, February 1.—The Army's drive to curb the heroin epidemic among GIs in South Vietnam, a job considered by many commanders as important as battling the Vietcong, has made some progress since it began last spring.

But at the same time, officers acknowledge that there are major problems still remaining that may only be solved when the last GIs board the plane for home.

On the positive side, the Army's greatest strides have been in overcoming the confusion about what needed to be done that prevailed at the time the drug crisis here began to be reported in Congress and the media last year.

Over the months, a reasonably systematic program of education, identification and treatment has evolved. As it is now, a GI should have a pretty good idea of what can happen to him if he uses heroin and where he can turn if he wants to stop.

As for the problems, the biggest is that high-quality and low-priced heroin continues to be plentiful on or very near most U.S. installations. Any GI who wants heroin, it is generally agreed, can still get it.

In the Mekong Delta city of Cantho, for example, the two most notorious drug establishments—"Fat Mama's" and "Shabazz"—are still thriving despite countless raids by American MPs and Vietnamese police.

"We hit them one day," said Maj. Kenneth J. Toso, the drug officer for the 9,000 U.S. troops still in the delta, "and the next day they're back in business."

The proprietors, it is said, have family connections with the local police.

Vietnamese authorities insist they have tightened up considerably on drug smuggling, but it evidently has not been enough. "Let's face it," one American observed, "they just don't care as much about it as we do."

This easy access to heroin accounts for the fact that the number of users among younger enlisted men remains dismayingly high,

especially in rear area support units where the epidemic has always been most severe.

Statistics released by the Pentagon show the overall rate of heroin use declining to somewhere between 5 per cent and 2.5 per cent, depending on the criteria used. But the percentages are misleading because they apply to everyone—majors and master sergeants as well as privates.

Among the lowest ranking and youngest GIs (whose numbers are diminishing rapidly in Vietnam) the rate of heroin use has dropped, according to drug experts, from a peak of perhaps 20–25 per cent to about 15 per cent.

Not all of these are addicts, by any means, and the number of users dips very significantly as the date approaches for the men to go home.

"Heroin is not part of the Vietnam experience they want to take home with them," said one young drug counselor.

But among those GIs staying behind, it is more difficult, officers have found, to get them to stay off drugs. Just as in the United States, drug specialists in Vietnam have discovered that physical withdrawal is only the first and easiest part of helping addicts.

"The best we're able to do is get the heroin itself out of their system and maybe get them pointed in the right direction," said Capt. James A. Walley, who runs a treatment center at Binhthuy in the Delta. "We're not kidding ourselves."

When it comes to dealing with repeaters, the army still hasn't figured out exactly what to do. The worst of the lot, over 100 soldiers a month, are simply processed out of the service as undesirables.

Although the army makes certain that the men are not using heroin the day they are actually returned to civilian life, the very fact that they have been kicked out means they are not rehabiliated and run a high risk of immediately starting up again.

In President Nixon's message to Congress declaring a "war on heroin" last June, he said the legislators would be asked to authorize the military "to retain for treatment any individual due for discharge who is a narcotics addict."

"All our servicemen," the President said, "must be accorded the right to rehabilitation."

The Pentagon has drafted and presented the legislation, but in the meantime, those drug users the army decides for one reason or another it can't help, it doesn't.

In bringing the present order to the Army's approach to the drug problems, by far the most important innovation appears to have been the urine test which made it vastly more difficult to take heroin without getting caught.

The tests have served first to identify heroin users so they can be dealt with and second as a deterrent to starting in the first place. The urinalysis machines have proven usually reliable and no method, short of going off drugs for a period of several days, has been found for getting around them.

At first, the tests were administered only as GIs were leaving Vietnam, but the program has been gradually extended so that every unit is now tested, randomly and without warning, at least once every three months.

When a soldier tests positive he is promptly dispatched to one of two detoxification centers set up in June at the still-massive support bases in Longbinh and Camranh Bay. Together the facilities can handle about 300 people at a time, and both are said to operate at or over capacity.

While not actually stockades, the centers are tightly guarded. The time a soldier spends there "drying out" is added to his time in Vietnam and his pay for those days is forfeited. A notation of drug use is made on the GI's permanent medical record.

Soldiers twice identified as users whose disciplinary records are otherwise poor are sent to a high-security "drug abuser holding center" at Longbinh where procedures for getting them out of the Army take place.

Besides doctors and nurses, Longbinh and Camranh Bay have staff psychologists and counsellors. But, as is so often the case with crowded and busy public institutions, they have little time for individual problems in the four to six days each GI spends there.

Ideally, after detoxification, a soldier would be sent to one of the nine rehabilitation centers around the country for more counselling. In practice, this almost never happens and the men are just returned to their units.

The rehabilitation centers began to appear about a year ago with the first signs of trouble. They open and close and go through one reorganization after another like so many fly-by-night businesses. Quality and commitment vary widely.

The centers are smaller than the detoxification facilities and less punitive. The most ambitious keep their patients for two weeks and offer genuine counselling and recreation as well as health care. Time spent there is counted as part of a Vietnam tour.

Until recently, the only way to get into a rehabilitation center was to volunteer for what used to be called the amnesty program and now is called "exemption." Anyone picked up through urinalysis is ineligible.

Now, however, probably because the rehabilitation centers generally operate with fewer GIs than they can take, the decision whether to send a drug user to Longbinh, Camranh or a local center has been left up to the man's commander.

The drop in the number of GIs turning themselves in has been attributed to the belief that there is nothing to be gained any more by doing so since the notation made on the permanent medical record is the same as if one were caught.

Under a previous amnesty procedure, no record was kept at all. That was quietly changed last August. Medical records are supposed to be confidential, but soldiers fear they will be used against them should they ever apply for a government job or seek a security clearance.

There seems to be good reason for the fear. Senior officers conceded that there might well be circumstances in which the substance of a medical record would be released to outside government agencies, including the FBI.

The colonel added that heavy drug users are also likely to have bad administrative records (court martials for possession of heroin and so on) that would give them trouble even if there were no notations on their medical records.

Another innovation in the antidrug campaign unpopular with the GI is an eight-page, 96-item questionnaire that each man must fill out whether he turns himself in or is picked up in the urine test.

Maj. Toso in the delta said the forms, which bear the drug user's name, are used to provide valuable raw data on the drug problems and the kinds of people who become involved.

He said the forms are kept in Vietnam and are not, as many GIs believe, routinely turned over to the FBI.

The major, who had no experience in the drug field until he arrived in Vietnam last October, oversees the regional education program (visits to units from reformed addicts and specially trained Drug Education Field Teams) and works closely with the rehabilitation center in the Binhthuy Army Base hospital.

The center has 30 beds but last week only two GIs showed up and after a day, one dropped out.

The soldier said he wanted to be with his buddies at the Longbinh detoxification center, even though it would cost him time and money to be sent there. He was placed on the first available plane.

The previous week, seven GIs came. As of last Tuesday three had dropped out, one because the Army had abruptly cut short his tour and sent him home.

For the most part, an official at the center said, the men coming to the center are the ones getting close to the end of their stay in Vietnam and want to get straightened out before they leave.

"The biggest thing in their lives is going home," said one of the social workers at the center, "that's the medicine that works best."

QUORUM CALL

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO 10 A.M. MONDAY, FEBRUARY 7, 1972

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in adjournment until 10 a.m. on Monday next.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR RECOGNITION OF SENATORS CHURCH, FONG, RANDOLPH, MOSS, EAGLETON, HANSEN, GURNEY, AND PERCY ON MONDAY NEXT

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday, immediately following the recognition of the distinguished Senator from Tennessee (Mr. BROCK), the following Senators be recognized, each for not to exceed 15 minutes and in the following order: Messrs. CHURCH, FONG, RANDOLPH, MOSS, EAGLETON, HANSEN, GURNEY, and PERCY.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS ON MONDAY NEXT

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the unanimous-consent orders recognizing Senators on Monday next there be a period for the transaction of routine morning business, not to exceed 30 minutes, with statements limited therein to 3 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

QUORUM CALL

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, before making a motion to adjourn, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR LIMITATION OF DEBATE ON CERTAIN NOMINATIONS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, as in executive session, I ask unanimous consent that there be a limitation of 1 hour on each of the nominations appearing on the Executive Calendar—Calendar No. 1, Calendar No. 2, and Calendar No. 3—the time to be equally divided between the majority leader and the minority leader, or their designees.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

THE PENDING QUESTION

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, what is the pending question before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending question is on agreeing to amendment No. 813, offered by the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. ERVIN).

PROGRAM

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, on Monday the Senate will convene at 10 a.m. After the two leaders have been recognized under the standing order, the following Senators will be recognized, each for not to exceed 15 minutes, and in the order stated: Messrs. BROCK, CHURCH, FONG, RANDOLPH, MOSS, EAGLETON, HANSEN, GURNEY, and PERCY.

At the conclusion of the unanimous consent orders recognizing Senators there will be a period for the transaction of routine morning business, not to exceed 30 minutes, with statements limited therein to 3 minutes each.

At the conclusion of morning business, it is the intention of the distinguished majority leader to proceed with the consideration of three nominations; namely, the nomination of John Eugene Sheehan, of Kentucky, to be a member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System; of George H. Boldt, of Washington, to be Chairman of the Pay Board; and of Mr. C. Jackson Grayson, Jr., of Texas, to be Chairman of the Price Commission.

There is a possibility of a rollcall vote on one of the nominations. I cannot be sure of that, but the majority leader thought it best to alert Senators to the possibility that there might be a rollcall vote on one of the nominations.

After the nominations have been considered and acted upon, the Senate will return to the consideration of the unfinished business. The pending question is on agreeing to amendment No. 813, offered by the able Senator from North Carolina (Mr. ERVIN).

Rollcall votes are possible at any time, and motions to table amendments may be made at any time and votes had thereon.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. ON MONDAY, FEBRUARY 7, 1972

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

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3:28 p.m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, February 7, 1972, at 10 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 4, 1972:

U.S. ARMS CONTROL AND DISARMAMENT AGENCY

The following-named persons to be members of the General Advisory Committee of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency:

Robert Ellsworth, of Maryland, vice William J. Casey, resigned.

John A. McCone, of California, vice Cyrus R. Vance, resigned.

Earle Gilmore Wheeler, of West Virginia, vice Douglas Dillon, resigned.

David Packard, of California, vice Peter G. Peterson, resigned.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

THE COURT AS A SUPER LEGISLATURE

HON. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 4, 1972

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, the January 25 edition of the Miami Herald included an interesting and reflective article written by Mr. Perry Morgan, who is the editor of the Akron, Ohio, Beacon Journal. The article concerns the recent U.S. District Court decision that would order the merger of the school systems of Chesterfield and Henrico Counties, Va., with that of the city of Richmond.

This Ohio editor went directly to the heart of the matter when he wrote:

> The court thus became, in a twinkling, not only a super school board but a super legislature.

I ask unanimous consent that the article, entitled "Judge-Made Law Threatens All," be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

JUDGE-MADE LAW THREATENS ALL

(By Perry Morgan)

Judicial activism seems to have reached its zenith in two lines of cases advancing toward the Supreme Court of the United States. If the court validates the reasoning in the cases, the principle of local control of education will be a thing of the past. Public schools, root and branch, will be remade according to judicial standards. The end result could be a national system of education.

The first line of cases arises from a quest for a school-by-school balance of races. In what New York Timesman Tom Wicker called a cataclysmic decision, a federal judge in Richmond has ordered the consolidation of three school districts because the defendant district had an insufficient number of blacks to produce a racial balance pleasing to the court.

The court thus became, in a twinkling, not only a super school board but a super legislature. It eradicated existing political subdivisions and ordered new ones created—changing tax rates, creating a new school board, and handling other details once thought to be the responsibility of the people acting through their elected representatives.

An educator quoted by The Wall Street Journal said: "The social and educational implications of the Richmond decision are overwhelming. Potentially, it could affect every American."

True, obviously. For the court in Richmond was not relying on a finding of official acts of discrimination or of discriminatory intent. It was saying that segregation North or South, whether the product of discrimination, circumstance, happenstance or free choice, must be ended and, with it, any local or state laws that permit it.

The court did not say this, as The Charlotte News had stated; "because the three school systems were designed for discriminatory or invidious or unconstitutional ends, but because court-ordered restructuring was an expedient way to achieve the goal of racial balance."

With an arrogance increasingly evident in the attitudes of some federal district courts, Judge Robert R. Merhige Jr. described his revolutionary mandate as a "strict constructionist" interpretation of the Constitution. The decision in truth, whatever its merits, is a radical expansion of judge-made law.

And that decision, like those from Texas and Minnesota voiding school financing methods in those states, invites the Supreme Court to preside over a revolution in American government.

The Texas and Minnesota decisions must be read as requiring a rough equity in the amount of dollars spent on each school child within a state. This means—instantly—more means of raising and distributing school monies.

But if it is unconstitutional to have disparities between districts within a state, it follows logically that no more may be spent on the education of a child in New York than on a child in Mississippi; thus, the next step is to push the power beyond the hands of the state and into the hands of the federal government.

The most disturbing element in these decisions is not that they are radical but that they may well be reckless and senseless as well. Judges are expert, more or less, on the law. They know little about education and seemingly care little about the delicate and complex blend of public attitudes and compromises by which public school systems are sustained by citizen interest and tax support.

Referring to the Texas decision on school financing, Harvard's Dr. Daniel P. Moynihan

had this to say in the annual education supplement of The New York Times:

"One may sympathize—as I do—with the court's decision without having to suppose that the judges had the slightest awareness of the knowledge problems they were raising, nor yet of the political problems they were bringing about by ordering the Legislature to do something which on its own it was clearly averse to doing."

Similarly, lower federal courts have established racial balance as an antidote to racial discrimination without significant evidence that education will be improved for black or white. There is no certainty among educators, as contrasted with judges, about techniques that will bring about quality education for all American children. Yet legal remedies are constantly prescribed for what Moynihan calls a knowledge problem. "The courts," he says, "need a better understanding of what they are about."

William Raspberry, black columnist for The Washington Post, has put it another way.

"Racial segregation in public schools is both foolish and wrong, which has led a lot of us to suppose that school integration must, therefore, be wise and just . . . (but) it ain't necessarily so . . ."

Surely it is time for the Supreme Court—if it is to agree to judicial control over all aspects of public education—to set forth the educational data as well as the constitutional premises which would underlie such a sweep of authoritarianism.

MAKE FREE ENTERPRISE WORK FOR ALL

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 3, 1972

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, in a Washington Post article on January 31, Mrs. Alice Rivlin offers many telling comments on the pace and direction of welfare reform. As she correctly states:

> The biggest obstacle to agreement on reform of the welfare situation is the fact that the American people, and their representatives in Congress, have widely divergent views about how to make sure that able bodied poor people work.

When all the rhetoric is stripped away, the differences on this point come down to whether to use incentive or compulsion.

To a great extent, the difference of opinion on this question rests on a lack of understanding and knowledge about the poor—who they are, what they want, and what motivates them. Many Americans are guilty of assuming that the poor fit a stereotype image which has little, if any, basis in fact. As Mrs. Rivlin puts it:

> The compulsion advocates really believe that poor people are lazy and do not want to work . . . while the incentive advocates believe that many more poor people want to work than can find jobs.

While the "welfare chisler" is a popular whipping boy at election time, the facts are that only a very small percentage of welfare recipients are able-bodied males. Almost all welfare family heads are aged, disabled, or mothers with infant children. The tragedy is that, under the present system, work is discouraged even when it can be found. If a welfare mother takes a job, it is almost certain that medical care, food, and other benefits for her children will decrease faster than her income increases. She must decide between the well being of her children and her own self-pride.

If we are to reverse the cycle of welfare dependency, we must rationally construct an incentive system that is grounded on economic reality and not on political rhetoric. As long as the welfare family loses a dollar of aid for every dollar earned, where is the incentive to take and hold the low-paying jobs available to them? Economic logic tells us that only an incentive system providing for a percentage reduction of assistance will have some chance of success. The most reasonable incentive plan, it seems to me, would be to reduce assistance by 50 cents for each dollar earned in a job. Such a plan can be instituted without a major, comprehensive change in the welfare system.

Mr. Speaker, the House has twice passed the comprehensive welfare reform bill requested by the President. I supported his plan both times. It has become evident that the other body will not pass the plan and that some of its supporters are having second thoughts. The President has apparently backed off on his commitment to H.R. 1 and will settle for a "pilot program." If this is to be the case, Mr. Speaker, I feel strongly that part of the trial plan should be the "50 cents on the dollar" incentive plan. Once this is done, we will find out how many employable people are on welfare and how many jobs are available to them.

This country, it is often said, has prospered primarily as a result of the free enterprise system. Such a system relies on market incentives to accomplish both individual and collective goals. Our current welfare system grossly violates this principle. The provision in H.R. 1 which requires a person to accept a job would make the situation even worse unless the financial provisions are altered to provide a 50-cent reduction in benefits for every dollar earned. As the present system and H.R. 1 stand now, we are saying that we will force people to work and also see to it that they have less income in the process. This would make a mockery of the free enterprise system in America.

THE FAMILY VISITATION ACT OF 1972

HON. EDWARD I. KOCH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 3, 1972

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, one of the major complaints that is frequently voiced about our prison system is that the total confinement of a prisoner and resulting lack of sexual relationships have grossly affected prisoners adversely. It has encouraged homosexuality in the prisons and destroyed family ties, which are needed if the prisoner is to be reformed. The U.S. Parole Board has stated that one of the most important facets of the prisoner's return to normal life is his family. At present, the prisoner is only allowed to visit his family in case of emergency.

On February 3, I introduced the Family Visitation Act of 1972. This bill would afford prisoners in Federal prisons a 24-hour furlough during each month of their confinement subject to his or her good behavior during his or her incarceration. Any violation of the furlough privilege would be treated as an escape and subject to penalties under existing laws. The following is a statistical breakdown of our Federal prison population according to sex and marital status:

		Percent
Men [1]	20,281	95.3
Women [1]	762	4.7
Single [2]	5369	26.8
Married [2]	4464	22.2
Widowed [2]	165	0.8
Separated [2]	1998	10.0
Divorced [2]	1246	6.2
Common Law [2]	877	4.4
Not Reporting [2]	5946	29.6

[1] Denotes population as of 1/13/72 (total: 21,043).

[2] Denotes population as of October 1971 (total: 20,065).

The benefits to the married are obvious since the bill would afford them an opportunity to maintain some familial relationships. The benefits to the unmarried prisoners would also be of positive nature since mothers, fathers, brothers, and sisters would be able to maintain better contact with their kin. And surely it must be recognized that unmarried adults also have sexual drives and needs.

While the Federal law presently provides for emergency furloughs, it does not provide for conjugal furloughs. Conjugal furloughs have several practical advantages over conjugal visits. First, conjugal visits pose the problem of suitable accommodations within the prisons and even when such arrangements are available, they are often distasteful to the couple or family because they are conducted to a prison facility. Second, conjugal visits present certain psychologically harmful effects and administrative impracticalities for unmarried inmates.

There has been much rhetoric recently concerning prison reform and many States are reexamining their penal codes. The Federal Government, by introducing a family furlough program in the Federal prisons, could take the lead in a meaningful way.

LA CAUSA COMUN—SELF-HELP FOR PUERTO RICANS

HON. HERMAN BADILLO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 3, 1972

Mr. BADILLO. Mr. Speaker, on numerous occasions over the past 14 months, I have discussed with our colleagues and others the many problems encountered by the 1½ million mainland Puerto Ricans in fully participating in the political, economic, and social life of our country. I have demonstrated that the aspirations of many of those who migrated to

the United States from Puerto Rico have not been realized and that emigration to the mainland has often failed to result in the economic salvation many had so desperately hoped for.

The Puerto Rican seeks nothing more than what other immigrant groups have achieved. Our community is actively searching for economic security and independence; full access to our educational and social institutions; equal opportunities in employment, housing, and health services; and the enjoyment of basic human rights and freedoms and equal protection and treatment under law.

There is much to be done to secure fair and equitable treatment for Puerto Ricans. However, our community is proud of having a tradition of taking the initiative ourselves. In many areas the Boricua is working to achieve the goals of equality and fair treatment for his fellow compadre and himself. A number of grassroots programs are underway designed to help Puerto Ricans to compete on an equal basis with other groups, to secure their just share of governmental aid, and to participate in various Federal, State, and local programs on the same basis as other ethnic and nationality groups.

One of these efforts is a new and ambitious program—La Causa Comun—primarily aimed at assisting Puerto Ricans in the Northeast. Serving as a type of ombudsman and providing a variety of technical and resource capabilities, this development center and action agency will be staffed by young Puerto Ricans dedicated to assisting their fellow Puerto Ricans in New York, Philadelphia, Newark, Washington, Bridgeport, and the many other areas where our people have settled.

This unique undertaking is the result of the tireless efforts of two energetic and capable young men—José Gutierrez and Willie Vasquez. Individually and together they have contacted numerous Government officials, private agencies, educators, manpower experts, community development authorities, and others, briefing them on their proposal and eliciting their support These young men and their program reflect the deep concern the Puerto Rican has for his own community and his willingness to devote considerable time and effort to help it. I commend José and Willie for their dedication and perseverance.

I submit for inclusion in the RECORD, a brief description of La Causa Comun and its proposed services:

LA CAUSA COMUN

Puerto Ricans hold a unique place in American society. They are distinguished by both language and social and cultural differences. As a result, their socialization into the American mainstream is doubly disadvantaged. The recent economic decline has shown Puerto Rican persons to be particularly vulnerable to labor market fluctuations and discriminatory practices.

Of an approximately 3½ million Puerto Ricans/Spanish surnamed persons located in the Northeast, there are a sizable number (at least 66% of those 25 or older) who have not completed high school and are in need of help, in education and job placement information and training, to at least establish a foothold in the economic mainstream. There is a dual constituency of those requiring assistance: (1) one concerns the Puerto Rican with a language barrier and cultural difference so great that he cannot become a functioning, employed individual without much help; (2) the other concerns the better educated Spanish surnamed person especially the unemployed, who needs a place for self-identification and stimulation.

La Causa Comun will be an outreach program aimed at Puerto Ricans in the Northeast. . . . The purpose of the organization is to be a national service center to administer to the comprehensive needs of its people. La Causa Comun will be a center run by young Puerto Ricans for Puerto Ricans.

La Causa Comun, a development center, will be a touch-stone, which the Puerto Rican and his agencies will use when in need. They will turn to La Causa Comun Development Center to help him enter the proper channels. The center will serve as a clearing house and will endeavor to keep Puerto Ricans and other Spanish speaking in the Northeast alert to all federal, local, private and state programs for minorities.

ACTIVITIES

Proposed programs include: Employment program, Medical Health program, Educational program, Housing program, Law and Justice program, New Business and Economic program, Welfare program, and Social Participation program. These activities indicate a concern for both scope and balance in the planning and administering of programs to deal with the Puerto Rican individual as a total person.

A comprehensive survey of the socio-economic characteristics and geographic distribution of Puerto Ricans in the Northeast. The survey will be continued to verify any changes due to migration or social-economic development. At the same time, respondents will be informed about their voting rights. There will be satellite stations developed, and similar surveys throughout the Northeastern states will be administered.

"La Causa" is a bilingual publication featuring articles in Spanish with corresponding translations in English; this source will serve as the main communicative link between the Center and Spanish surnamed persons in the northeast community.

There will be established a nominal counseling and referral service, predominantly in the following areas: Naturalization, Housing, Immigration, Legal Matters, Labor Relations, Discrimination, and Health. Competent specialists in these complex areas will be recruited to serve the universe of needy people.

HOUSING

La Causa Comun proposed to provide housing services in the following areas:

Home ownership—provide counseling (advertising, interviewing, referring, counseling) to low income Puerto Rican families to qualify them for eligibility for home ownership under the FHA section 235 mortgage payment subsidy program.

Rental Housing Referral Service—providing for a file of available realtors and for interviews for possible rent payment subsidy.

The implementation of the housing program would require the services of an Experienced Housing Counselor, who would train two Puerto Rican Housing Counselor Trainees. Thus, perpetuating the expertise.

LAW AND JUSTICE

Many Puerto Ricans are unable to understand and exercise their rights to Equal Protection Under the Law. The Law and Justice Project propose to see to it that the people are informed of their rights and that in fact, equal rights are delivered to them.

Executive Order 11246 orders that the ratio of minorities participate in a more equitable manner in employment hiring practices. In the Northeastern states, La Causa Comun can become an important monitoring agent to insure compliance by undertaking the following activities: defining the affirmative action requirement of the order (by consulting the Office of Federal Contract Compliance and others), monitoring the compliance programs already in effect (watchdogging the hiring practices, for one), and building a strong equitable construction compliance program (having some input in evaluating and planning improved programs).

The Puerto Rican Courts Program Activity would serve the needs of these minority group members through the following kinds of diverse functions; assisting courts by providing interpreter services, counseling for police detainees, assisting residents in obtaining legal aid, assisting in counseling and interpreter services for jury selectees and other court appointees, and aiding the employment of Spanish persons in law enforcement areas.

The Federal Prisons Program Activity is aimed at providing counseling, visiting, and administering a financial fund for Puerto Ricans, who are prisoners or ex-prisoners (and their families) of the State or Federal Prison System.

La Causa Comun hopes to conduct a talent search, campus visitation, and intensified school visitation program. This has grown out of the knowledge that many Puerto Rican students leave high school before graduation and, in fact, the Spanish surnamed community, as a whole, has a very low level of educational attainment, on the average, which is perpetuated through each succeeding generation. On-campus visitations would make college a realistic possibility in the minds of high school students. They would be encouraged to talk with Puerto Rican college students and counselors about admissions, financial aid, housing, and student activities. An intensified school visitation program to bring the college into a high school setting (through college representatives coming to the high school) would expose many Puerto Rican young people to college life and, hopefully, arouse interest. Similar programs, all aimed by upgrading the educational attainment and employability of young Spanish surnamed people, would be developed in addition to the two mentioned.

La Causa Comun hopes to deal with the whole issue of public employment. The organization proposes to develop a program to help create public employment career opportunities for the Puerto Ricans and Spanish surnamed in the Northeast. Unfortunately, the implementation of civil service laws have often failed to carry adequately equal employment provisions for these system disadvantaged people. La Causa Comun hopes to provide leadership in an action program.

It is planned that a Task Force of experts on public employment will review the issues and offer constructive change. Targets of concern will be: archaic laws, unrealistic selection standards, excess professionalism, petrified job structures, static recruitment, cultural bias in tests. Besides reforming the system, the Task Force would work with training and developing strong applicants, facilitating government cooperation, upgrading acceptance of Spanish surnamed, and offering better supportive services to applicants.

ON MULTINATIONALS

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 3, 1972

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, many Americans are concerned about and mystified by the growing trend of international corporations or multinationals, as they are called. There is a great deal that we need to know about them, particularly since demands are being made on the

Congress to take legislative action to restrict this development. Before we can do anything worthwhile, we had better have a clear picture of what we are dealing with.

I would like to call to the attention of the Members of the House a speech given by Mr. Allan L. Rudell of the Honeywell Co. at the November 9 meeting of town hall in Los Angeles. Mr. Rudell speaks from his personal experience as a vice president of one of the multinationals:

A DEFENSE OF INTERNATIONAL BUSINESS

(By Allan L. Rudell)

An American has been described as a person who drives home in a German car from a French movie; slips off his Hong Kong suit and Italian shoes; puts on his English robe and Mexican slippers; and sips Brazilian coffee from Dutch china while sitting on Danish furniture. Then he writes a letter to his congressman on Canadian paper with a Japanese pen—demanding that the government do something about all the gold that's leaving the country.

My remarks today are entitled "A Defense of International Business." It is not my intention to overstate the importance of the international business corporation, which most people today call multinationals, but I do feel that they play a vital role in world affairs. This is what I want to talk about: How they operate; Why they operate as they do; And what effect they have in broader international affairs.

Some brief background information is in order. For all the new talk about American multinational companies, it must be realized that this phenomenon is neither new nor strictly American. Corporations have operated on a global scale for centuries. Indeed, this nation got its start from European commercial interests who subsidized colonists in the New World. The St. James settlement in Virginia and the Massachusetts Bay Company in my home state are but two of the more prominent examples.

As to the second point, that multinationals are not strictly American; many of the larger international corporations are headquartered outside the United States. Shell, Lever Brothers, Bayer and Nestle are common household names throughout the United States—and yet all of them are European concerns. I sometimes wonder how many Americans realize that.

Thus multinational corporations are not new, and they are not the exclusive property of America. I think it is important to keep that in mind when we hear the strident voices of critics both in this country and abroad. These are the people who say these new American giants have given the world a new structure that is uncontrolled and are playing with the lives and economies of nations around the world for someone's private gain.

Quite the contrary. Many people around the world benefit from the operations of the so-called multinational companies. Certainly the stockholders of a company benefit from increased revenues, and hopefully profits, from the broader operations. Labor also benefits because more new markets mean more jobs. Local, or "host," economies benefit in many ways. The host gets infusions of capital from many new sources. New technology is introduced. New jobs are created, as are new tax dollars. Living standards rise, and consumers around the world can avail themselves of new products produced better than before.

To be sure, there have been abuses in the past, and abuses exist today. No system is perfect, and there is precious little that cannot be improved. But I think that today's international business operations are far more beneficial than harmful, and they should be viewed as builders of world peace and understanding, not as detractors from that goal.

In discussing the how and why of the international business system, or corporation, I will use my own company as an example. Honeywell manufactures and markets automation products throughout the world. These automation products include environmental control systems for residences and commercial buildings; sensing and recording instruments; systems to control and monitor industrial processes; control and guidance systems for aerospace and defense applications, and computers.

Because I am most familiar with the company's computer operations, I will concentrate on that portion of the business. Also, I think that the world computer business is a good example of the contributions and workings of the global company.

We are in the information business. Computers, as I'm sure you know, are electronic tools that accept, store, process and disseminate information that people put into them. Nothing more and nothing less than processing information.

The need and flow of information is not confined to any one country. The flow of information is not stopped by boundaries (the Iron Curtain is even being raised a bit), and hence the need for tools to process that information—computers—is worldwide in scope.

It is this fact that caused Honeywell to develop, manufacture and market computers on a worldwide scale. And of course it is this factor that causes any company in any business to go international. If the need for a product or service is international in scope, and the resources for design, development and manufacturing are international in scope, then the companies will be international in scope.

In Honeywell Information Systems we have four operating organizations, each corresponding to market territories. Since each geographic organization is also engaged in the design, development and manufacture of computers, I am not referring just to sales outlets when I refer to our international business. The operating components are vertical organizations, and we have facilities for the design, development and manufacture of computers and related equipment in the United States, Canada, the United Kingdom, Germany, France, Italy and, through licensing agreements, in Japan.

The coordination of these four components is something we call our Worldwide Mission Assignment Plan. I mention it because I think it is a fine example of the worldwide character of the information business, and, by inference, of other industries. Each of our four operations, in addition to their marketing responsibilities, has the total worldwide responsibility for the development, manufacture and distribution of certain computer systems and related equipment. As you might expect, the whole plan is a bit complicated, but as a rule, large and medium systems are produced in the United States, as well as minicomputers; small systems in Italy and very small systems in France. Medium scale and minicomputers are produced in the United Kingdom. Regarding peripheral equipment, the United States has the mission for mass storage devices. France has the mission for line printers and terminals, and Italy has the assignment for serial printers. Although that is a bit of an oversimplification, I think it indicates the faith we have in the international posture of our business and the capabilities of our people. It is also indicative of the worldwide cooperation that can result from people working toward a common goal.

Of particular significance is that much advanced technical work is done on an international scale. Whereas in the past, many companies went multinational by moving American-developed products and techniques offshore to protect foreign markets, today we see more and more companies fully recognizing the technical contributions that all employees can make no matter where they are found.

In addition to the technical abilities we find in our international operations, we also find enormous managerial and executive talent. As a measure of this, of the 28,000 employees in our non-U.S. operations, only 94 are Americans and only a handful of these are in upper management positions. The head of our United Kingdom operation is an American but senior management in France is French, in Italy they're Italian and so forth.

In some instances we find that we are partners with local companies. Compagnie Honeywell Bull, which operates in Continental Europe and parts of Africa and Latin America, is a joint effort between Honeywell and Compagnie Machines Bull, with Honeywell having a two-thirds ownership.

Another method of having local equity participation in a multinational company is by offering the corporation's stock on foreign exchanges. This Honeywell does in Brussels, and hopefully, soon in Paris.

To recap briefly the why and how of Honeywell's international computer business: The flow and processing of information is international in scope, and the lightning speed and power of the computer is making it more so. An example is one of our time sharing networks in Europe. A subscriber in Paris takes his telephone, which can be coupled with a computer terminal, dials a local number, and gets in touch with the central processing unit, which happens to be in Cleveland, Ohio. It is done by satellite, and for all the subscriber knows or cares, the computer might be in the next room. The subscriber only cares about getting his information processed in the most expeditious manner; if he can get his information processed in Cleveland efficiently and cheaply and just as fast, then so be it.

We operate on an international scale because the information business is international. We design, develop, manufacture and market around the world because that's where the business is. In each country in which we operate, we do so with nationals of that country; and we see equity interest in the concern around the world through minority ownership situations and through stock offerings on foreign exchanges.

Well, up to now, you've probably thought, "Well that's a fine commercial for Honeywell. But what significance does it have if I don't work for Honeywell or own stock in the company?"

I think that's a fair question, and the answer is that it is significant because it is an example of what international corporations are all about. What Honeywell does today may not be recorded or remembered in the long run. But the activities of all corporations operating around the world, taken together, will be important 100 or 200 years from now.

To move from the specifics of Honeywell to the generality of international business, I think that the existence and prosperity of the international corporation is vital for the United States economy. Such organizations provide outlets for American products and technology, and at the same time they are avenues for bringing internationally-developed techniques and products to the United States. In the computer business, we have learned that technology is not a one-way street out of this country. I'm sure the same holds true for other businesses and industries.

Multinational corporations also enable American firms to hold and protect their market shares abroad, thus furthering the well-being of the American economy. When

there are worldwide markets for a variety of products, choosing not to participate in them is economic suicide. The economics of the day dictate that companies take advantage of scale in order to be efficient and profitable.

The multinational corporation is also a positive factor in this country's balance of payments situation. One-fourth of all U.S. exports are shipped to subsidiaries or operating units of U.S.-based international companies. Thus, if these companies did not exist, our exports would shrink by a quarter.

Another contribution made to the balance of payments situation is the money these businesses earn through their international operations. In 1970 American direct investment abroad totalled approximately four billion dollars, bringing the cumulative total to approximately $71 billion. The money this investment brought in, in the forms of profits, fees, payments for licensing, and so forth, was eight billion dollars. So foreign investment is not really a net outflow of American dollars. It is an investment that yields substantial returns.

As for the world in general, I firmly believe that the world is a better place to live because of international business. Of course I am not so naive as to think that the international corporation is a panacea for the world's ills, but I do think it is a positive contributor to world peace and understanding.

Twenty-five years ago saw the end of World War II. In those 25 years we have seen the economies of the Western world become intimately intertwined. Each of the Western countries has prospered as trade between them skyrocketed and as multinational firms flourished. Most important there has not been armed conflict between them. I think this is no accident. As countries and economies flourish, the possibility of war lessens. To put it cynically, the countries involved would have too much to lose.

In the underdeveloped world, we do see conflict, and we do not see flourishing economies and heavy involvement of multinational corporations. This too is no accident. The loyalties of people are being pulled and tugged one way and another. But the one common key is the promise of economic improvement and a raised standard of living.

We live in an imperfect world, and in a time when people often cannot live amicably because it is the moral thing to do, many people enjoy peaceful relations because it is the economic thing to do. The Europen Common Market has meant that a conflict between the states of Western Europe is virtually impossible. The EEC has tied the lives of the Western Europeans together to the point where war is unthinkable.

The relative peace but absolute prosperity of the past quarter century is due to many things. One of the key factors has been the proliferation of international business. Along with the international involvement of the United States government, and the turning of the attention of the American people to the international scene; along with the realization on the part of the member states of Europe that their future lies in cooperation; the international business organization has made the world a bit more livable.

The *Wall Street Journal*, in a recent editorial headlined "World Depression," indicated that the economy of each country in the Western World was dependent in varying degrees on the economies of all the others. It said that to avoid a world depression, we must avoid unilateral action, and aim for cooperation. We must cooperate with each other so that we all can prosper.

I might point out, however, that I recognize the unilateral decisions of a short-term nature are sometimes necessary to correct temporary imbalances in the world trade situation. The danger is that these temporary measures may become long-term measures that may well be counter-productive.

The multinational company has proven that such cooperation between different countries can exist. I deal every day with people from America, Canada, England, Italy, France, Germany, Japan and so forth. And I find that the cooperation we need for the mutual prosperity of all of us is there to be found.

If business organizations can do it, then there is no reason the rest of the world can't avoid conflicts. This is perhaps the most lasting impact that multinational business can have on the world. At a time when we can literally incinerate ourselves at the touch of a button, I think it would be prudent for critics, government heads, and the average citizen to take a look at the facts and the record of international business. Good will and prosperity can prevail, and the record of the international business system proves it.

But the fact that business has proven that cooperation and good will can be achieved is not enough. Too often in the past business has been content to ignore critics, even well-meaning critics, until the criticism has reached crisis proportions. Pollution, consumerism, auto safety and many other examples abound.

I think that what is needed are programs from multinational organizations that will further the causes of world peace and understanding on an international scale. For example, I would propose worldwide data banks dedicated to solving the social problems of the day. Such data banks would serve the needs of concerned people, professionals and technologists around the world by rapidly disseminating information to concerned parties to help them solve their problems.

Each data bank would be dedicated to a specific area of concern—a particular discipline, if you will. For example, we would have data banks dealing with medicine, housing, agriculture, nutrition, air pollution, marine biology, meteorology, and many many more. Each data bank would be under the sponsorship of an appropriate international organization or professional society dealing with the area of concern.

The professionals and technologists, the people who would use the data bank, could come from anywhere. Business, government, industry, academia—wherever. They would be able to share the information contained in the worldwide repository for the betterment of their societies.

The possibilities of such networks are astounding. For example, statistical data on housing problems in any given society could be transmitted to the worldwide data bank on housing. Their it could be instantly accessed by professionals anywhere in the world. They would take that knowledage and data, and work out solutions which would then be transmitted back to the appropriate people in the country involved.

An area of growing concern today is pollution of the oceans. A worldwide data bank on marine biology would be continually updated with the latest marine information from around the world, alerting people to dangers, and helping them with solutions.

Since the data banks would be under the sponsorship of international organizations such as professional societies, they would be free from control of individual companies or governments. Yet they would serve as the connecting links, the storehouses of timely and pertinent information, for the use of the professionals in the given discipline.

To create such data networks requires several steps and the cooperation of many people and organizations. First, of course, they would have to be funded, and here I think the United Nations could play an important role, along with concerned governments and private organizations.

Second, the relevant data would have to be given to the data bank. I think that all parties that have expertise in the given fields should cooperate in making their data available for use by the international data banks. Governments, universities and business organizations should contribute what they can in order to make as much information as possible available to people around the globe. I recognize that businesses would not give out proprietary information, and governments would not release material of a top secret nature. But I still believe that a vast wealth of knowledge would be available for these data banks.

I'm sure most of you are familiar with Alvin Toffler's book, *Future Shock*. Mr. Toffler states that if we divide the last 50,000 years of man's existence on earth into lifetimes of 62 years each, there have been 800 lifetimes. The first 650 of them were spent in caves. And, he states, "The overwhelming majority of all material goods we use in daily life today have been developed within the present, the 800th, lifetime."

The relevance of this statement is this: the Egyptians learned how to make bricks thousands of years ago, but there are some societies in the world that still do not know how to make bricks. Today we have a core of professionals and technologists throughout the world who are intimately involved with the day-to-day problems of their societies, and they are using technology to solve many of them.

With the worldwide computer-based network I have described, it will be possible to instantly transmit technology around the world to help solve the problems of all peoples. No longer will a society have to wait 5,000 years to make a brick . . . or to have all the knowledge available for combating social ills. For in an accelerating world, we also see accelerating social problems.

Again to cite Mr. Toffler, we are presently in an era of rapidly accelerating change, and the speed of change is causing people to fall behind. With the instantaneous capabilities of the computer and a force of dedicated people and organizations around the world, perhaps we can harness this rapidly developing technology and use it for the social benefit of all.

THE BLACK MUSLIM MOVEMENT—RARICK REPORTS TO HIS PEOPLE

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 3, 1972

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, I recently reported to my people on the Nation of Islam or the Black Muslim movement. I insert my report in the RECORD at this point:

RARICK REPORTS TO HIS PEOPLE ON THE BLACK MUSLIM MOVEMENT

The January 10th ambush and massacre of deputy sheriffs and city police officers by identified Black Muslims resulted according to the latest count in the deaths of two white deputies and three black men with over thirty injured as well as in the disruption of race relations in a peaceful community. Four hundred National Guard troops were called to duty to bolster local and State police in enforcing dusk-to-dawn curfew which was imposed to protect the lives and people of the community.

Because of the violence and havoc wrought by the Black Muslim fanatics and because of the threat they pose to the domestic tranquility of any community, the people have a right to know the goals and background of this subversive group. So, I thought today we'd discuss the Black Muslims—their origin, background, beliefs, and activities.

Most of the facts I shall present about the Black Muslims are found in their own official newspaper, "Muhammad Speaks," and are contained in the report—Report No. 3 of January 9, 1963 of the Joint Legislative Committee on Un-American Activities of the State of Louisiana from hearings following a Muslim incident in Monroe, Louisiana in 1960. The report is entitled, "Activities of 'The Nation of Islam' or the Muslim Cult of Islam in Louisiana."

ORIGIN AND BACKGROUND

In 1930 while the communist leaders in Moscow were engaged in delineating their policy of "Self-determination for the Negroes in the Black Belt" of the United States which called for the establishment of a separate, free, and independent black nation to be made up from the States of Mississippi, Louisiana, Alabama, Georgia and South Carolina; an itinerant peddler appeared in the Negro community of Detroit and was going from house to house selling pots, pans, silks, raincoats and other wares. This man's name was W. D. Fard but he also went by the names Farrad Mohammad or Mohammad Ali. He had just recently been released from San Quentin Prison on a narcotics charge. During his business, he began to preach from the Koran, the Moslem Bible. He later devoted his full time to preaching. In 1930 he was joined by a Negro named Elijah Poole, a native of Georgia. The two acquired a few followers and began what they called the New Lost-Found Nation of Islam.

Fard took on an air of mysticism, dressing in a long flowing white robe, and claiming that he was originally from the Holy City of Mecca—that he had been sent to America as Savior of the "first people"—the "Asiatic black man."

After a while, Farrad Mohammad—Fard—who came to be known as the "prophet", began denouncing the white race and attacking the teachings of the Bible.

Thus began the movement known as The Nation of Islam or Black Muslims which today is ruled by their teacher Elijah Mohammad—who is Elijah Poole.

Who in reality was this W. D. Fard alias Farrad Mohammad and from where had he come?

In his book, *The Black Muslims in America*, Professor C. Eric Lincoln related numerous legends as to Fard's origin. Reporter Ed Montgomery, however, in an article in the New York "Mirror" of July 30, 1963, documented Fard's background with information contained in police records in California and Michigan. According to these police records, Fard is not a Negro, but a white man. His true name is Wallace Dodd. He was born in New Zealand on February 26, 1891. He married a Los Angeles waitress who bore him a son, Wallace Dodd Ford on September 1, 1920. On the son's birth certificate, Dodd alias Fard listed himself as "white."

So, from the research available, it appears that the founder of the Black Muslims was a white man who hides behind the cloak of religion to teach Negroes to hate white people, our country and our civilization.

As a result of his followers' offering a human sacrifice in 1933, Fard alias Dodd alias Mohammad Ali was run out of Detroit and since then there has been no trace of him. Before his disappearance, he named Elijah Poole to succeed him. Elijah Poole, who later changed his name to Elijah Muckmud, and then to Elijah Muhammad, says that Fard returned to Mecca to keep in touch spiritually. Reporter Ed Montgomery says that police records show Fard returned to New Zealand.

Elijah Muhammad later moved the headquarters, or the Temple, to Flint, Michigan and then to Chicago where it is presently located. He follows the teachings of Fard whom he describes as Allah himself who had come and gone and claims that he is the messenger of Allah.

BELIEFS AND ACTIVITIES

According to Muslim teachings of Elijah Muhammad, the blacks are not Negroes, they are Asiatic black men and were the first people on the Earth. Allah who is God appeared in the person of Master W. Fard Muhammad in July, 1930 as the long-awaited "Messiah" of the Christians and the "Mahdi" of the Muslims.

In a Muslim Training Manual obtained by the Monroe, Louisiana police during a 1960 investigation of the Muslims in Monroe, whites are referred to at least 16 times as "white devils" who overran and enslaved the original people—The Asiatic blacks. Muslims are taught that their last names are names given to them by the white devils and not their true names, so they adopt the name of "X" until such time as their name will be restored by Elijah Muhammad. However, New York police have said that the Black Muslims become eligible to use the letter "X" when they seriously maim or kill a white person. The Black Muslims are taught to believe that the white man is the devil incarnate and integration with the white man is rejected on this basis. New York State Police are reported to have a list of 75,000 identified Muslims in their state alone.

According to "Muhammad Speaks" of April 17, 1970, the Muslims believe the offer of integration is hypocritical and is made by those who are trying to deceive black peoples into believing that their white devil enemies are suddenly their "friends" and that such deception is intended to prevent black people from realizing that the time in history has arrived for the separation from the whites of this nation.

On October 11, 1963, Elijah Muhammad wrote:

"We believe our contributions to this land and the suffering forced upon us by White America, justifies our demand for complete separation in a state or territory of our own.

"If White people are truthful about their professed friendship toward the so-called Negro, they can prove it by dividing up America with their slaves."

The Joint Legislative Committee on Un-American Activities of the State of Louisiana found that Elijah Muhammad "has directly stated that the Negro Americans, for all of whom he purports to speak, 'insist' upon 'some land' in this United States of America for a separate nation, free from all currently existing governmental authority. The State of Louisiana was specifically mentioned along with several others as part of the land desired by the Muslims. The method of acquisition of this land is unspecified by Muhammad, but in view of his various teachings and speeches . . . there does not appear to be much doubt how this land is to be had. The cult members have in fact engaged in violence in several different places in this State and Nation, which violence was invariably directed against duly constituted authority as represented by police officers or custodians of institutions of correction and detention . . .

Elijah Muhammad has predicted there will be a "battle of Armageddon" in which white rule in the U.S. will be overthrown. The Muslims foresee their coming to power through a United Front of Black Men who will take the fight into the streets.

In Washington, D.C., as in many other large cities where the broadcasters are required by the FCC to program their shows to the racial minorities of the area, Black Muslims are given free time—just as is a church minister—but to preach their interpretation of black superiority and their diatribes of hatred for White people.

Washington, D.C., Chicago, and New York may be a long way from Louisiana but so were the Muslim leaders who provoked the Baton Rouge shoot out.

The program of the Black Muslims for forming a separate Black Nation out of several Southern States whether by coincidence or not seems to be the same program instigated and supported by the Communist Party. A group known as the Republic of New Africa has been purchasing land in several Southern States apparently to establish communes as bases of operations, and just last year there was a confrontation between the police and members of the Republic of New Africa when they attempted to establish a base near Jackson, Mississippi. Over 3 years ago, in a speech to the House of Representatives, I reported in some detail about the Black Secession Movement.

The muslims believe in allegiance to the Nation of Islam and not to the United States. Fard explained to his followers that it was stupid to pledge allegiance to a flag that offered no protection against "the depravities of the white devils" who by "their tricknology kept the black illiterates to use as tools and slaves. The American flag is referred to in Muslim doctrines and teachings as "the rag."

Further evidence as given in the Louisiana report of the use of the guise of religion by Muslims "to give credence and dignity to their programs of calculated disloyalty, sedition, and racial hatred" is a plaque which the Monroe Police seized in the Black Muslim temple in Monroe in 1960.

In the upper left-hand corner of the plaque is the American flag and under it is the word "Christianity" and a cross, and below that a rather crudely drawn picture of a colored man hanging from a treelimb by a rope, and the words, "Slavery, Hell and Death." Then in the center are the words, "Which one will Survive the War of Armageddon" and a question mark; and on the right side of the plaque is what purports to be the flag of Islam with the word Islam underneath it, and the words, "Freedom, Justice, and Equality."

Is there any tie-in between the Black Muslims and the Communist Party of the United States? An article in the Jackson Daily News of August 25, 1962 revealed that Claude Lightfoot, Vice-Chairman of the Communist Party, U.S.A., urged communists "to work for the growing, fanatical, all-Negro, Muslims, also known as the Nation of Islam, to get them involved in what they termed a mass-struggle." He told the Communists they were "duty bound to go along with our Muslim brothers to help light and understanding among them."

The Louisiana Joint Legislative Committee on Un-American Activities found:

"The influence of the communist conspiracy in the Nation of Islam appears to be significant and dangerous. The communists support the cult because of the classic communist doctrine of attempting to destroy the faith of the people in their own institutions. Through the Nation of Islam, the communists see hope for producing their desired goals of progressive disillusionment, dissatisfaction, and disloyalty."

"Muhammad Speaks," the official organ of the Black Muslims, while having no praise for black anti-communists such as the late Moise Tshombe, has openly praised not only Nkrumah and Kenyatta, who are black Communists, but also Ben Bella and Castro who are White Communists. Communism not race is the common factor worthy of praise by Black Muslims.

A report on the closed convention of the Socialist Workers Party in August, 1963 showed that in attendance at the sessions of this Communist organization were members of the Black Muslims who took part in discussions on resolutions relating to Negro activities which advocated closer orientation of the Socialist Workers Party toward the Muslim movement.

The Louisiana Committee conducting the hearing on the Black Muslims found that the Nation of Islam is a subversive organization within the meaning of Louisiana statutes. FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover in testimony

before the Subcommittee of the House Committee on Appropriations on February 16, 1967 stated that the Nation of Islam was an "all-Negro violently anti-governmental and anti-white organization." He characterized the NOI as a "very real threat to the internal security of the Nation."

I have no quarrel with the Muslims as a religious group to believe what they wish and to practice their religion as they see fit so long as they do it legally. The Constitution secures freedom of religion for all in America.

However, when they preach sedition and disloyalty and practice violence to achieve their objectives, then it is time that they be brought to trial for their illegal actions.

Evidence exists that these Muslims have been allowed to tour by caravan across State lines and from city to city; and by use of intimidation raise money and conduct membership drives without any interference from the U.S. Justice Department.

The seriousness of such penetration into the Baton Rouge community in the January 10th shoot-out was not made available to the local law enforcement people by the Federal authorities. Some of the first police officers on the scene weren't even aware that Muslims were involved. Somewhere, there has been a serious laxity in Federal law enforcement and a breakdown in communications between Federal criminal intelligence and the local law enforcement officials.

So, I have urged the Committee on Internal Security, at the earliest possible opportunity, to conduct hearings into the Black Muslim movement so as to clarify any splinter movement or rebel faction as well as supply those of us in Congress with the investigation necessary toward additional Federal legislation, if necessary, to prevent any recurrence of such nomadic extremists upsetting race relations in peaceful communities in the future.

In view of the above facts, I have urged the President to invoke his Executive Order 11605 to recommend that the Attorney General petition the Subversive Activities Control Board to conduct appropriate hearings to make a determination as to whether the Muslims are a subversive organization.

Punitive measures must be taken to curb the illegal actions of any subversive group which attempts to destroy the nation.

In conclusion, I quote another finding of the Louisiana Joint Legislative Committee on Un-American Activities:

"The Committee notes that the responsible negro people of this State hold no sympathy for the Nation of Islam, and are firmly opposed to it or any organization which preaches disloyalty and violence. The Nation of Islam purports to offer to negroes, through so-called 'religion', three things which many people, both negro and white, greatly need, namely: personal and racial pride, self discipline, and good moral standards. The committee is convinced that negro citizens can readily acquire all of these things through personal responsibility within the framework of the Constitution of the United States and without being a part of a movement which openly advocates calculated disloyalty to all constitutional authority and bitter racial hatred to the point of actual murder of white people."

I have made this report and called for investigations by federal authorities because the people and especially local and State police officers have a right to know about the goals and activities of this black separatist organization which so affects their lives as well as who concocted the fantastic history of the origin of the black and white races as contained in their training manual. And I might add, who finances them. According to a story in "Newsweek" of January 31, estimates of the wealth of the Black Muslims ran as high as $75 million. Muhammad is building a new $500,000 mansion for himself and four other mansions for his children and aides costing $350,000 each. The multifarious business enterprises of the Muslims include 20,000 acres of farmland in Michigan, Georgia, and Alabama. In Chicago alone the Muslims have two supermarkets, a bakery and fish store, a restaurant, coffee shop and dairy—and more are in the planning. The Muslims have a $1.5 million printing plant for their newspaper and recently purchased a $4.4 million Greek Orthodox Church to be used as a new mosque. The four-engine Super Constellation which is available for Muhammad's use will be soon traded in for a jet. Where did the Muslims acquire this enormous wealth? You the people have a right to know.

PLAYING POLITICS WITH LEAA

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 3, 1972

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, for 2 months now I have been sitting quietly while the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration completes its funding allocations to the two cities that will host national party conventions this year. I have been waiting 2 months because it took that long for LEAA to finalize the grant that will go to the city of San Diego, Calif., to protect the Republicans.

Mr. Speaker, you and my colleagues will certainly remember a newspaper article, printed in December, which went into great detail concerning protective measures to be taken in Miami. At best, the article was sordid—describing how moneys would be spent on tanks, gas grenades, police helmets, handcuffs, and television monitor and taping equipment designed to make arrests more conclusive.

But, even more important, Mr. Speaker, is the fact that LEAA took it upon itself to advise Democratic National Chairman Lawrence O'Brien of the $395,424 grant and ask for his comments.

To put this in perspective, we must remember that LEAA made a big thing of detailing exactly what this equipment was being used for, then admitting that some of the bigger stuff would be transferred to California for the Republican Convention. Now we come to the crux of the matter.

On January 8, 1972, the Sacramento Bee ran an article detailing the LEAA grant to San Diego, with the general theme that law enforcement officials in the city were going to make sure nothing happened there like the incidents of Chicago, 1968. The grant, Mr. Speaker, is for $920,000, of which over $250,000 will be used for training alone.

The question is begging to be asked, Mr. Speaker: Was Robert Dole, Chairman of the Republican National Committee contacted by LEAA and asked for a comment? I do not think so.

The entire procedure is a simple one to understand. The Nixon administration is now in office and using every office under their command to wage a political battle on the road to the campaign. Mr. Nixon has the audacity to call on Congress for bipartisan support of his legislative concepts, while turning every facet of the executive branch into a separate, but equal, branch of the "Nixon for President" campaign. The two grants, to Miami and San Diego, were used as political toys for the administration. Another fundamental question rears its head amid all this, Mr. Speaker. Why did not LEAA simply wait 1 month and announce both grants at the same time—explaining details of each? Again, a simple answer, newsmen and voters all across the country would have easily seen that the city of San Diego is getting nearly two and a half times as much money to control crowds during the Republican Convention, even though some of the equipment to be used in Miami will be sent to San Diego at the Democratic Convention.

And so, Mr. Speaker, I come here today to set the record straight in a bipartisan manner. I wish to include both articles about the convention in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so that my colleague can get the full benefit of each, in relation to the other.

And, in doing so, Mr. Speaker, I would urge that my colleagues analyze each story with the full impact of some of the statements in mind. Please notice that the Republican Convention is intent on making sure all newsmen are taken to the front of the demonstrations—supposedly to get a better view, but also to restrict their activities.

And, finally, Mr. Speaker, I wish all my colleagues will realize that this entire matter was drummed up by the administration as part of a political campaign of paranoia. Get the Democrats sidetracked—expose the riots of 1968—delay the funding of San Diego until this entire funding matter for Miami has been allowed to sink into the subconscious of the voter. It is a comment on our leadership and its party when they openly play upon the emotions and paranoia of a public while betting on the belief that no one will look back at this development, place the facts in context, and realize what they have done.

As I said in the beginning, Mr. Speaker, I have been sitting back quietly for 2 months now, letting the LEAA spider weave its web and finish its work. Now, I only hope that inclusion of these two articles in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will open the eyes of the "voter-moth," so that it may make a sound decision on which way to fly in the elections of 1972.

The articles follow:

SAN DIEGO IS PREPARED TO AVOID RIOTS

(By John Berthelsen)

San Diego is taking every precaution to make sure there is no instant replay of Chicago '68 during the GOP nominating convention Aug. 21–25.

Paramount in those precautions is training for what James W. Connole, the San Diego police inspector in charge of the law enforcement task force for the convention, calls "crowd control, crowd management, constitutional protection of participants."

Of the city's total $920,000 Law Enforcement Assistance Act federal grant, $258,900 is budgeted for training, and not just training officers to tell how to tell demonstrators their rights as they are loaded onto the bus.

THE BEST, JUST IN CASE

"It's been said before," repeats the 20-year veteran of the force. "We are going to plan for the worst and hope for the best." And once planning is completed, he feels, "we will have some of the best-trained police, in case of a riot, in the United States."

Officers are being trained, he says, "to know the limits of the law (for them), the constitutional rights of the demonstrators, and so on. That is the constitutional protection we are talking about."

Almost since the day the city reluctantly accepted President Nixon's undisguised hint to invite the Republicans to San Diego, Connole has been making plans. And, he bristles:

"There are no goddamn armored cars (on order)." But there seems to be plenty of everything else, to make sure no long-haired, young heads are busted by flying nightsticks on the 6 o'clock news. Since last August, officers have been contacted from other demonstration-torn cities including Washington and Los Angeles to tell local officials how to cope with the situation.

LEARNING FROM OTHERS

They also are receiving help on how to handle conventions from Miami Beach, which was host to the Republicans in '68, and from San Mateo County where the GOP met in the Cow Palace in 1964. In addition, Police Chief Raymond Hoobler is expected to travel soon to Chicago where the Brobdingnagian American political brouhaha took place at the Democratic convention in 1968.

There, newsmen and spectators were assaulted along with demonstrators by police, as most of the nation looked on via television. The violence was considered a factor in the close defeat of Hubert Humphrey by President Nixon.

One of Connole's 20 two-man committees—all of them under an umbrella designation of a "general administration task force"—is setting up plans to escort newsmen to the front if a riot develops. Newsmen will not be allowed to get between demonstrators and police lines. Otherwise, he says, there are virtually no strictures on them.

Other committees are dealing with setting up communications, logistics, detention facilities, prisoner control, liaison with other agencies like the National Guard and the California Highway Patrol, and other facets of the problem.

In another unique approach, San Diego is bringing in sociologists "and people like that to come in and give us a little more insight into these people (demonstrators)," Connole says. His men are being taught crowd dynamics—the ability to spot and deal with the sparks that may set off major disturbances.

ALL REMAIN SILENT

No one on a state or national level is willing to talk about the specifics of contingency plans which climb up through the levels of regional law enforcement. But if the San Diego sheriff's office and the police department can't handle the problems, reinforcements from the six counties surrounding San Diego can be called in.

In addition, the California National Guard will be training men as part of their normal summer duties at a handful of military reservations; the closest is Camp Irwin, 175 miles from the convention city.

A spokesman for the guard in Sacramento refuses to discuss the size of units that will be kept on the alert to move if they are needed. But they do exist.

POLICEMAN FOR EVERY DELEGATE

WASHINGTON.—The U.S. government has awarded the city of Miami Beach nearly $400,000 to purchase sophisticated police equipment and to train Florida security forces for next year's Democratic national convention.

The federal grant, quietly approved by the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, will be added to $178,313 in local funds to prevent a recurrence of riots that plagued the 1968 Democratic convention in Chicago.

The project is the first of its kind of LEAA, which has the discretion to fund innovative law enforcement projects. Florida-Atlantic University will study every phase of police activity during the convention and prepare a handbook for LEAA, which will distribute it to police agencies around the country.

Although the number of police was not included in Miami Beach's application for funds, one federal official guessed there would be a policeman for each of the 3,016 delegates attending the convention.

PHOTO RECORD

Some of the newest police hardware will be bought with the LEAA grant which includes $228,000 for equipment. There will be night vision and optical devices, metal detection sweepers and hand devices to locate guns or bombs, 35 police helmets that contain two-way radios, a radio transmission scrambling system that will prevent unauthorized persons from monitoring police communications, a closed-circuit television system complete with TV cameras mounted on telephone poles in the vicinity of Miami Beach convention hall feeding pictures back to a mobile command post.

A video tape recorder will keep a permanent record of any disturbances within the view of TV cameras, some of which will be placed in corridors and other sections of the convention hall itself.

In addition, federal funds will purchase 2,000 plastic handcuffs which have gained popularity among police in civil disturbances. The grant even provides for marking pens to write on the handcuffs the name of the person who has been arrested.

Also provided will be body armor, bull horns, mugging cameras, 12 Polaroid cameras, movie cameras, film and film processing equipment; 40 face shields for riot duty, 120 gas grenades, 20 gas grenade launchers, 45 portable radio transmitters and receivers, a portable fingerprinting field kit, two high-intensity portable lights, a mobile command van, a 22-passenger minibus to transport police and prisoners, plus maps and graphic arts materials for the police command post.

NEXT CONVENTION

Following the July 9 convention in Florida, some of the police hardware purchased by the government will be transferred for use at the Republican national convention, Aug. 21–25 in San Diego.

U.S. Justice department sources said they were uncertain as to the extent of the equipment transfer until San Diego submits its own application for federal anti-crime funds, which is expected by LEAA about Nov. 15.

Justice sources said that no federal funds were allocated for the purchase of "firearms, tanks or armored cars." Miami beach officials were told they would have to purchase these items from local or state funds.

Before final approval of the grant was made. LEAA notified Democratic national chairman Lawrence O'Brien it was funding the project and asked O'Brien for his comments.

PARTY SECURITY

O'Brien did not reply, but Richard Murphy, manager of the Democratic convention, said in a telephone interview the party attitude was that the $395,424 grant was "a matter between LEAA and Miami Beach." While not anticipating any trouble now, Murphy said, the Democrats will shortly name their own security committee, one of whose functions will be liaison with Miami Beach police.

Florida Gov. Reubin Askew has placed Miami Beach police chief Rocky Pomerance in complete charge of convention security. Pomerance will augment his 300-man force with police from all over the state, including fish and wildlife officers, highway patrol, deputy sheriffs and police from other municipalities. Pomerance, through the governor, also will have control of Florida national guardsmen.

RAND AND ITS WORK

HON. CHARLES H. WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 3, 1972

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, the Rand Corp. has been the subject of public discussion since it became known that Daniel Ellsberg had been an employee of Rand at the time when he said he obtained possession of the so-called Pentagon Papers.

It is unfortunate that the actions of one person should reflect on Rand or on similar research organizations. Rand is too valuable to the Federal Government to permit it to suffer because of Ellsberg. It can best do its important work in an atmosphere of relative stability and quiet.

Rand should be judged, therefore, by its work and its value to the Defense Department and other agencies, not by the headlines or by the actions of a previous employee.

WHAT IS RAND?

Rand is a private nonprofit corporation engaged entirely in research and analysis of problems of American security and public welfare.

It is concerned primarily with the kinds of problems Federal, State, and local leaders face in making policy choices. The problems are usually large, complicated, long term, and expensive. The public is likely to benefit if they are addressed by public officials at least partially on the basis of objective, independent analysis.

Rand helps provide this analysis in areas of its experience and competence.

Rand began as a pioneering attempt by Government and California scientific leaders at the close of World War II to create the conditions and the institutional framework necessary for independent sustained analytic, interdisciplinary research designed to solve national defense problems.

The Rand Corp. is located in Santa Monica, Calif., with additional research facilities in Washington, D.C., and New York City. There are about 1,000 employees, about half of them professional researchers.

Rand professionals are trained in many disciplines, including engineering, mathematics, physics, economics, and the social sciences. The Rand function under its various contracts is, essentially, to apply interdisciplinary working teams to the task of developing preferred solutions and aiding the client in examination of the options.

The decisions, of course, are made by the Government officials, based on a variety of inputs, including Rand's.

RAND'S WORK

From its beginning, Rand dealt with a wide range of subjects related to the future security of the Nation. There were studies of rocket engines, high-energy fuels, computers, radar detection, and effects of high-energy radiation. Rand studies were backed up by a broad program of advanced research in mathematics, physics, electronics, and other fields relevant to the development and use of future aircraft, missiles, and satellites.

Over the past decade, Rand has applied the research methods and skills it developed in national security research to problems directly affecting the lives of Americans at home. The work has ranged from the analysis of water supply, urban transportation, weather modification, and the causes of teacher shortages in our school systems to biomedical studies involving the cooperative efforts of engineers, physical scientists, mathematicians, and physicians.

STRATEGIC POLICY

Rand is perhaps best known for its work on alternative nuclear-war policies. Rand analysts in the 1950's began a number of studies of the purposes, alternative uses and consequences of various nuclear postures. These studies provided an education for many government decisionmakers and offered specific alternative policies. One alternative explored by Rand in the late 1950's led to extensive changes in nuclear war targeting in the early 1960's.

Rand's study of air bases from 1951 to 1954 laid the foundations for the strategic concept of an assured second-strike capability, a major step in retaining limited war as an alternative to an all out nuclear exchange. It also decreased U.S. dependence on overseas bases, thus reducing international tensions. Finally, the base study developed a new concept of operations, which by Air Force estimate netted savings of $1 billion in installations alone, and was judged to provide the same security as other proposed systems costing many billions more over a 4-year period.

SYSTEMS ACQUISITION STUDIES

The Rand studies of the complex and expensive process of developing and buying major weapons systems has helped the Department of Defense to arrive at current reforms, including improved prototyping and sequential development.

Rand work on prototyping, which has been carried on since the early 1960's, has identified specific instances when there are substantial cost and performance advantages in prototyping. Rand analysts also have devised a method of measuring in advance the difficulty of meeting given technical improvements and the cost in time and money. Rand is able to contribute to current Defense Department changes because of its long continuity in analyzing the problems and its independence in developing alternative solutions.

MAINTENANCE AND MANAGEMENT

Almost all Rand analyses look for more economical use of resources, but some are aimed directly at identifying possible money-saving changes for the services. The resulting savings, easily pay Rand's cost to the Defense Department. Here are some recent examples:

Air Force Materiel Management. The Rand base stockage model was the basis of cumulative inventory savings which range upward to $200 million.

Air Force aircraft maintenance policies. Two recent studies, the culmination of 15 years' research, have led to an Air Force rethinking of basic inspection policies. Air Force cumulative and future savings flowing from this work can go as high as $100 million.

Avionics development and procurement practices. Rand suggested strategies for repair and maintenance of avionics, tailored to the needs in the field, which can save probably $4 million a year and provide better availability of systems.

URBAN PROBLEMS

Although the analytical methods developed at Rand can at best embrace only parts of any broad problem affecting society, they can nonetheless lay bare previously obscure aspects of the problems, supply data, stimulate relevant questions, and assist in defining alternatives for the policymaker. For instance, Rand is increasingly applying its experience to such domestic tasks as the appraisal of housing programs for the city of New York and development of methods for evaluating national manpower training programs for the Office of Economic Opportunity.

ANALYTICAL METHODS

Rand has been a leader in the development and application of many analytical methods now widely used in the scientific, governmental, and economic communities. One versatile analytical tool closely associated with Rand, for instance, is linear programing, which is used to optimize a particular objective while satisfying a constraint, such as minimizing costs of production or transportation, or maximizing profits.

STATUS OF RAND

Rand remains dedicated primarily to service in the national security area, but with a newer and growing contribution in domestic affairs. Its work is continuing in nuclear and limited war policy, force effectiveness, alternatives for weapons development, acquisition and support, personnel effectiveness and advanced analytical techniques.

Current funding restrictions applied to Federal Contract Research Centers by the Congress and Department of Defense have reduced Rand's DOD funding from about $19 million to $16 million. As a result, Rand is now reducing its employees dedicated to defense work by some 13 percent. This is a heavy blow to Rand, but its researchers and management continue to be dedicated to professional excellence and to public service. Their work can be of great continuing value to the Federal Government even at this lower manning level. The repercussions of the Ellsberg case should not be permitted to cut further into their productivity.

UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

HON. PAUL S. SARBANES

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 3, 1972

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. Speaker, January 22 marked the 54th anniversary of the proclamation of Ukrainian independence—one of the proudest moments in the history of that noble land and a date which continues to inspire freedom loving men and women everywhere. It was on January 22, 1918, that the Ukrainian Rada established an independent Ukraine and on that same day in 1919 passed the Act of Union which incorporated all the lands of the Ukraine into one nation. Symbolizing the determination and courage of the Ukrainian people, January 22 provides an opportunity for all Americans to reflect upon the proud heritage which belongs to Americans of Ukrainian descent and to renew our dedication to the principles of freedom and liberty for which Ukrainian Independence Day stands.

A proud, courageous people, Ukrainians have a history stretching back over a thousand years. Theirs is a fertile, productive land. But its very fertility has been the source of its enduring tragedy, for the fine soil of the Ukraine, tilled productively by the industrious Ukrainian people, has been coveted by powerful neighbors throughout recorded history. Time after time these valiant people have been forcibly conquered by aggressor nations. Yet their soul and spirit have never been subdued. Even today while the Ukraine is held in Soviet bondage, reports reach the outside world of continuing resistance.

Mr. Speaker, the history of the Ukraine was first recorded by Herodotus and later Greek and Byzantine historians. By the ninth century the people of what is now the Ukraine had organized into a strong state called Rus with its capital at Kiev, and by the end of the 10th century the Ukraine had accepted the main features of Byzantine culture. Ancient Kiev with its Cathedral of St. Sofia became one of the most prominent outposts of Christian civilization. Then in 1240 came the invasion of the Mongol Tartars under Batu Khan which destroyed the Kievan state and reduced the capital to rubble. In the centuries that followed the fertile Ukraine passed into the constantly changing hands of powerful neighbors.

The 17th century saw a new force emerge—the freedom loving Zaporozhian Kozaks. Under their Hetman Bogdan Khmenitsky, the Kozaks defeated neighboring armies in 1648 and 1649 only to meet eventual defeat with the partition of the Ukraine in 1667 by Poland and Russia. By 1793 the Ukraine had fallen completely under the control of Russia.

Its political autonomy and even its name disappeared.

Ukrainian nationalism was reborn in 1846 when 30 Ukrainian patriots under the leadership of the great Ukrainian poet, Taras Shevchenko formed the Secret Brotherhood of St. Cyril and St. Methodius. Though the leaders were all quickly arrested and either imprisoned or deported, the movement they started began a cultural revival which continued and grew, reaching its zenith during the Russian revolution.

When the Russian revolution broke out in 1917, Ukrainian nationalists seized the opportunity to establish an independent Ukraine. On April 7, 1917 a tremendous demonstration occurred in Kiev and Prof. Mykhaylo Hrushevsky, the great Ukrainian historian, called upon all Ukrainians to fight for their national rights. Out of that demonstration came the Rada—the governing council which eventually declared Ukrainian independence in 1918. The centuries' old dream of independence was realized only briefly however, for the Ukraine was invaded by the Red Army and by the end of 1919 the free republic of Ukrainia ceased to exist.

The Ukraine suffered severely between World War I and II under Soviet rule. World War II only intensified that suffering as it became a battleground for German and Russian forces. Despite the courage of the Ukrainian resistance movement, the war closed with renewed occupation of the Ukraine by the Soviet Union.

Today the Ukraine continues to be a captive nation, but the memory of that glorious period of freedom burns bright in the hearts of the Ukrainian people. Recalling the events which occurred 54 years ago in the Ukraine, I salute the Ukrainian people in deepest respect for their remarkable commitment to the principles of freedom and justice which they have so amply demonstrated throughout their history and for the continuing contribution Americans of Ukrainian background have made to the strength, progress, and prosperity of this Nation. Americans of Ukrainian background exemplify the finest tradition of American family life and love of country.

FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK BOARD ACTION

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 3, 1972

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, it is with no small degree of consternation that I note today's action by the Federal Home Loan Bank Board in approving an application by a federally chartered mutual savings and loan to a State-chartered capital stock association.

As my colleagues on the Banking Committees of both the House and Senate are aware, conversion legislation has been introduced and was to be considered in this session of Congress. While I have been less than anticipathetical to such conversions—given an appropriate and defensible formula which would adequately meet the questions which have already been raised—I had sincerely hoped the House Banking and Currency Committee would be given the opportunity to explore further and more fully these and other questions prior to any precedential action by the Board.

Thus it is that we are placed in the position of insuring, after the fact, if you will, that this action will not have the negative consequences suggested by some of the more violent reactions but rather that the constructive results desired are as far as possible achieved. And I hasten to emphasize to my colleagues that this oversight function is made no easier by the lack of established policies and formulae for conversion which today's action may well foreshadow.

POLICING THE PLASMA PLANTS

HON. VICTOR V. VEYSEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 3, 1972

Mr. VEYSEY. Mr. Speaker, in yesterday's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD I include a stark account of how commercial "blood banks" bleed undernourished and impoverished Haitians for the U.S. plasma market. With virtually no safeguards, plasma from Haiti is shipped into this country to be made into various drug products. The same shortage of supervision and serious need for remedial legislation exists in the domestic plasma market.

An informative description of the U.S. plasma situation appeared in the August 17, 1970, issue of Time magazine. Although this article is now a year and a half old, the problems it describes have yet to be corrected.

The Government agency with responsibility for the purity, potency, and safety of plasma is clearly not doing its job on imported plasma and still claims to have no authority on plasma collected within single States in the United States. With the exception of Texas, few States are protecting blood recipients any better today than when the article appeared.

Mr. Speaker, the National Blood Bank Act, H.R. 11828, which I recently introduced would correct the scandalous lack of supervision of plasma operations. I will be pleased to provide my colleagues with any information they can use on this correctable problem:

POLICING THE PLASMA PLANTS

Plasma, a clear, yellowish fluid that constitutes about 60% of human blood, is an important medical commodity. Hospitals use it for direct, life-saving transfusions to victims of burns and injuries, while pharmaceutical companies have been purchasing increasing quantities for use in the production of vaccines and serums. This growing demand has created a thriving business for hundreds of unlicensed private laboratories, which buy plasma for $5 and up per pint, sell it for at least a 100% profit. But it has also led to a serious public-health problem, and last week the National Academy of Sciences-National Research Council proposed strict new rules to police the plasma plants.

The prime target is the widespread use of plasmapheresis by commercial blood laboratories. An old technique, plasmapheresis separates the components of whole blood and returns the red blood cells—hardest for the body to replace—to the donor. The procedure as now employed can be both profitable and dangerous. Whole blood should not be given more often than every two months. But donors can and do sell plasma far more frequently, and often to laboratories that fail to protect either them or the ultimate user of their life-saving product.

LACK OF CONTROL

One of the dangers that blood donors face is serum hepatitis, a sometimes fatal liver disease transmitted by unsterile laboratory equipment. But the council is even more disturbed by the lack of adequate control over the majority of plasmapheresis programs now under way in the country. Coordination among programs is lacking, record keeping practically nonexistent.

Donors are both unscreened and untested. Though most whole-blood donors are volunteers in good health, many of the approximately 100,000 plasma donors are Skid Row bums and drug addicts. Desperate for money, they may involve themselves in several programs at once, selling plasma as often as three or four times a week. Many allow themselves to be hyperimmunized, so that their blood will produce disease-fighting antibodies. Others participate in programs that could create RH-factor incompatibilities, exposing them to illness or even death if they themselves should later require blood transfusions or certain types of medication.

Appalled by this situation, the Research Council has responded by drafting a set of guidelines aimed at protecting both the donor and the user of plasma products. To weed out the unfit, it proposes limiting participation in plasmapheresis programs to persons of "fixed address."

The council also wants to establish regional registries to identify qualified donors and to maintain records on them. Such a system would also prevent donors from either giving plasma too often or taking part in programs involving the injection of incompatible antigens. It also proposes strict limitations on the laboratories themselves. Under the suggested rules, a physician would be required to supervise all laboratory blood operations, examine all donors.

More than guidelines, however, are needed to deal with the burgeoning blood business. The council itself has no enforcement authority, and the U.S. Public Health Service's Division of Biologics Standards can regulate only the purity and safety of those plasma products shipped across state lines. Washington can exercise only limited control over the purchase of raw plasma from unlicensed laboratories. It is up to the states to regulate the commercial blood centers, and few, so far, have shown any inclination to act.

THE FEDERAL PRISON SYSTEM AND THE FIRST AMENDMENT

HON. BELLA S. ABZUG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 3, 1972

Mrs. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, during recent events at some of our Federal prisons it has been alleged from many sides that inmates are regarded by prison authorities as subhuman. This attitude, many of us feel, has been largely responsible for the bitter tragedies at the prisons which have shocked us in recent months.

To insure that such tragedies do not recur prison officials must work constantly from the principle that prisoners are human beings, entitled as such to basic rights and respect. Certainly the status of prisoners entails the deprivation of some of their civil rights, but prisoners should be subjected only to those deprivations which are essential to good order in the operation of prisons.

The right of prisoners to communicate freely by mail with the media is a right which cannot justifiably be infringed. What unique exigency of the prison situation can convincingly justify denial of prisoners' rights to participate in public discussion through the press? I say there is no such exigency.

Yet the letters I am inserting in the RECORD clearly describe the arbitrary denial of the above rights in the case of 36 inmates at Danbury Federal Prison.

Mr. Speaker, it is time that these human beings receive our attention. It is time that we call the Justice Department to task for its repression of the moral and political rights and beliefs of prisoners. It is time that we demand fairness and impartiality from our prison administrators.

I commend to your attention the following letters:

DANBURY, CONN., *January 17, 1972.*

Hon. BELLA ABZUG,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MRS. ABZUG: Enclosed is a letter that was submitted to the chief of classification and parole in this Federal prison on January 4. It is an "Open Letter to Richard Nixon" signed by 36 inmates and to have been sent to the New York Times. After ten days of individuals' efforts to discover the letter's fate (general inaccessibility, procrastination, and mindless equivocation mark the style of the best caseworkers). The letter was returned to the first signature; postal delivery was denied on grounds of "bureau policy." The specifics were never fully delineated. Something was mentioned that inmates were not allowed to write to newspapers.

This amorphous "bureau policy" is used as the catch-all regulatory index for most institutional commerce. It is a mysterious and sacred set of regulations summoned into being, molded to fit the occasion, and levied according to whim by which the prison machinery is stored and oiled. It is a big club to instill fear, maintain discipline, and slaveful obedience, prevent redress of grievances, and to tighten the screws until the administrators are made to stop. Power yields nothing without demand—it never did, it never will.

Sometimes interested and other than self-serving Congress people will confront "bureau policy." Sometimes inmates, braving the lethargy and uninterest of those in decision-influencing roles, will initiate action themselves—in the only way they have to guarantee a listening audience—and thus producing Atticas and Rahways.

So we have this letter, polite, reasoned, tolerantly respectful dissidence bespeaking good citizenship. To tell you the truth, Mrs. Abzug, some of us had serious qualms about signing anything so damn liberal. But it got turned back and you seem to be the only recourse right now.

It's certainly no big deal, especially in context of penal atrocity elsewhere. But it's indicative. Maybe you could read it into the Congressional Record. Maybe you could forward it to the New York Times with a copy of this letter. Maybe you could phone the Federal Bureau of Prisons about "bureau policy." Or maybe you, too, could say to hell with it.

Keep up the good work, Bella.

JOHN M. BACH.

AN OPEN LETTER TO RICHARD NIXON

(To be submitted to Mr. Key and forwarded to the New York Times)

DEAR RICHARD NIXON: It is with anger, shame and sadness that we write you to condemn the intensified bombing of North Vietnam and the continuation of the war throughout Southeast Asia.

We hope that the recent forays north will awaken this nation to the fact that the policy of the Nixon Administration is not "to wind the war down" but to continue the fighting in Southeast Asia under the cover of Vietnamization and troop withdrawal. We cannot imagine that it much matters to the people of Indochina whether they are killed and their villages and crops and cities laid to waste by American troops or by Asian troops equipped, trained and supported by the United States; nor do we believe it much matters to the people of Indochina whether death comes from the ground or under a rain of American bombs from the sky.

Merely tinkering with the policy of the Johnson Administration, or clothing the same deeds in new language, will not effectively alter the ongoing and horrible reality of the war for those it most effects—the Southeast Asians. When the Secretary of Defense chooses to refer to "limited-duration, protective-reaction strikes" instead of—more simply—"bombing raids," he does not lessen the destruction of those raids, nor does he quiet the cries of the victims.

We are not deceived. The conditions we opposed when we entered prison persist and we expect more men and women will follow us in order to underline their determined opposition to "Nixon's War."

(Signed by War Resisters and anti-war inmates at Danbury Correctional Institution.)

Michael McCord, John M. Bach, Kevin Messinger, Kevin Jones, Stephen E. Murray, Arthur Burghardt Banks, M. Henley.

Alfred A. Howell, Jr., Stephen Leeds, Daniel Berrigan, S.J., Tom Hosmer, Richard S. Stone, Stanley L. Clark, Michael Fuller, William Cox.

William R. Bowens, Donald D. Garner, Eddie Johnson, Timothy M. Pawlik, Ralph M. Howell, Paul McAlee, Ralph Almedrin.

John Sadler, Gus Edwards, William R. Lynas, William Cousins, Charles Hartwell, Salvatore Migliore, Wm. Witsey.

Frank Pezza, Gregory Mitchell, Harold Stone, Robert Barcella, Martin Goldman, Eugene S. Daniell III, Carl H. Dubitsky.

MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN—HOW LONG?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 3, 1972

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

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

How long?

STATE DEPARTMENT TO COOPERATE ON NEW POW CAMP INSPECTION

HON. LES ASPIN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 3, 1972

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, on February 1, I called upon Secretary of State William P. Rogers to insist that the South Vietnamese cooperate in a new effort by Amnesty International to inspect prisoner-of-war camps in both North and South Vietnam. According to this morning's Washington Post, the State Department does plan to cooperate in a new effort by Amnesty International to conduct an impartial inspection of prison-of-war camps in both North and South Vietnam.

I am happy to report that the executive commitee of Amnesty International is meeting in London this weekend to decide whether to attempt another visit to North and South Vietnamese camps. I assume that the Department of State will not allow the South Vietnamese Government to sabotage another mission by Amnesty International.

If Amnesty International gains entrance to North Vietnamese camps, it will be the first time that facilities containing American prisoners have been inspected by any competent international authority. Hopefully, with full American and South Vietnamese cooperation, a reciprocal visit of POW camps can take place.

This morning's Washington Post article follows:

U.S. SUPPORTS PROPOSAL TO VISIT POW'S

(By Sanford J. Ungar)

The State Department said yesterday that it will support an effort by Amnesty International, an organization with headquarters in Britain, to conduct an impartial inspection of prisoner-of-war camps in both North and South Vietnam.

If the organization gets a firm agreement from Hanoi that would permit it to visit American prisoners there, a State Department official said, "we would use whatever influence we have" in Saigon to persuade the South Vietnamese to permit a similar inspection.

Rep. Les Aspin (D-Wis.) announced a few hours later that Amnesty International is expected to launch such an effort after a board meeting in London this weekend.

American support for the mission would represent an apparent change of emphasis in U.S. policy, which has long regarded the International Committee of the Red Cross as the only organization sufficiently impartial to make such an inspection.

Frank A. Sieverts, a State Department officer with special responsibility for the prisoner of war problem, insisted, however, that no change of policy was involved. "We would like anyone to see the prisoners in North Vietnam," Sieverts said.

But Aspin said he was "suspicious" that the State Department had previously kept the organization from visiting prison camps in the south.

He called upon the State Department to "encourage" Amnesty International's new proposal and to put pressure on the South Vietnamese to go along.

Aspin released documents this week which

he said demonstrated that the effort last spring by the organization to visit prisoners on both sides "blew up" when Saigon refused to grant visas for an Amnesty International delegation.

Sieverts denied that South Vietnam had actually turned down group's application, but had merely asked that it be "deferred" pending the efforts of South Vietnam to repatriate prisoners from the north.

He said he was skeptical, however, that Hanoi would actually permit a visit to American prisoners held in the north.

"If a visit to North Vietnam should take place," Sieverts said, "then we would support" a similar visit to the south.

But he added that "it would take an awful lot to convince us," in light of North Vietnam's refusal to let other groups visit the prisoners.

He pointed out that the International Red Cross regularly visits prison camps in the south, but has been turned down in its efforts to get into North Vietnam.

The State Department takes the position that the Red Cross qualifies under the Geneva convention on prisoners of war as a group that may conduct neutral international inspection of prison camps.

Sieverts said last night that Amnesty International, on the other hand, is a "political organization" whose impartiality is doubted in South Vietnam and elsewhere.

A non-governmental group which includes people of various ideological persuasions, Amnesty International generally has directed its efforts on behalf of "prisoners of conscious."

It has for example, investigated the conditions of political prisoners in Greece and the Soviet Union and recently prepared a report on British internment camps in Northern Ireland.

Aspin observed last night that it would be "unusual" for Amnesty International to get involved in a "shooting war situation." But he pointed out that the organization's request to the Saigon government included a desire to visit military camps as well as "civil camps," where political prisoners may be held.

The prospect for a new Amnesty International bid to visit the prisoners of war on both sides arose during testimony by William H. Sullivan, deputy assistant secretary of state for East Asian and Pacific affairs, before a House Foreign Affairs subcommittee.

The subcommittee chairman, Rep. Clement J. Zablocki (D-Wis.), raised the allegations made by his junior colleague from Wisconsin with Sullivan.

Sullivan answered that "we would welcome" a visit to the camps in the north by Amnesty International and would "encourage" a reciprocal visit to the south.

QUEENS VILLAGE-COMMUNITY SURVEY PROJECT-ECONOMICS

HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 3, 1972

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, the students of Martin Van Buren High School in Queens Village, N.Y., have recently completed a project that, I believe, is worthy of your attention. These students undertook a study which traces the history of the Queens Village community and provides valuable information as to the social and economic complexion of the area. The data gathered in this study along with the well-written analysis makes this work equal to many professional efforts.

All too often, our younger generation is criticized for their lack of direction and their inability to do work of lasting value. Clearly the students of the honors economics class in Van Buren High School disprove this common cry. So interesting and illuminating is this study that copies are being sent to the Queens Village and Jamaica branches of the public library as well as to the local community organizations. I am sure that this study will be most valuable to those in government who plan and fund community facilities for this section of the Queens County.

The students covered the following areas in their research: history, people, location and physical setting, size of the community, occupation, politics and elections, health, recreation and culture, housing and school facilities, welfare agencies, transportation, and drug abuse. A bibiography of success is appended for each section of the study.

Every area was probed for all the facts it could yield, the students relying on standard source books, interviews, and surveys based on door-to-door research or questionnaires taken home by Van Buren students living in Queens Village. Each of the 12 sections of the book was prepared by a team of 2 or 3 students working together.

Students drew on every community resource available, including the parks department, borough president's office, local newspapers, human resources administration, Queens Board of Elections, Jamaica Social Services Center, Queensboro Council for Social Welfare, and so forth. Important reference works used were the "City Plan of New York, (Borough of Queens)," and the most recent census available.

After you examine this study, Mr. Speaker, I am sure you will understand why I am particularly proud of the young people who live in my community. It is a reflection of their concern for Queens Village as well as a fine example of their intellectual curiosity and abilities.

At this time, I would like to insert this study into the RECORD so that my colleagues may share in the insights and wealth of information published in this project:

QUEENS VILLAGE-COMMUNITY SURVEY: CLASS RESEARCH PROJECT-ECONOMICS IH3

(By Martin Van Buren High School, Social Studies Department)

Edward Kelso, Assistant Principal.
Richard DeFiore, Teacher.

CHAPTER AND TEAMS

History: Sylvanne Beck, Marlowe Schneidkraut.

People: Joanne Masiello, Sharon Grossman.

Location: Neal Buchalter, Stuart Forster.

Size: Andy Simon, Steven Finn.

Occupation: Jeffrey Liebowitz, Eric Skelnick.

Politics: Wayne Hamburger, Paul Fergione.

Health: Nina Schwartz, Lisa Cogen.

Recreation: Alan Grenadir, David Finkelstein.

Housing and Education facilities: Kenneth Roistacher, Jeffrey Strom, Bill Unger.

Welfare: Douglas Love, Alan Lipkin.

Drug Abuse: Mark Rosen, Jay Newman.

HISTORY

The history of Queens Village dates back to the 17th century—1640 to be exact, when ancestors of Mr. Charles P. Rose traded fresh bread for meat with the Indians.

The original founders were, of course, the regional Indians. Two tribes appeared to dominate the area—The Cauaisie—who dominated land from Sheepshead Bay and Coney Island to Jamaica—and The Matinecoc—a branch of the Algonquins who inhabited the Alley Pond Park area, Little Neck and Douglaston.

The first name of this tract (now the present Queens Village and Bellaire) was "The Little Plains" to distinguish it from the Great Plains of Hempstead. It was then a wilderness, transformed into fertile grounds yielding prosperous crops, and then into a New York City suburb located sixteen miles from Manhattan. The first roads were Hempstead Turnpike and Jamaica Avenue, originally Indian roads.

About 1824, Thomas Brush settled in what was known then as "The Little Plains."

In 1844, the Long Island Railroad (Brooklyn-Greenport, L.I.) was built and a railroad station was built at Brushville, although it was noted that the trains only "slowed down."

Adjacent to, and north of the Long Island Railroad Station, Brush built a hotel, chapel, grocery store, blacksmith shop and a tobacco factory.

On January 1, 1857, at a Public Meeting, the name of that part of Brushville was changed to Queens after Queen Catherine of Braganze, wife of King Charles II of England.

The area had its initial start as a residential, suburban community through the enterprise of Col. Alfred Wood, a civil war hero, and later Mayor of Brooklyn (1864–1865) and United States Consul to Italy. Col. Wood laid out a large tract in 1868 which he called "Inglewood" after his 200 acre estate.

In 1871, Wood arranged with the President of the Long Island Railroad to build a new station on land donated by himself. The railroad station was built, but the Long Island Railroad refused to honor the stop unless it was called "Queens." The "Inglewood" sign was pulled down and the "Queens" sign went up.

In September 1924, the name was changed to "Queens Village" to avoid confusion with the county. It was officially recognized and assigned a Post Office. A library was established in 1896 through the efforts to the Shakespeare Club of Queens. It became a branch of the Public Library in 1901.

After the World War II real estate boom, Queens Village was transformed from an agricultural community to a residential suburban community.

The area Queens Village includes: east of Francis Lewis Boulevard to Cross Island Parkway and the Nassau County Line; south of Grand Central Parkway to 114th Avenue.

Famous Buildings and Events:

Queens Village Reformed Church, built in 1858, Jamaica Avenue and Springfield Boulevard.

Lyceum Hall: 98–01 218 Street, oldest meeting place in Queens Village. Built in 1889 as a Woman's organization under the supervision of Mrs. Alfred Eno. No important events in regard to women's suffrage were noted and the organization soon moved. Today, it is a Veteran's meeting hall.

Callister Plant

A distinct "change of the times" can be noted at 212–50 Jamaica Avenue, once home of the Callister Plant, a carriage and farm wagon manufacturer. It is now a Lincoln-Mercury Dealer a showroom and sales office.

Veteran's Plaza

This is dedicated to the memory of all World War II martyrs from Queens Village. It is located at Amboy Place and Jamaica Avenue, across from the Railroad station.

Other points of interest include Cunningham Park, named for a blood-thirsty Revolutionary War general, the Queens Village

Public Library, the Queens and Community Theaters, Creedmoor State Hospital, and Alley Pond Park.

In 1927, Queens Village achieved nationwide notoriety as the scene of the Snyder-Gray Murder. An Art Editor, Albert Snyder was killed with a sash weight by his wife and her lover, a man named Judd Gray. The only reasons for putting it on front pages was the involvement of a sex triangle, and the Snyders were ordinary people in an ordinary suburb—the sort of people with whom the ordinary reader could identify. The Snyder-Gray case felt the nation's delight at vicarious horrors and was a result of the forces of ballyhoo. Mrs. Snyder was the first woman sent to the electric chair.

Queens Village Centennial: September 1971: This event, featuring parades and dances was held to honor the construction of Col. Wood's Long Island Railroad Station, September 1871. Guest speakers included Mayor Lindsay and Astronaut Alan Shepard.

Alley Pond Park

Alley Pond Park, 409 acres, bordered by Union Turnpike, Winchester Boulevard, Springfield Boulevard, Cross Island Parkway, and Northern Boulevard, were at first settled by the Matinecoc Indians.

In 1637, Thomas Foster, the first settler, obtained a royal land grant of 600 acres near the "Alley". He built his home, a beautiful stone house there, three years later. It was a refuge against Indian attacks, and the only way of entrance was by means of a creek.

An Englishman by the name of Bartlett sailed up the creek one day looking for Flushing. He stayed at Foster's home awhile and gave him a cutting from a pear tree upon his departure. From that cutting appeared the first Bartlett pears in the United States.

In 1752, a grist mill was built near the alley. It was the scene of filming of several shots for the silent movie, Zaza in 1920. The entire village was made to appear as a European hamlet, the general store, a Swiss Chateau.

The general store was built beside the grist mill in 1838. A post office was built in 1821. This was the official post office for the town of Flushing. "The Alley", the pass through the hills and swamps, was often used as a shortcut route from Roslyn to Flushing or from Refers to "Alley Pond" located off Northern Boulevard and Long Island Parkway, Roslyn to Jamaica or New York via Jamaica and Brooklyn.

All the historic buildings have since been torn down to make way for the Cross Island Parkway. "Alley Pond" before the parkway, was so beautiful it was often synonymous with Thoreau's "Walden."

It was established as a park in 1929. The park consists of a half mile nature trail, 16 tennis courts, playgrounds, wading pools, and fields for handball, softball, baseball, basketball, and football. It contains the borough's largest picnic spot. Two lakes, Oakland Lake and Alley Pond, are dying from the effects of the carbon monoxide of surrounding parkways. The enlarging of the Grand Central Parkway, which involved destruction of much of the park, has had devastating effects on residents and ecologists.

Creedmoor

Creedmoor (Boundaries: Hillside Avenue, Winchester Boulevard, Union Turnpike, Marathon Parkway) was established as the Creedmoor rifle range by the National Rifle Association in 1872 by General George W. Wingate and named for the Creed family who owned the land. It was acquired by the state in 1890 as a rifle range for the National Guard. Many famous International Rifle Meets were held there, the first being in 1874 between the Irish and American teams. The American team won 934–931. In 1876, the Centennial International Rifle Match was held at Creedmore. This attracted wide attention. The scores were:

American team	3,126
Irish	3,104
Australian	3,096
Scottish	3,061
Canadian	2,923

There were over 85 acres, with 30 targets ranging from 50–1200 yards. Regiments of the National Guard were required to practice here at regular intervals. An economic depression and "penny-pinching" governor left abandonment of Creedmoor in the 1890's. The National Rifle Association moved its range to Sea Girt, New Jersey.

Several reminders of the Creedmoor Rifle Range consist of a few street names: Winchester Boulevard, Pistol street, Range Street and Sabre Street.

A poem written by Dr. Charles Miller, a Queens Village poet, about the Creedmoor Range is on the following page.

A painting of the historic Creedmoor Oak Trees was exhibited at the National Academy of Design.

In 1910, the Brooklyn State Hospital was decided to be built. In 1935, it became an independent institution, involved in the care of mentally ill patients, and a center for psychiatric research. A farm complex was also constructed to raise fruits and vegetables for the hospital patients. The farm is still in existence, but it is no longer in use.

The Creedmoor complex consists of over 25 buildings, plus a 22 story building, the largest structure in Queens, and a children's psychiatric Institute. The entire complex consists of 312 acres.

Creedmoor has been under the constant blows of criticism. Due to lack of funds, it is overcrowded and understaffed. One critic called it a "blight to the community." Another more recent critic: "Today the existing treatment and residential areas are the abandoned stage sets; isolated stage sets; isolated from each other and the community outside the fence." A dysentery epidemic occurred in 1944, which brought national attention to the hospital and care for the mentally ill in general. Creedmoor was called the "Crematory."

Despite its constant blows of attack, Creedmoor's facilities and care for the mentally ill, have been steadily improving. There is no longer any need to call it a "blight to the community" but to look at it as an important service to the community, the city, and the state.

THE PASSING OF THE CREEDMOOR OAKS

"'Tongues in Trees' were most eloquent in these!
At Queens we rode by 'Doughty's Grove' today;
A favorite pastime on Jericho Highway
Has given one a half-century of real delight.
Afforded by nature's woodland beauty site
'Too old for ship timber a hundred years ago'
Alas! this venerable forest now must go!
How the heart of each noble tree broke
At tree murder's iconoclastic stroke
Indeed, precious are the traditions recorded true
Of historic rendezvous, 'festive barbecue'
'War Rally' where the immoral Beecher's voice
Made each patriotic heart rejoice
There firmly the old oaks stood
The same primeval wood
There native Indian chiefs and braves
Would protect the trees or fall in hero's graves.
Later, the nature-loving fortune telling gypsies came
With quaint tents and campfires enchanting the same.
Then one sad note of less romantic sound
'Neath underwood, solitary suicide was found.
A public park the brave old oaks should be today.
A noble object lesson 'oasis' has passed away."

Carl De Muldor Miller (Dr. Charles Miller).

The poem summarizes fame of Creedmoor, its oaks, the Rifle Range, and the great International shooting matches.

Queens Village is more or less, a small town with a simple but unique history located within the realms of a gigantic city, teeming with history and problems. In its brief one hundred year span of a few important recorded historical events, it has managed to keep a sense of pride and unity typically found in small American towns. Queens Village has undergone many transformations. Only one hundred years ago it was all farm lands. Only after World War I did residential homes begin to spring up.

Although Queens Village is not noted for any fantastic historical or cultural events, its unique old-time homes and castle houses and small shops, embedded in the atmosphere of a small town only 16 miles from a teeming metropolis, make it an interesting community.

PEOPLE

Collecting recent data for this report was an impossible task. As a result, all work was based in the 1960 census because the 1970 census figures were not yet available. Wherever we went in search of data, we were advised to return in six months when the 1970 census reports would be at our disposal.

We went to the Census Bureau in pursuit of information and were informed that some of the 1970 Census results were available but not for geographical subdivisions the size of Queens Village or Census tract 1301. Census tract 1301 is the census code for the area immediately surrounding Martin Van Buren. These would be ready at a later date. That same day, we visited the City Planning Commission. It was our hope that we could study the new city plans for Queens and that they might provide pertinent facts. However, we were advised that they were not available at present.

We called the Queens Village Chamber of Commerce, anticipating that they would have some relevant material pertaining to their own town; they were most apologetic but could offer nothing.

A telephone call to the Borough President's office, resulted in the suggestion that we go to the library. We telephoned the Long Island Press and the New York Times and were given the same advice. We did have some success when we called the Daily News. They were very helpful and did offer some information but, again, this was for the 1960 Census.

We visited the Long Island Room of the Central Branch of the Queens Borough Public Library twice and collected what little information they could offer. Most of this data dated back to 1960. The publications dated 1962 and 1966 had facts which were based on the 1960 Census statistics.

Telephone calls to the Civil Court, Ethnic Court, and the Marriage License Bureau proved fruitless. All were unable to offer any assistance other than to refer us to the Library.

When we called the Municipal Reference Library, we were told that they had some data—all of which was based on the 1960 Census. We had planned to research their files, but were unable to do so because they are open Monday through Friday only. We phoned the City Planning Library and the Library of Archives and Records, but they were unable to offer any assistance.

The school library had nothing and the librarian recommended we go to the Central Library, as did the local librarian. Therefore, statistics, unless otherwise noted, are from 1960 census tract 1301.

TABLE 1.—*Age distribution*

Under 5	431
5 to 9	812
10 to 14	789
15 to 19	329
20 to 24	99
25 to 29	137
30 to 34	351
35 to 39	643
40 to 44	709
45 to 49	454
50 to 54	240
55 to 59	145
60 to 64	112
65 and over	228

Median age—32.1 years.

TABLE 2.—*Sex distribution*

Male	2,703
Female	2,776

TABLE 3.—*Race distribution*

White	5,464
Negro	9
Puerto Rican	0
Other	6
Total	5,479

TABLE 4.—MARITAL STATUS

	Male	Female
Total 14 years and over	1,708	1,813
Single	295	284
Married	1,384	1,391
Separated	6	13
Widowed	25	112
Divorced	4	26

TABLE 5.—*Ancestry*

United Kingdom	103
Ireland	60
Norway	4
Sweden	21
Germany	291
Poland	555
Czechoslovakia	64
Austria	273
Hungary	100
U.S.S.R.	793
Italy	317
Canada	86
Mexico	0
Other	300

TABLE 6.—*Origin of birth*

Total people	5.479
Total foreign stock	2,967
Foreign born	511
Native, foreign, mixed parentage	2,456

TABLE 7.—*Religious distribution*

	Percent
Protestant	24
Roman Catholic	54
Jewish	20
Other	2

TABLE 8.—*Annual income distribution*

Total number of families	1,430
Under $1,000	20
$1,000–$1,999	8
$2,000–$2,999	21
$3,000–$3,999	30
$4,000–$4,999	92
$5,000–$5,999	231
$6,000–$6,999	235
$7,000–$7,999	158
$8,000–$8,999	160
$9,000–$9,999	125
$10,000–$14,999	260
$15,000–$24,999	74
$25,000 and over	16

Median annual income, $7,494.

I. Organizations

A. Religious:

(1) Churches:

(a) Betany Lutheran Church.

(b) Grace Lutheran Church.

(c) Hollis Avenue Congregational Church.

(d) Lutheran Church of the Redeemer.

(e) Methodist Church of Queens Village.

(f) Queens Reform Church.

(g) St. Joseph's Episcopal Church.

(h) Queens Baptist Church.

(i) Church of the Good Shepard.

(j) First United Presbyterian Church.

(k) Holliswood Community Church.

(l) Evangelical Lutheran Church of the Redeemer.

(m) Calvary Church of Queens Village.

(n) Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints.

(o) First Church of Christ Scientist.

(p) Incarnation R.C. Church.

(q) Our Lady of Lourdes R.C. Church.

(r) SS. Joachim and Anne R.C. Church.

(s) American Martyrs R.C. Church.

(t) Jehovah's Witness Kingdom Hall.

(2) Synagogues:

(a) Bell Park Jewish Center.

(b) Hollis Hills Jewish Center.

(c) Holliswood Jewish Center.

(d) Queens Jewish Center.

(3) Related Organizations:

(a) St. Anne's Council—No. 2429 Knights of Columbus.

(b) Court Our Lady of Lourdes—No. 1082, Catholic Daughters of America, Meetings every second and fourth Monday.

(c) Queens Chapter No. 732 Order of the Eastern Star, State of New York.

(d) Young Christian Society—The Evangelical Lutheran Church of the Redeemer.

(e) Catholic Traditionalists Movement.

(f) Catholic War Veterans No. 185.

(4) See Religious Distribution By Identification:

RELIGIOUS DISTRIBUTION BY IDENTIFICATION

[Population in thousands, 1970; communities Q and R total Queens Village; figures do not total because of rounding]

Communities	Estimated population	Protestant population	Percent	Roman Catholic population	Percent	Jewish population	Percent	Other population	Percent
R	50	12	24.0	27	54.0	10	20.0	1	2.0
Q	57	18	31.6	33	57.9	5	8.8	1	1.7
QV									
Total	107	30	28.0	60	56.1	15	14.0	2	1.8

B. *Fraternal*: According to the Queens Village by-laws, service clubs are composed of professionals and business people.

(1) Lions Club—largest international membership.

(a) local membership, 45.

(b) aims, sight conservation and combat of drugs addiction.

(c) goals. (1) Funded research on laser work and glaucoma; (2) established Braille libraries and print shops; (3) founded seeing-eye dog training school and related facilities; (4) sponsored summer camp for blind; (5) sponsored candy sale and raised approximately $3000 to be used to combat drug addiction.

(d) meetings from September to June. Weekly meetings are held on Tuesdays at Antuns.

(2) Kiwanis Club—International:

(a) Local membership, 27; international membership 400,000.

(b) Aims: Motto: "We Build"—to help in any way possible the youth of the community.

(c) goals:

(1) Kiwanis Baseball—sponsors 1600 boys from ages 8 to 13 years.

(2) Boys' camp—this year the club sponsored three local boys.

(3) Youth of the Month Program—honors senior students from local high schools for their scholastic achievements.

(4) Service award to high schools—recognizes students prominent in school activities.

(5) Cop of the Year Award—honors outstanding policeman of the year.

(6) Funds boy scouts and Girl scouts of America.

(7) Actively involved in Drug Alert Program—printed up and distributed posters and cartoons on the topic and distributed them to local schools.

(d) Meetings from September through June:

(1) weekly meetings every Wednesday at Antuns.

(2) Annual State convention.

(3) Annual international convention.

(3) Rotary Club—International:

(a) Local membership, 45; international membership, 15,000 clubs in 149 countries. For further information on joining, write: Brief Facts, P.O. Box 84, Queens Village, N.Y. 11429.

(b) aims—"service above self"; "The improvement of our community and the advancement of world understanding and peace."

(c) goals (1970)—water pipeline built and financed in Haiti.

(4) St. Anne's Council—Knights of Columbus No. 2429.

(5) Eastern Queens Business and Professional Women's Club, Inc.

Queens Chapter No. 732 Order of the Eastern Star, State of N.Y.

(7) Ancient Order of Hiberians—Viv. 17.

C. Social:

(1) American Legion—No. 980 and No. 301.

(2) Bell-Vill Civic Assoc.

(3) Catholic War Veterans—No. 185.

(4) Creedmore Civic Assoc., Inc.

(5) Eastern Queens Ad Hoc Committee for a Natural Attitude Toward Urban Recreational Environment (NATURE).

(6) Queens Village Rep. Club.

(7) V.F.W. Unity Post No. 1570.

(8) Rocky Hill Civic Assoc., Inc.

(9) Y.M.C.A.—Eastern Queens.

(10) Wayanda Civic Assoc.

(11) Queens Village Civic Assoc.

(12) Queens Village Stamp Club.

(13) Queens Village Camera Club.

(14) Young Republicans of Queens Village.

(15) Boy Scouts of America.

(16) Hollis-Bellaire-Queens Village Little League.

(17) Lioness Club of Queens Village.

(18) American Assoc. of Retired Persons Chap. No. 560.

(19) Queens Braddock Civic Assoc.

(20) Queens Village Boys Club.

(21) Queens Village Democratic Club.

(22) Twenty-First A.D. Democratic Club.

II. Cultural resources

A. Cultural Organization on the Arts:

(1) Goals—secured street closing for the Queens Village Centennial.

(2) Aims—promote the lively arts by sponsoring a/O presenting artwork, ballet, music, etc. to the public of the community.

(3) Funds—from N.Y.C. and N.Y. State organizations for the lively arts.

B. Theatres: (1) Community Theatre; (2) Century's Queens Theatre.

C. Libraries: (1) Queens Village Branch of Queens Borough Public Library.

D. Physical Activity Center: (1) Y.M.C.A. of Eastern Queens.

III. Delinquency—Crime

A. According to the Commissioner of Police: Queens Village has a comparatively lower crime rate than anywhere else in Queens, and therefore, does not need extensive coverage. Until the new building is completed, the Queens Village police precinct (No. 105) is stationed in Rochdale at the 113th precinct.

B. Community Policy Patrol for Queens Village.

(1) Headed by a police sergeant to provide expanded power and increased facilities.

(a) The sergeant is the acting police chief of the community.

(b) The community force is composed of 60 men; 20 men per tour in a round-the-clock patrol.

(c) Patrol coverage includes business and problem areas in the heart of Queens Village (on Jamaica Ave.).

C. Delinquency Statistics—Queens Village:

(1) No information on crime rate, delinquency, and staff coverage by police was dispensed for this report by the 105th precinct.

*Delinquency (1967)**

Queens	33.6
Q**	25.6
R**	75.6
Queens Village	101.2

*Offenses (arrests and referrals of the Police Dep't) per 1000 youths from 7–20 years of age.

**R and Q are sections which make up Queens Village

IV. Mental Health

A. Creedmore State Hospital—only mental institution in Queens Village, funded by the State. There is however, a private organization for brain-injured children.

(1) Recently, Creedmore has established an Open Door Policy and an Out-Patient Policy to lessen the number of permanent patients per day.

(a) Open Door Policy—patients come and go as they see fit, everyday.

(b) Out-Patient Policy—Patients report to Creedmore only when they feel in need of help, and then sign out to go home, when appeased.

(2) Creedmore houses the mentally disturbed and brain-injured of all ages.

LOCATION AND PHYSICAL SETTING OF QUEENS VILLAGE

Climate: The climate of Queens Village is called continental by some and temperate by others. We have a seasonal climate. Neither extreme winters or burning summers plague us.

Many businesses are controlled by the seasons. Ice cream vendors (for example) sell their goods during the warm summer months. Other businesses, such as clothing stores, must restock their shelves for each new season.

Soil: Queens Village soil has a large amount of gravel in it. It also contains considerable amounts of clay. Under the loose top soil, we have a solid sedimentary rock base.

The soil can and was used for agricultural purposes, but it is not the best. The rock base allows the easy building of tall buildings with a minimum of time and money spent on the foundation.

Food Production: The production of food in Queens Village is very limited. Meat production is non-existent, however, many residents of the community grow some of their own fruits and vegetables. Those who do, do it as a hobby, not intending to support themselves by it.

Center of Population: Queens Village does not have very many dense population centers. Most of the housing units in the community are private one or two family houses. There is also a limited number of low rise apartment buildings. The center of population for New York City is far from Queens Village.

Our community does have two areas of fairly dense population. The first area is between 90th and 99th Avenues and 190th and 204th Street. The other area is bordered by Braddock, Ransom, Jamacia, and 87th avenues.

Natural Resources: Today, the natural resources of Queens Village are limited. We have wooded lands (at least as compared to the other parts of the city), waterways, and people.

The woods and ponds of Queens Village are scattered over the community. They are probably the most important resources we have. It's a shame that the few remaining areas are being destroyed. Now there are ponds such as Lily Pond and Pea Pond still left. Queens Village also has two major parks: Alley Pond Park and Cunningham Park. Both parks have baseball fields and similar facilities.

Queens Village has no direct contact with the ocean. Yet, it plays a significant role in the lives of many of the residents of our community. New York City, which supplies a large percentage of our employment, developed in the beginning, mainly due to the great seaport and harbor that it had. Today, many people use the not so distant beaches as a place of pleasure and entertainment, especially in the summer.

The people, if you can call them a natural resource, are last, but not least. The population tends to be a working, white, middle class society. Unfortunately, some people have grown unfriendly and cold; a tragedy caused by the vast population of the large cities.

Physical Setting: Queens Village has a very interesting geological significance. There is a steep hill, following and just north of Hillside Avenue. This hill marks the exact spot where the great glacier stopped.

Problem Growing Out of Location and Setting: Many of the communities problems stem from its out lying location. About sixteen miles from city hall, taxed by the city, yet feeling remote from it, residents believe they are slighted and unserved. Some grievances are legitimate; public transportation and connections with other parts of the city have been deficient; improvements, such as street paving and repair and sewer installations, have been slow. With the remaining vacant land quickly being developed, the need for services from the city is increasing. The district has an expanding air freight industry, and the community suffers from the noise of planes arriving and departing from Kennedy Airport.

Queens Village Location and Physical Setting: The location of Queens Village has many advantages. It is close enough to the city so that we have the advantages of the city. Yet, it's far enough from the city so that we don't have the pollution and extreme overcrowding.

The ground allows the little agricultural use we demand of it. It also has the solid bedrock which makes the buildings of tall structures much easier. Even the climate is helpful. The weather rarely freezes the activity of the community. With the different seasons, residents are exposed to all the different out door sports and activities.

Queens Village may not be the perfect community, but the location and physical setting don't harm it any.

SIZE OF THE COMMUNITY

The community of Queens Village is an area bordered by Union Turnpike and Grand Central Parkway on the north, 211 Street on the west, Jamaica Avenue, on the south, and Gettysburg Street, Braddock Avenue and Winchester Boulevard on the east. We studied the size of the community, particularly the population. Our research took us to the 1960 census where we found that Queens Village was broken down into eleven census tracts. In addition to our general study of Queens Village, we did an in-depth study of tract 1301. This tract, which contains Martin Van Buren High School, is determined by Union Turnpike and Grand Central Parkway on the north, Springfield Boulevard on the west, Hillside Avenue and Braddock Avenue on the south and Winchester Boulevard on the east.

In our study of Queens Village, we discovered certain trends in the population. We researched schools and trade areas in the neighborhood. This included banks, industry and business, and shopping centers. Finally, we conducted a survey of selected families in Queens Village and found out their attitudes towards the size of the community.

The typical types of housing in Queens Village are: single family detached, two-story garden apartments, row houses and small apartment houses. The maximum density in the area is from four, to about 29 housing units per acre.

There are numerous places to shop in Queens Village. The community has both large and small shopping areas. There are also many shopping centers outside of the neighborhood that are frequented by Queens Village residents.

On Hillside Avenue between Springfield Boulevard and 88th Avenue there is a minor shopping center that includes two supermarkets and an assortment of smaller stores. There is also a major commercial area on Jamaica Avenue between 216 Street and 220 Street. This area of stores, service facilities, commercial recreation, and offices include shopping centers at Roosevelt Field, Green Aces, Jamaica, Glen Oaks, and Lake Success.

Queens Village has more banks in a concentrated area than any other community in the city. A few of them are: Jamaica Savings Bank, Reliance Federal Savings and Loan Association, and the Kings Lafayette Bank. These banks pay varying amounts of interest, as much as 5¼% annually.

Industry and business are concentrated in two areas, both along Jamaica Avenue. On the south side of Jamaica Avenue, from 212 Street to 220 Street there is light industry. This includes light manufacturing and warehousing. On the north side from 212 to 216 Street there are heavy commercial and service activities. Among these industries are warehousing, motor vehicle repair, and amusements.

To find out the attitudes towards the size of the community, we took a survey of fifty students from Martin Van Buren High School that are residents of Queens Village. The survey consisted of eight questions involving population trends and school and community problems. The results of our survey can be seen on table 4. One interesting aspect of the survey was that 47 out of 50 students said that Van Buren is overcrowded, yet only 29 felt that there are not enough schools in Queens Village. We agree that there are not enough high schools in the area, but there is a sufficient number of elementary and junior high schools. Most of the students we spoke to stated that overcrowding is the major cause of the school's problems. Some of the problems they mentioned were, large classes, double session, and not

enough personal attention from teachers as well as advisors.

We also looked into community problems stemming from the size of the area. Almost 50% of those surveyed said that Queens Village is overcrowded. More than 75% felt that the area is too segregated. The other questions that we asked were: Are there enough shopping centers and what do you think the average annual income of a family in Queens Village is? Community problems that were suggested are; crowded busses, segregation, not enough recreational facilities, and not enough job openings.

Through the course of our research, we found that the population of planning district 13, (which Queens Village is a member), has had an increase of 100,000 people in only two decades. However, we feel that this figure is not very significant because the population of most areas have been increasing at a similar rate.

We feel that the population of Queens Village is an adequate size now, but increases could cause severe difficulties. We also think that the community is too segregated. Queens Village could use another high school to relieve the pressure on Martin Van Buren.

TABLE I.—POPULATION

[Based on 1960 census data]

Category	Tract 1301 Number	Tract 1301 Percent	Tract 1301 Percent[1] Q.V.	Queens Village Number	Queens Village Percent[2] Q.V.
1. Preschool	631	11	25	2,473	9
2. Teens	542	10	20	2,668	10
3. Voting age	3,192	59	17	18,159	70
4. Over 65	156	3	6	2,406	9
5. Nonwhite	25	0.05	44	57	0.2
6. Negro	25	.5	81	31	.1
Total	5,347			26,194	

[1] Percent of the number of people in a particular category in all of Queens Village that are in tract 1301, 81 percent of the Negroes in Queens Village are in tract 1301.

[2] Percent of people in a particular category relative to Queens Village.

TABLE II.—SCHOOL POPULATION[1]

School	Students	White Number	White Percent	Negro Number	Negro Percent	Puerto Rican Number	Puerto Rican Percent	Capacity	Plus or minus capacity	Percentage of rooms[2]
Junior High School 109	1,581	1,020	65	544	34	17	1	1,684	−120	93
Public School 33	1,220	1,109	90	94	8	17	2	1,442	−169	87
Public School 18	386	3,117	82	64	16	5	1	689	−303	56
Public School 135	1,180	927	79	241	20	12	1	1,310	−130	90
Van Buren	4,470	3,393	88	482	11	55	1	3,468	+1,002	128

[1] Population based on plan for New York City, 1968.
[2] Percentage of rooms in use.

TABLE III.—INCOME

Category	Number of families	Percent
Tract 1301:		
Under $1,000	20	1.5
Under $5,000	161	11.0
$5,000 to $7,000	466	33.0
$7,000 to $15,000	703	50.0
$15,000 to $25,000	74	5.0
Over $25,000	16	1.0
Total	1,430	
Queens Village:		
Under $1,000	94	1.0
Under $5,000	1,344	18.0
$5,000 to $7,000	1,875	26.0
$7,000 to $15,000	3,416	49.0
$15,000 to $25,000	404	6.0
Over $25,000	53	1.0
Total	6,997	

[1] Income based on figures from the 1960 census.

TABLE IV—SURVEY[1]

Question	Response Yes	Response No
Is area overcrowded	23	27
Is area segregated	38	12
Is Van Buren overcrowded	47	3
Is overcrowding the cause of school problems	41	9
Are there enough schools in Queens Village	21	29
Are there enough shopping centers	44	6
What are some school and community problems growing out of the size of the community	(2)	(2)

[1] Average income of families in area surveyed: Under $5 000, 3; $5,000 to $7,000, 8; $7,000 to $15,000, 24; over $15,000, 15
[2] Varied answers in body of report

OCCUPATIONS

The community of Queens Village encompasses a wide range of occupations, incomes, and other related factors. Since our report deals basically with the school community, we limited our survey district to the area between Jamaica Avenue and Union Turnpike on the south and north, and 233 Street and Bell Boulevard on the east and west. Occupations: The area which we have delineated is a typical middle class neighborhood. There is an abundance of people employed in municipal and community services. Included are policemen, firemen, sanitation workers, and postmen.

Production also plays a great occupational role in the life of this section of Queens Village. Machinery and other durable goods, textiles and apparel, and food and other kindred products make up the largest amount of employment in manufacturing among the people of the community.

Distribution is also an important factor in the occupational breakown of the people in the area. Included in this subheading are people involved in wholesale trade, retail trade, and the ownership of eating and drinking establishments.

Transportation is an integral part of the community though not an extremely large segment of the populace is employed in this field. Taxicab drivers, motormen, and bus and truck drivers are included in the above.

Educational and other professional service employees make up a fairly large segment of the community. This subdivision encompasses teachers, lawyers, doctors, dentists, and also engineers and architects.

Workers in communication also make their mark on the community. Included in this field are printers, publishers, telephone operators and repairmen.

Income: Income in this portion of Queens Village ranges from the moderately low to the upper brackets. It ranges from about $3,000 a year to $15,000 and over. As one proceeds north in this section of the community, one finds that income generally rises. The following is a chart showing income breakdown per family size. (Taken from plan for Queens.)

Size	3,000 to 5,999	6,000 to 9,999	10,000 to 14,999	15,000 and over
1 person	334	275	0	8
2 people	3,466	4,594	1,536	274
3 people	2,272	4,631	2,182	602
4 people	2,302	5,342	2,507	944

This chart shows us that the community is basically middle income with yearly earnings between $6,000 and $15,000 and that, in general, larger numbers of people earn more money to support larger families.

Unionism: Workers in the community belong to unions according to their occupational breakdown. Main unions include: Patrolmen's Benevolent Association, Uniformed Fire Fighters, United Sanitation Workers, Transit Workers Union, United Telephone Repairmen. Workers have gone out on strike when their unions led the way.

Unemployment: According to the Department of Labor, unemployment figures are given for a specific census tract only if there are one hundred people on unemployment in that tract and if that number constitutes 5% of the total population of the tract. It is conceivable to have 150 people unemployed, but that might only constitute 3% of the population of the tract. Therefore, this statistic will not be listed. None of the tracts for the section of Queens Village we are studying were listed at the Department of Labor, showing us that unemployment is either less than 100 families per tract or less than 5% per tract. In our survey, we came upon only two families who were unemployed.

Welfare: In this section of the community, 106 cases of welfare have been filed, constituting 201 people. This includes home relief, temporary aid to dependent children, old age assistance, and aid to the blind and disabled.

Transiency: There are no figures available for job changes. In our survey, we found only two or three cases of job changes or changes in occupations in the past year. According to Mrs. Handler, head of the Queens Village Chamber of Commerce, people keep the same jobs and occupations for practically their entire lives. This district is one of the stablest segments of Queens in this respect.

Child Labor: There are no reported incidents of child labor in our sampling district. We must assume that it is non-existent.

1960 CENSUS STATISTICS OF OCCUPATIONS IN TRACTS LOCATED BETWEEN JAMAICA AVENUE AND UNION TURNPIKE

Tracts	542	548	552	554	556	558	560	562	564	566	1,301
Total employed	1,827	837	1,017	927	813	684	622	454	620	481	2,015
Construction	63	30	56	29	46	43	46	17	30	22	66
Manufacturing (total)	439	210	225	197	169	167	133	89	139	119	544
A. Lumber products	3	3	8	9	4	4	0	0	8	0	4
B. Metal industries	32	12	9	0	22	0	5	0	0	4	41
C. Machinery	47	40	26	32	23	47	8	12	4	10	19
D. Transportation equipment	39	0	10	17	21	3	4	12	23	11	58
E. Other durable goods	57	26	27	20	26	27	29	14	23	11	58
F. Foods and kindred products	80	52	10	12	19	23	23	15	38	22	51
G. Textile and apparel	57	16	50	31	15	13	20	0	11	5	166
H. Printing, publishing and allied industries	60	16	50	31	15	13	20	0	11	5	166
I. Other nondurable goods	64	18	40	35	22	26	16	12	20	13	50
J. RR and RR Express	0	8	4	7	5	4	5	13	11	0	20
Other transportation	70	38	43	67	42	37	41	27	36	27	50
Utilities, sanitary	90	66	50	62	53	45	16	19	40	43	43
Wholesale trade	114	35	69	43	47	42	24	21	8	16	124
Eating and drinking places	32	17	28	13	13	12	8	3	4	33	46
Other retail trade	277	92	93	133	175	90	81	46	99	58	307
Business and repair trade	88	28	56	33	23	12	26	15	16	12	58
Private households	8	0	17	0	3	0	12	0	3	4	4
Other personal services	40	15	27	40	23	3	8	11	19	29	38
Hospitals	22	4	44	30	21	8	12	28	4	9	48
Educational services	80	26	30	15	49	35	26	17	24	20	132
Other professional services	120	22	43	20	25	42	33	15	57	34	120
Public administration	127	64	68	90	69	39	68	54	36	16	258
Other industries	253	182	164	148	150	105	73	78	94	39	

ELECTIONS AND POLITICS—HONESTY IN GOVERNMENT

There is no local government in Queens Village. We are represented however, by duly-elected officials in the City Council, State Legislature, and Congress. The Councilman representing Queens Village (16th Council District) is Matthew J. Troy, Jr., a Democrat. He has represented Queens Village in the City Council since 1964. He now also holds the post of Queens County Democratic Leader. He has recently come out in support of George McGovern (Democratic senator from South Dakota) for President. Mr. Troy has often been described as a conservative who votes liberal. Also representing the people of Queens Village, the two councilmen at large from Queens are Mr. Alvin Frankenberg, a Liberal, and Mr. Mastropieri, representing the Democratic Party. The Chief executive of Queens, or Borough President is Donald Manes, a Democrat. He became Borough President this year when Sidney Leviss resigned and decided to run for a judgeship in the court system. When Mr. Leviss announced his resignation, it was already too late for a primary election for Borough President to be held. A replacement (Donald Manes) was therefore appointed by the executive committee of the two major parties. Mr. Manes was then elected to the Borough Presidentship this year, with the support of the Democratic, Republican, and Liberal Parties. Queens District Attorney Thomas Mackell, Democrat, was also reelected with the support of these three parties.

The majority of Queens Village lies within the 20th Assembly District (A.D.) and is represented by Republican John Esposito. A northern portion of Queens Village lies in the 21st Assembly District, and is represented by Saul Weprin, a Liberal Democrat.

Queens Village lies within the 8th State Senatorial District and is represented by Murray Schwartz, a Democrat. He has been a State Senator since 1966. He wishes to encourage civic groups to press vociferously for reforms. He has always supported anti-busing bills and shows a wide range of concerns including election reforms and consumer protection. He gives solving the narcotics problem top priority because he says it leads to so many other problems.

Seymour Halpern, a Republican, has represented the 6th New York Congressional District since 1959. He often sponsors consumer protection bills.

All of our representatives have good reputations and there is really no question of dishonestly in government.

The registration in Queens Village is predominantly Democratic (approximately 3 to 1) but it is generally considered a basically conservative area and very often votes Republican. For example, Queens Village's representative in the State Assembly has been a Republican for approximatly the last three decades.

Queens Village has local branches of both the Democratic and Republican Clubs. The Democratic Club (which never seems to be occupied) is located at 220–24 Jamaica Avenue and meets the third Friday of every month.

This year's elections were marked by some of the most sweeping bipartisan endorsements of candidates in Queens County history. These included nominations for Judges, Borough President, District Attorney, and Surrogate. Of the four major parties, the conservatives were the only ones to put up their own slate. Under the agreement between Democratic County Chairman Matthew Troy and Republican County Chairman Sidney S. Wein, three Democrats and three Republicans received nomination to the State Supreme Court. Jules Kroll, A Democratic candidate for Queens Councilman at Large brought a suit in Federal Court to nullify the nomination charging that Troy and Hein plotted with residing judges to resign after the deadline for filing primary petitions and then nominated the same candidates. He charged these actions were designed to disenfranchise Queens voters by subverting the democratic process in the primary, then preventing a choice of candidates in the general election. This action violated the fourteenth amendment according to Mr. Kro. . . . However, the suit was dismissed.

In recent years, the city has tried to bring government closer to the people through neighborhood city halls, creation of the Mayor's Urban Task Force and the strengthening of Community (Planning) Boards established by the City Charter.

Mayor Lindsay proposed this June a plan that would establish a single community board for each community planning district in the city with a full time staff, community offices, and a community cabinet of local city officials. It would provide for a single local board to deal with all city problems, with a broadly based membership. It would have the capacity to effectively monitor local services, broaden citizen involvement in government decision-making and make agencies mor accountable to the community they serve. The new neighborhood governments would be given the powers that are now held by Community Planning Boards, Urban Action Task Forces, Neighborhood City Halls, and Neighborhood Conservation Bureaus. These powers would basically be to oversee city services and make recommendations with little or no power to allocate funds. It is estimated that this plan would not cost the city any additional money since the two million dollars now budgeted to the Community (Planning) Boards, Urban Action Task Forces, Neighborhood Conservation Bureaus, and Borough Improvement Boards would be rechanneled to be used by the new neighborhood governments.

The present Community (Planning) Boards in each community planning district would be strengthened. The members of these community boards would be appointed as follows: the Mayor, Borough President, and Councilmen for the district together with Councilmen at Large would each appoint seven members; also community school boards covering the district would appoint three members. This would make a minimum number of twenty-four.

In addition, any community corporation boards or model cities advisory committee included within the boundaries of the community planning district would appoint up to three members, in proportion to the total population of the district they serve. It is hoped that eventually these boards will be appointed. Then, there would be a community hall in each district.

A community director would be appointed by the Mayor from a panel of five names submitted by the community boards. The community director would chair regular meetings of the community cabinets. The officers of the community boards, the Borough President, and the city councilman or their designees would also attend.

The local boards would prepare annual district papers which should contain an evaluation of municipal services in the district and recommendations for improvements. They would hold hearings on the city's capital budget on projects located in the communities and then make suggestions to the Mayor, Board of Estimate, and City Council.

REGISTRATION OF VOTERS—JUNE 1971

20TH ASSEMBLY DISTRICT

	Republican	Democratic	Liberal	Conservative	Total
Election District:					
50	271	362	8	31	711
52	229	321	8	16	623
53	129	211	8	22	385
54	182	352	4	14	589
55	131	184	3	16	366
56	232	302	7	10	581
60	119	234	7	10	396
77	192	245	11	11	498
Total 20th Assembly District	1,485	2,211	56	124	4,149

21ST ASSEMBLY DISTRICT

	Republican	Democratic	Liberal	Conservative	Total
Election District:					
35	92	592	41	4	762
36	60	618	18	1	737
51	112	266	5	1	423
52	83	211	5	2	337
53	53	323	8	3	434
54	98	276	17	18	447
82	38	370	14	1	435
Total 21st Assembly District	536	2,656	108	30	3,575
20th Assembly District	1,485	2,211	56	124	4,149
Total	2,021	4,867	164	154	7,724

1971 ELECTION RESULTS

[Councilman at large: Muratori, Mastropieri]

	Republican	Conservative	Total	Democratic
20th assembly district	7,439	4,083	11,522	11,161
Queens total	82,943	49,231	132,174	216,488

[Assemblyman, 20th assembly district: Esposito, Laudun]

Republican	Conservative	Total	Liberal
9,005	4,490	13,495	2,231

TRANSPORTATION BOND ISSUE

	Yes	No
20th assembly district	9,365	17,126

HEALTH

The once sparsely populated areas of Queens Village and Floral Park have become increasingly populated due to the current desire for suburban life. This sudden rise in population has stimulated the need for more hospitals, old age homes and treatment centers for the sick and aged.

Health is an important aspect of community living; only one carrier of a contagious disease is needed to infect many others and then possibly create an uncontrollable epidemic. The typhoid crisis, many years back, is an illustration of this point. One "typhoid" Mary spread the typhoid sickness and caused it to reach epidemic proportions. On the following pages, the already existing health and nutritional programs and facilities that have been established to cope either successfully or unsuccessfully with the community health problems are listed. On the basis of the extensive research done, several conclusions have been made as to how effective they have been in combating and preventing sickness and malnutrition in the school community.

The ultimate source of water for the school community is the Catskill reservoir. In order to reach the tap at home, the water must pass through the two city tunnels in Brooklyn, enter the Ridgewood reservoir and travel through water mains to its final destination.

The city of New York has established definite rules in regard to sanitation in apartment buildings. When a building houses more than eight families, the landlord is obligated to have regular janitorial service available to his tenants. If he does not do the janitorial work himself, he is required to station a superintendent in the building or on the same block. In cases of more than 12 families, the landlord must either live in the apartment house, or have a janitor in the building or within 200 feet of it. If the landlord doesn't live in the building, he must have his name, address, and phone number posted in the entrance hall.

It is the landlord's responsibility to keep the halls, stairs, dumbwaiters, shafts, cellars, roofs, alleys, backyard and stoops clean and free of any vermin. The tenant is obligated to keep his apartment clean or face eviction. He is forbidden to shake mops and throw trash out of the windows or into the dumbwaiter shaft or into public halls. In areas where pets are allowed, the tenant is responsible for their actions on the sidewalk.

If an exterminator is needed, the landlord must provide one. When it snows, he must also see that the sidewalks are shoveled, then sanded or salted.

If there is no incinerator in a building, the landlord must provide alternate means for garbage collection and disposal. He must put out at least two cans daily from 7–9 a.m. and 6–8 p.m. The Department of Sanitation sends out day trucks and night trucks. The garbage is dumped in a landform on Fountain Avenue. These cans must have tight-fitting metal covers. All garbage must be placed in these cans and no garbage is permitted on top of the lids. Old magazines and newspapers must be tied up in bundles for collection. Bulky items that are to be disposed of will be picked up by phoning the Department of Sanitation. It is illegal to leave a refrigerator outside for pick up with the door still on.

The preceding paragraph in regard to garbage collection applies to apartments as well as private homes. In addition, there are special sanitation rules that apply to the cooperative development surrounding the school. Separate garbage rooms with cans are provided for the disposal of refuse. The litter cans on the sidewalks and the garbage cans in the laundry rooms are not intended for household garbage. They are used strictly for papers and empty detergent packages. In 90% of the communities in Queens, garbage is picked up twice a week.

The current rise in house construction has necessitated the need for improvements in the storm and sanitary sewers in Queens Village and Floral Park. The following are the plans for the location of storm sewers and the schedule to begin work:

East Williston Avenue, 74th Avenue from Little Neck Parkway to 225th Street (Spring, 1970) as well as 240th Avenue from 93 Avenue to Braddock Avenue (Spring 1970). According to the Plan for New York City these projects should have taken a year to be completed and they should be finished by now. The estimated costs for these projects and those mentioned below are:

Project:	Cost
East Williston Avenue	$800,000
Springfield Boulevard	3,390,000
226 Street	1,260,000

The state in January, 1970, if things have proceeded according to schedule, should have to do work on the installation of sewers along the prolongation of Springfield Boulevard from 2,900 feet south of 147 Avenue to 147 Avenue. This is supposed to be in conjunction with the construction of a Nassau Expressway. A second stretch along 226 Street has been planned, but no starting date has been set as yet.

BIRTH AND DEATH RATES: ILLNESSES

The birth and death rates for the health district including Floral Park and Queens Village show the following statistics for 1965:

Births	
White	6,808
Nonwhite	328
Total births	7,136
Deaths	
White	3,590
Nonwhite	115
Total deaths	3,705
Deaths by Cardiovascular disease	
White	2,111
Nonwhite	62
Total deaths	2,173
Deaths by malignant neoplasm	
White	735
Nonwhite	20
Total deaths	773
Fetal deaths by cestation	
White	714
Nonwhite	63
Total deaths	777

To summarize the statistics in Floral Park and Queens Village, cardiovascular diseases contributed to the most deaths, 2173/3705 or approximately 66%. The second most prevalent disease is malignant neoplasm, approximately 25%. The total number of births is approximately twice the total number of deaths. The statistics bear out the current ones for the U.S. The number one killer is heart disease, the number two killer is cancer.

Other disease present are the ones present in most middle class suburban areas. The common cold, the flu, throat infections, occasionally, the grip. Among children there is chicken pox and measles. Diseases such as small pox, polio and diptheria are obsolete due to the preventative immunizations. Recently, due to the bad air pollution, many people's throats have been bothering them, but hopefully this will be eliminated.

This district has more hospital beds than any other in Queens, although only a small number are general health facilities. The state's 6788-bed Creedmore Mental Hospital is now being modernized and the voluntary 300-bed Hillside Hospital, also voluntary, are both psychiatric facilities. Creedmore Hospital has about 200 acres of undeveloped land. Long Island Jewish Hospital and Deepdale Hospital are both general hospitals.

There are three kinds of hospitals in New York City, in terms of financial support:

(a) Municipal Hospitals, operated by CUNY.

(b) Voluntary Hospitals, private, non-profit.

(c) Propriety, profit-making.

Voluntary hospitals have somewhat higher costs and charge higher rates than Municipal Hospitals. They provide more extensive private care, and any person may be admitted. "Medicaid patients are eligible for treatment at Voluntary Hospitals. It is a fallacy that poor people can be treated at only Municipal Hospitals. Each type of hospital may be either a general hospital, handling many kinds of illnesses and conditions, or a special hospital. New York City pays through its charitable institution budgets, $130,000,000 to voluntary hospitals, for in-patient care of Medicaid patients. Additionally, the city pays $25,000,000 for outpatient care. This amounts to about 50% of voluntary hospitals income.

Medicaid is a state program designed to cover the major medical expenses for those medically indigent. Eligibility standards are still being worked out. To find out more information contact: Dept. of Welfare Information Services, 250 Church Street New York 10013 (PI 4 8700).

There is another medical program nearly all Americans 65 and over are eligible for, medicare. To join, a person must sign up and pay $3 monthly. 80% of all reasonable charges for the following are covered, after the first $50:

(a) Physician and surgeon bills in hospitals, doctor's office.

(b) Home health services up to 100 visits a year.

(c) Various other medical and health services such as diagnostic tests, surgical dressings, or rental of medical equipment. For further information contact: Greater New York Hospital Association, 3 East 54 Street New York 10022 (HA 13300)

Other health insurance programs include programs under Social Security hospital insurance. Hospital Insurance is provided automatically for people 65 and over, who are getting social security or railroad retirement benefits. A few months before 65, contact the Social Security Administration. Generally, this program covers:

(a) up to 60 days in a hospital except for the first $40.

(b) all but $10/day for an additional 30 days for each spell of an illness.

There is a lifetime limit of 190 days on payment of treatment in mental hospitals.

(c) up to 20 days in an extended care facility, skilled nursing home, or convalescent sections of a hospital, and all but $5 per day for an additional 80 days. These services are effective for only a hospital stay of at least three days.

(d) up to 100 home health visits by a nurse or other health worker in the year following release from a hospital or an extended care facility.

(e) 80% of cost of out-patient diagnostic tests in hospitals after the first $20 for each twenty day period of testing.

The Health Insurance Plan is joined through place of business and is supervised by the State Department of Insurance.

Blue Cross's purpose is to protect people in terms of hospital cost rather than a fixed dollar allowance. To contact, call MU 9-2800.

The Board of Health carries out administrative services. The Board consists of a commissioner of health who is the chairman of four members, at least two of whom must be doctors. The Board is a legislative body with broad powers, ranging from issuing of permits to trapping pigeons, to practical midwifery to mobilizing the city's facilities in an emergency. The closest district health center for Queens Village and Floral Park is located at: 90-37 Parsons Blvd., Jamaica, New York (018-6600).

It provides services for maternal and child health, school health, preventable diseases and adult hygiene, nutrition, public health nursing, social work, health education and maintains clinics for chest, veneral disease, cancer and diabetes check-ups.

There are two nursing homes located directly within these two communities: (a) Windsor Park Nursing Home, 212-40 Hillside Avenue; (b) Glen Oaks Nursing Home, 260-01 79 Avenue.

The visiting nurse service of New York provides part time skilled nursing care and home health aide services in home to the sick of all ages. Care includes, physical therapy, rehabilitation, family health supervision, and nutrition guidance. For further information contact: Visiting Nurse Service of New York, 160-16 Jamaica L.I., New York (JA 6-7787).

Public health nurses are assigned to child health stations, caring for infants and preschool children, render public health nursing service to elementary public and parochial schools and secondary schools, they act as consultants to teaching staff on problems of health, refer to proper community agencies for health and welfare services, assist in immunization programs, working paper clinics, veneral disease, cancer detection, adult diagnostic and TB clinics. Nurses visit homes of patients to instruct in nursing care, help arrange, teach isolation precautions, to obscure health hazards, to learn social and economic needs of families, to help solve problems or refer to other health or welfare agencies, to urge immunization or other preventative measures, to teach need for medical care, to assist in epidemics, to do case findings, and to keep informed of special field and public health problems.

Another division of health agencies is the Home Health Aide Services. Headed by the Community Service Society of New York (254-8900); families and individuals are serviced by the society's Dep't of Family Services and Central Services, by the special projects of the Department of Public Affairs or by the Social Services Department of a voluntary hospital with which the social services had established a Cooperative Homemaker Service Plan. The National Council for Homemaker Services, located at 1740 Broadway, N.Y. (245-8000) stimulates expansion and improvement of home. Home health aide services are throughout the country and membership is open to agencies directly concerned with providing home health services, and organizations and individuals interested in giving support. The Council's purpose is to provide a central source of information and medicine, through which knowledge and experience can be pooled to advance development of Home Health Services. It promotes development of sanitation. It sponsors conferences seminars, publishes a bimonthly newsletter and reports. The Bureau of Special Services, Division of Homemaker Services (340-5854) trains and provides services of homemaker to assume responsibility and care of children when mother is hospitalized or ill at home. The local bureau is at 92-16 147 Place, Jamaica, L.I. New York (990-5793).

The American Cancer Society, Queens Division, 116-55 Queens Blvd., Forest Hills, New York (BO 3 2222) distributes informational materials such as films, posters, literature and conducts lectures on smoking. Programs are conducted in schools with the public at large.

The United States Dept. of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C., was established for grouping under one administration agencies whose major purposes are to promote social and economic security, educational opportunities, health of citizens, administer variety of grants in aid programs and offer professional advisory services in related fields.

The Queens County Mental Health Society located at: 192-08 Jana Avenue, Hollis, New York (479-0030).

It serves as a channel for citizens acting for conservation and advancement of mental health services. It fosters community organization and action to improve and expand services for mentally ill. It has programs for parent and civic groups, speakers' bureau, and a referral service .

The State Department of Health of CUNY located at: 125 Worth Street, New York (556-7711); Edward O'Rouke, President.

It regulates all matters affecting health in New York City, enforces all provisions of law for preservation of human life, and protects health. Public health services rendered by special bureaus are generally decentralized to Borough Offices and District Health Centers.

The Community Agencies Public Relations Association (CAPRA) c/o Community Council of Greater New York.

It is organized by professional public relation practitioners. It aims to promote high standards of public relations practices, to serve in the interest of the entire community to facilitate the exchange of information and ideas to build more effective public relations programs, to promote cordial relations among public relations.

The Bureau of Public Health Nursing located at: 125 Worth Street, New York (566-7074). It administers and supervises public health nursing services in homes, schools, and clinics of Department of Health.

The Medical Community for Health located at: 175-15 Hillside Avenue (AX 7 8398). It is a group of medical and paramedical who fight for adequate special health care for all citizens regardless of race or economic status. There is a non-political emphasis on provided information to community.

The Coordinating Council of the First District Branch, Medical Society of the State of New York located at: 37 New Dory Lane SL 10306 (987-3377) Joseph F. Shanopy, M.D. Chairman, William Wheeler, M.D. It represents the organized medical profession of the city of New York in matters of local concern pertaining to the practice of medicine, services. It sustains and promotes the public health and welfare and the scientific progress of the medical society of N.Y.C. It cooperates with the medical society of N.Y. in matters within its sphere. It is composed of medical societies of N.Y., Bronx, Brooklyn, Queens, and Richmond counties.

The Central Chapter of the American Red Cross located at: 90-07 Merrick Blvd., Jamaica, L.I., N.Y. 11432 (787-1000), Harold Bassett, Director. It offers blood, first aid, water safety, and volunteer programs.

The Food and Nutritional Council of Greater New York located at: 485 Fifth Avenue, Manhattan 10017 (PL 7200). Seymour I. Halpern, M.D., President, Stella Hope Page, Planning Chairman. It sponsors citywide Nutrition Month, Borough committees function in all five Boroughs.

There are these health and hospital clinics available:

(a) Booth Memorial Hospital; Main Street and Booth Memorial Ave., Flushing, 11385. Thursday by appointment.

(b) Jamaica Hospital: Van Wyck Expressway and 89th Ave., Jamaica, L.I., N.Y. 11418 (JA 6-7500). Thursday, 12:30 p.m., by appointment.

(c) Mary Immaculate Hospital: 152-11 89th Ave., Jamaica, L.I., N.Y. 11432 (291-3300). Monday by appointment.

(d) Anti-Rabies Clinic: 90-37 Parsons Blvd., Jamaica, L.I., N.Y. (658-6600).

(e) Cardiac Consultation Service Clinic: same as above.

(f) Child Health Station: same as above.

(g) Chest Clinic: Triboro Hospital, 162 Street and Grand Central Pkwy., Jamaica, N.Y. (JA 6 8600).

Child Health Services are available at:

(a) Queens Hospital Center: Queens Gen-

eral Hospital, 62–68 164 Street, Jamaica. L.I., N.Y. 11432.

(b) Well Baby Clinic: (990–2412) Tues. Thurs. 9 a.m., Premature Mon. 1 p.m.

The Jamaica Glaucoma Detection Center located at: 90–37 Parsons Blvd., Jamaica, L.I. N.Y. (OL 8 6600). It offers diagnostic and preventive services for residents of N.Y.C. 25 and over.

The Cerebral Palsy Speech and Hearing Center located at: 65–30 Kissena Blvd., Flushing, N.Y. 11367 (HI 5 7500). No residential requirements. Children and adults—ext. 358. It offers a rehabilitation program to the speech and hearing handicapped. Mon.–Fri. 9 a.m.–5 p.m., Sat. 9 a.m.–1 pm. Program and fees: individual therapy $6/hr; group therapy $3/hr.; interview fee $5; special diagnostic interview $10; hearing test evaluation $10; hearing aid evaluation $15; hearing test screening $5.

Care for the aged include:

(a) Catholic Charities, Diocese of Brooklyn, 145–22 Jamaica Ave., Jamaica, L.I., N.Y.

(b) Chapin Home for the Aging: 165–OI Chapin PKWY. Jamaica, L.I. Men, Women, Couples.

(c) Queensbridge Health Maintenance Service for the Elderly: Queensbridge Housing Project, 10–29 41 Ave. L.I. City (ST 6–0393).

(d) Salvation Army: Booth Memorial Hospital, Main Street at Booth Memorial Ave. Flushing (445–1000).

The problem of nutrition has become ever increasing due to diet fads and interest in organic foods. Many people undertake dieting and due to their lack of nutritional requirements become undernourished. Some organic foods have no mineral or vitamin content due to soil deficiencies. The current rise in the use of additives has consequences that are unknown by the average consumer. Lucky Whip and Cool Whip, two synthetic whip creams, have coconut oil as their primary constituent. Coconut oil is extremely high in saturated fat and is of little nutritional value. Diet margarine is simply margarine whipped with water. The consumer is paying more money for this product because of the added water. All of these "convenience foods" are high in caloric value. The four basic food groups of meats, cereals and breads, fruits and vegetables, milk and milk products must be met in the proper amounts for a nutritious diet.

"Health is a condition which depends upon certain factors; the balance between the susceptibility of the people as compared with the virulence of the organism."

Queens Village and Floral Park have various programs available to combat health and nutritional problems. Weight watchers meet every Wednesday night at the Bell Park Jewish Center, "Hillside Ave. and 232 Street, Queens Village, New York. For a small fee, persons who wish to lose weight are set on a nutritious diet. At every session, the dieter records his/her progress. Those who are on the weight watchers diet have mentioned that they never feel hungry. This program gives an overweight person the opportunity to lose weight by eating properly and not endangering his/her health.

The Jamaica Health Center has a number of nutritionists available to aid the consumer who is unaware of human nutritional needs. They try to insure proper diets.

The Home Economics Department of Martin Van Buren High School, under the direction of Mrs. Purnell, is trying to institute a consumer nutrition program in Pantry Pride, a nearby food store. They have suggested that a table, manned by several home economics students and a teacher, be set up in the store. In this manner, any consumer who wished to know the nutritional value of any product would be able to have her questions answered at this table. As yet, this plan has not been approved by the store manager.

Many schools are used at night as dental or medical clinics. The following list indicates where these services are available in Queens:

Dental Clinics:

(a) P.S. 45, 126–38 150 Street, Jamaica, J.A. 91853.

(b) P.S. 116, 107 Ave. & 173 Street, Jamaica, J.A. 64884.

(c) P.S. 131, 84th Ave. & 172 Street, Jamaica, R.E. 94229.

(d) P.S. 50, 146–26 101 Ave.

Diabetes & Glaucoma: P.S. 40, 109–28 Union Hall Ave.

The school system has always been concerned about health as evidenced by the numerous hearing tests, eye tests, recordings of weight and height, medical forms, dental forms, dieticians in the cafeterias, school nurses, hygiene and biology courses. In Martin Van Buren High School, the Home Economics Department offers several courses that are concerned with nutrition and health. Boys and girls are encouraged to take the two term Food Preparation Course which gives instruction on how to select and prepare food for its best nutritional value. Those who elect the one-term International Foods course are also given this instruction, in addition to consumer practices. Prospective nurses taking Introductive Nursing learn about the different diets that must be prepared for special patients.

The Health Careers course that is offered by the Biology Department is designed to teach the students the proper techniques of how to use microscopes, centrifuges, and other bacteriological equipment. The pupils are so effectively trained that many receive up to one year laboratory technician certification after completing the course. Health Careers is a twenty week course. The first ten weeks of class are taught by Mrs. McCarthy. Mr. Purnell teaches the remaining ten weeks. Blood tests are performed first using commercial blood. Once they have received this practice, the students test themselves. On the basis of those tests, pupils have discovered that they had mononucleosis, anemia, and certain allergies. Routine treatments on urine are performed. Physical and chemical (acetone, albumin, and urinary sugar) examinations are made. The course might possibly be extended to include histology or tissue techniques. Through the various courses mentioned previously, educators feel that "hopefully the students will learn something about health and nutrition, carry this information home, and irradiate others."

RESULTS OF HEALTH IN THE COMMUNITY SURVEY (35 RESPONSES RECEIVED FROM STUDENTS AT THE MARTIN VAN BUREN HIGH SCHOOL)

Question	Queens Village			Floral Park		
	Yes	No	Blank	Yes	No	Blank
Are you satisfied with the availability of health and welfare facilities in your community?	4	9	2	12	8	0
Are you satisfied with these facilities?	4	9	2	7	11	2
Do you feel that the New York City Department of Sanitation is functioning adequately to take care of refuse in your community?	8	7	0	9	11	0
Is the school that your child or you attend sufficiently teaching about the importance of nutrition and health?	9	6	0	7	12	1

The following are some selected comments that were typical of the answers given to two opinion portions of the survey:

I. In your opinion, how can health facilities in your community be improved?

"Increase emergency-room type facilities. When you have a serious accident and go to Long Island Jewish Hospital you have to wait up to 4 hours to see a doctor in the emergency room."

"We need facilities in Queens Village Proper before we can worry about improving them!"

"More facilities should be built and the ones already built should be modernized."

"In many of these homes, corrupt practices are practiced. Many welfare home directors do not want to take a patient in on medicaid. They want patients to pay privately. In some cases, they try to collect from both medicaid and from the private patient."

"They should be given some notoriety so that people will know of their existence."

"We have a shortage of doctors. If we could shorten the length of time of study, it would add incentive to potential doctors to complete study."

"Private institutions are very expensive to build and maintain so are public facilities. Improvements can be made with more funds, investigation into wasteful expenditures such as unemployment benefits to the young, healthy and lazy is one way. . . ." Queens Village Responses.

"Although there is some availability, there should be more."

"They could give prompter service, instead of letting people wait in their clinics so long."

"Speaking only as a member of H.I.P., the only center in this area is the New Hyde Park Branch. It is woefully understaffed with a resultant paucity of services. Another branch in the area would help."

"More information about birth control and abortions."

"Make the waits in hospital emergency rooms less."

"More community centers for older citizens, bingo groups, etc."

"Too expensive." . . . Floral Park responses.

2. Additional Comments:

There should be greater federal, state, and local assistance to health institutions."

"The school cannot do all of the educating in terms of health and nutrition. Whether or not local health (mental and physical) facilities are adequate must also hinge on community-wide surveys showing population breakdown." "Only in this way can we ascertain the need."

"The importance of nutrition and health should be instituted at home and reinforced on all levels in school; kindergarten, etc. . . . Queens Village responses

"Department of Sanitation should have more concern over our sanitation matters."

"The school should improve their hygiene course."

"Neither Biology nor Hygiene gives an adequate picture of nutrition and health. Recently the biology curriculum was revised, and the unit on health was omitted, with the expectation that it would be covered in hygiene. However, in hygiene the unit was also pretty much omitted."

"Nutrition is taught effectively in Home Economics, but someone not taking Home Economics receives no information." . . . Floral Park responses

Floral Park and Queens Village do not have adequate health facilities to meet the ever-growing demands and needs of its residents. The foremost issue, is the lack of hospitals. This health district has the most hospital beds, yet there is a shortage. This is a very serious problem. Patients are being discharged days ahead of time to provide room for more to be admitted. Residents of Floral Park are quite familiar with the five to eight hour wait in the Long Island Jewish Hospital's Emergency Room. The district health center's clinic is another example of overcrowding and long hours of waiting. If more

hospitals and clinics were built, these problems would be eliminated. The reason there is an overcrowding in the health facilities, is that in the past ten years, there has been a large migration from the city to the suburbs. This is evidenced by the amount of new shopping centers. Finest on Hilside Ave., new schools, Hillcrest H.S. new homes, by the Glen Oaks golf course, and improvements in transportation, a direct bus to Manhattan. These new projects provide new homes, new jobs, more means of education and transportation, luring New Yorkers from the crime trodden, air polluted, overcrowded city.

To meet this growing population, the amount of medical care must correspondingly be increased. The number of agencies is large, but unfortunately, few are aware of their existence. The present community health programs should be increased to inform the residents what is available to them. A program is currently being set up to educate consumers how to shop wisely and expose the low calorie frauds and misconceptions. Community improvement begins with community awareness and knowledge. The school health offerings, biology and hygiene, have been supplemented by an excellent Health Careers Course. This course provides more depth into such hospital procedures, as blood grouping and urine analysis. The mandatory eye and teeth check ups have necessitated proper medical care for youngsters. By being weighed and measured throughout elementary school, children have been encouraged to eat properly and outgrow their friends. The services offered by the Department of Sanitation could be greatly improved. Biweekly collections are often not sufficient. Street cleanings and washings would give residents more pride in their community, instead of feeling ashamed at the filthy roads. Nassau County sands the icy streets in winter, the Dept. of Sanitation should follow this example. Many automobile accidents could be eliminated. The nursing homes located within the community are very small and very expensive. Homes for the elderly can be partially paid through pensions and social security, but often the family is burdened with heavy payments. Medicare and Mediciaid are wonderful ideas and have helped many people. But in individual cases, they have not provided enough. More extensive research should be done to make sure everyone has enough assistance to survive. The amount of illnesses and sicknesses have been fairly consistent, and have not reached staggering proportions.

The surveys taken reveal a great deal of dissatisfaction among students age 16 to 17 living in Floral Park and Queens Village. It is up to them, as future homemakers, to try to improve the existing conditions (wherever they live) by the proper means, or at least to make others aware of the problems. By community support, petitions, rallies, lobbys, etc. improvements could be made.

RECREATION AND CULTURAL OPPORTUNITIES

We have conducted a survey in Queens Village to determine the true recreational and cultural habits of the community residents. Forty residents on three blocks in the neighborhood were surveyed and the data for the fill-in questions collated. The comments of persons interviewed are stated in the report.

Among the problems encountered in searching this report were the lack of information in the public libraries (the information on recreation wasn't broken down into small areas like Queens Village) and the unavailability of one listing of all the recreational or cultural facilities in the area, thus forcing us to do our report in a piecemeal fashion, working mostly from the survey and from interviews. One other problem encountered was that many residents, leery of our intentions, would not cooperate in answering the surveys or granting interviews.

One of the most active centers for community recreation and culture is the Y.M.C.A. located at 238–10 Hillside Ave. It boasts of a membership of two thousand five hundred, and according to Mrs. Irene Handler secretary of the Queens Village Chamber of Commerce and a member of the Y.M.C.A.'s executive board, our "Y" is unique in that it is the only family-oriented "Y" in the United States. By a family-oriented "Y", she means that there are no facilities for boarders and that the activities taking place at the "Y" can be enjoyed by all members of the family.

Since the main objective of the Y.M.C.A. is to provide recreational activities to its members, the "Y" in our neighborhood sponsors the following groups and clubs: aquatic groups for all ages, volleyball teams, a "leaders club" for the teenagers of the community, a yoga class with a professional teacher, a Ladies Auxiliary which runs the adult social functions and takes care of entertaining visiting personnel from other Y.M.C.A.'s, and an "international gym" where the entire family can exercise together. The Y.M.C.A. in Queens Village is especially proud of its experiment in water instruction, the "Mom and tot swim." Young infants (as young as six months old) are placed into the deep section of the Y.M.C.A.'s pool along with their mothers and taught how to swim while under professional supervision. According to Mrs. Handler, astounding results have been achieved through this program.

Besides offering programs to its members, the Y.M.C.A. lends a helping hand to other groups. One of these favors to the community was the Martin Van Buren High School exchange program. From its inception in February, 1971 until the end of the school term in June, 1971, a limited number of students were offered full use of all the facilities at the "Y". The Y.M.C.A. also brings in groups of mentally retarded and underprivileged children to use their facilities. The swimming team of Van Buren also uses the Y.M.C.A.'s pool for practicing.

Outside groups using the Y.M.C.A. for their meetings include the Borough President's Planning Board No. 13, chapter 560 of the American Association for retired persons (members, although over 55 years of age, do not have to be retired), and the Rocky Hill Civic Association, Inc.

The churches and temples of the neighborhood are also active in providing culture and recreation for their members. The Bell Park Jewish Center, located opposite Van Buren H.S. on Hillside Ave. sponsors a basketball team, a youth group, a lending library, evening adult courses, and a lecture series. Groups using the center for meetings include Sophie's Weigh-in Ltd., L'Chaim B'nai B'rith Youth Adults (a singles club), and the boy scouts. Also offering the community reading material and a quiet study hall is the Christian Science Reading Room located on 217th Street and 93rd. Ave. It is open to all those interested in learning about the Christian Scientists.

Contrary to what you might think, Queens Village offers a multitude of organized sports activities. Among these are gymnastics, judo, karate, bowling, lifesaving, skin diving, scuba diving, aquatics for small children, yoga, little league, and all the teams organized by the various schools and churches in the community. According to our survey 40% of the interviewees participate actively in one type of sport or another. Those adults most involved in sports activities are those who have younger children.

Queens Village's major park facility is Alley Pond. The park offers tennis courts, handball courts, baseball field, football fields, and picnic areas. During the summer months rock concerts are held free of charge. One other major park is on Braddock Ave. Although it is minuscule in comparison to Alley Pond, it does offer tennis courts, handball courts, and basketball courts to those who live closer to it than Alley Pond.

As for the fine arts in the community Queens Village has two theaters, an oil painting group, and it is projected that a playhouse will be erected in the near future adding tremendously to the fine arts in the community.

A major social and cultural event in Queens Village was the Centennial Celebration which took place this past year. The functions that the Centennial Association ran were three parades, a street closing at which groups from various opera and ballet companies performed and the setting up of a Queens Village Museum. At this point the Association is pondering the possibility of continuing the celebration an extra year.

A survey by the Community Council of Greater New York has broken the city into 74 neighborhoods and set up indices for each neighborhood in each of several areas so that the average of the indices across the entire city is 100. Queens Village's index of playgrounds is only 15. However, our index of scouting membership among the community's youth is 23 (more than twice the city's average) and its index of scouting leadership, 271, if the highest in the city.

It is safe to say that most of the recreational needs of Queens Villagers are satisfied here in the community. However, the same cannot be said for culture. Fine arts of high quality are lacking in this area, and many people surveyed commented that they must travel to neighboring communities or to Manhattan to see stage performances and concerts. For example, Queens Village no longer has a concert series of its own, and those who want to join the series must sign up with the Laurelton or the New Hyde Park groups. Residents said they would like to see operas or a museum in this area.

The two motion picture theaters in Queens Village, the Queens and the Community, are located on Jamaica Ave. and Springfield Boulevard, and on Jamaica Ave. and 217 Street respectively.

The Queens Theater has two thousand seats and has two shows daily. On weekends "Kiddie Matinees" supplement the regular features at both the Queens and Community Theaters. It is estimated that 728,000 people visit the Queens Theater yearly. (It is to be noted that the statistics quoted about the movie theaters in Queens Village were obtained from the home office of Century Theaters). These figures are inaccurate for our purposes due to the fact that it was unknown to the source how many of the people involved actually reside in Queens Village.

The Community Theater holds 900 people and runs its shows on similar time basis as the Queens Theater. The two theaters, both Century, run different shows simultaneously. This offers a diversified choice of shows to movie-goers in Queens Village. Again, according to the Century's home office, it is approximated that 312,000 people frequent the theater yearly.

As for movie-going in Queens Village, 57.5% of the people surveyed claim to frequent the theaters less than once a month; 35% have been recorded as going to the movies one to three times a month, 7.5% go four to five times a month, and none surveyed attend the movies more than five times a month.

Television, by far, is the most utilized recreational source. Once again, those Queens Village residents surveyed supplied us with the following statistics: 5% watch less than one hour per day, 42.5% watch television one to three hours a day, 35% watch four to five hours per day, and 17.5% of those surveyed watch T.V. more than five hours per day.

Radio also seems to be a popular recreational facility in the houses of Queens Village. Our survey yielded the following data: 20% of those surveyed listen to the radio less than one hour per day, 50% listen

one to three hours per day, 15% for four to five hours per day, and 15% for more than five hours per day.

The following comments were taken from the surveys: "I'd like to see more movies that were (sic) appropriate for the family."; "less expensive movies"; "more discount admissions"; "movies that a family can see together"; "eliminate restricted movies"; "better movies, for example, 'Love Story' was shown in Elmont, not Queens Village, 'Gone With the Wind' was shown at Glen Oaks, not Queens Village." "Movies should all be one dollar." Pertaining to television, one Queens Villager states that, "more T.V. stations like channel 13 should be on the air."

One can see that sex in the film arts and high prices at the box office are forcing Queens Villagers to avoid their local theaters. Most people would like to see the return of the family movie. In conclusion if you are watching your "boob tube" every night, you are not alone . . . Queens Village is watching along with you.

The most accessible source of reading materials for Van Buren students is the school library itself. However, not many students are taking advantage of this excellent facility. "Our students are taking advantage of this excellent facility. "Our students are not reading much," says Mrs. Schwartz, librarian in Van Buren. From September, 1969 to June, 1970, 15, 214 books were borrowed from the school library, and between September, 1970 and June, 1971, the number of books taken out was 17,044. Mrs. Schwartz comments that this averages out to about four books taken out over an entire year per Van Buren students. She attributes this to the fact that there are no study periods in Van Buren, many students take buses to get home and cannot stay late to browse in the library, and many students do not want to borrow books since they do not want to have the responsibility of returning them on time. Mrs. Schwartz states with pride that the library is a specialized library, purchasing books specially to satisfy teenage reading interests. "We try to fill all students," she adds, with a large collection of periodicals, paperbacks, and technical scentific books.

The single branch of the Queens Borough Public Library in our community is the Queens Village branch, located at 94–II 217th Street. Total book circulation for the period July, 1970 to June, 1971 at the Queens Village branch was 212,119, a decrease of 1,029 books from the year before, according to the library's own records. This makes the branch the seventh most active, out of the 55 branches in Queens. Of the books borrowed, 67% were adult books and the rest juvenile. In the same period as above, July, 1970 to June, 1971, there were 64,513 requests for information telephoned to the branch, 22,485 requests for instruction on use of the library, and 17,382 researchers helped by the librarians, the above statistics for the adult section of the library only. For the juvenile section, the corresponding numbers for the same period are 22,046; 10,259; and 7,320. This adds up to a total of 104,380 adult requests and 39,625 juvenile requests for reference and, putting the Queens Village in fourth place borough wide in total reference in July, 1970 to June, 1971.

In the same period, 2,914 adult and 2,422 juvenile library cards were issued to people registering for the first time, giving the Queens Village branch a total active registration of 8,862 adults and 7,121 juveniles, for a grand total of 15,983. (See appendix, figure 4, for the data obtained for the Queens Village branch from the Queens Borough Public Library circulation statistics: June 30, 1970 and 1971.)

The following distribution of reading habits was obtained from the survey conducted: 35% use the library less than once a month, 37.5% go to the library between one and three times a month, 10% go between four and five times a month, and 17.5% use it more than five times per month. One of the Queens Village residents surveyed, a blind man, receives recordings of recent issues of Newsweek and Reader's Digest from the Queens Borough Library main branch and hopes that the service will be widened in scope. Another resident who enjoys classical records would like to see more opera recordings circulated. Many people surveyed expressed the desire for longer library hours, and one requested that all libraries be opened on Sundays. In view of the recent vandalism of the local library, one person wanted "families to form a patrol to control and guard Q.V. library, so we have no more fires, etc."

From the comments received on our surveys, it is our conclusion that the limited use of the library is largely due to the fact that the hours kept by the library are inconvenient to a large segment of Queens Village's population.

From the decrease in circulation and the increase in reference at the Queens Village branch this year over the year before, it is our conclusion that the library is being used less and less as a source of entertainment and more as a source of pure facts. The surprisingly low utilization of the library by the residents surveyed can perhaps be explained by the popularity of television and other forms of recreation.

Van Buren is extremely active in providing a center for recreation and culture in the community.

From 7:40 AM to 5:15 P.M., Van Buren's responsibility is to its 4400 students. To provide stimulation for students of varying interests, a myriad of clubs and teams has been established, many clubs existing for the first time this year. Most meet in classrooms during the afternoon hours with faculty advisors for supervision except for activities such as the Sophomore Sing which meets in the morning, as many tenth graders are on late session at school. According to the listing of extra-curricular activities, there are about 34 non-athletic clubs and 4 boys and 6 girls athletic-oriented teams and clubs this fall term. Most teams are supported financially by the Senior Organization.

In the evening hours, the school is the scene of rehearsals for SING and the Senior Show. In addition, a full recreational program is provided by the evening community center. 384 students have purchased one dollar tickets to attend the five night a week center, and starting this year, girls are allowed to come on Mondays, Wednesdays, and Fridays, when they are under the supervision of Mrs. Kate Raynor. The main activities are volleyball, basketball, and gymnastics. Mr. S. G. Elstein, the man in charge, comments, "I'd rather have 'em (teenagers) in here than standing around on street corners. However, due to a shortage of funds, the community center opened late in the term and the staff has been cut.

The Office of Continuing Education sponsors a choral group made up of Junior High School 109 graduates and run by Mr. Santonocito which meets each Tuesday. Mr. Santonocito also runs an adult choral group which visits hospitals and old age homes to give concerts.

Many other groups make use of the school's facilities. On Friday evenings, the cafeteria is used by the Sea Rangers for marching drills. The Bell Park Jewish Center, American Martyrs, St. Gregory's, and Incarnation each use the gym once a week for basketball practice, and one section of the gym is partitioned off for this purpose. On Tuesday evenings, the United States coastguard Auxiliary offers a free course to adults and teenagers interested in learning about knots, buoys, and the handling of boats (participants must buy charts of the local coastal waters). Those completing the course are given a certificate for boating which is equivalent to a driver's license. The New York Stock Exchange provides speakers for a free course on investing in securities, given on five consecutive Mondays for one hour per lecture.

The rest of the courses in the Adult Education Center meet for eight sessions at a cost of $12. A total of 600 people are enrolled in 24 courses, with Van Buren students allowed to take the courses in typing, stenography, rapid reading, auto mechanics, and PSAT preparation, but not in the golf, bridge, or dancing courses where adults might object. Some of the more notable courses are the high school equivalency class, English for foreign born people, and which uses the school's science laboratory.

The $7,000 in fees collected by the Adult Education center make the courses self-sustaining, but Mr. Elstein is looking for even more community participation. He states, "There's room for plenty more activity. . . . They (Bell Parkers) have their social activities at home." Mr. Elstein is looking forward to a memory course.

A major conclusion of the interview with Mr. Elstein is that the school is being used by many groups in the evening, but it is not being used to its fullest capacity. Mr. Elstein remarked that he would be happy to hire more teachers and give more courses if he had sufficient enrollment.

In looking at the list of extracurricular clubs offered in Van Buren, it is our conclusion that the school offers enough clubs to satisfy anyone's needs and taste, and new clubs can be started by interested persons (the English Honor Society was created as a result of a one-girl crusade).

One of the biggest problems confronting Queens Village is that its parks and street corners are becoming teenage hangouts. The complaint mentioned most often by the residents surveyed was that Alley Pond Park and Braddock Park are no longer safe. Teenagers smoke and inject drugs there as well as indulge in the use of alcoholic beverages.

Vandalism is another problem facing the community. Some Queens Villagers reported that obscenities were written on sidewalks, doors, and cars with spray paint. The churches and temples of this area have all been vandalized at one time or another and fires are often set in mail boxes and trash cans.

Now that the 105th Precinct has been relocated in Rochdale, residents fear that muggings and robberies, which up until now have only been isolated incidents, will increase.

One last comment made by a concerned Bell Parker sums up the situation: "It is unfortunate that in a community such as this which has always been secure, we have had to resort to organizing an auxiliary police force to insure the safety of the residents. In addition, the recent vandalism at our local library is very distressing."

It is our conclusion that idle use of leisure time could be conquered by creating more teen-age centers where the young people of the community could congregate and pass the time in organized activities.

In the words of one Bell Parker, "The community needs a place where young people can meet and get together, socialize, and have any activities that they desire with a certain amount of supervision. Hopefully this would lessen the number of incidents of an unwholesome nature by giving our young people outlets and a place where they feel they can belong."

SURVEY SAMPLE

How often does your family:

(a) watch television: less than 1 hr. per day; 1–3 hrs. per day; 4–5 hrs. per day; more than 5 hrs. per day.

(b) listen to the radio: less than 1 hr. per day; 1–3 hrs. per day; 4–5 hrs. per day; more than 5 hrs. per day.

(c) use the library: less than once per month; 1–3 times per month; 4–5 times per month; more than 5 times per month.

(d) use parks in Q.V.: less than once per month; 1–3 times per month; 4–5 times per month; more than 5 times per month.

Number of people in your family.

List ages of children.

I. List the organized sports activities in which members of your family participate (Little League, bowling club, basketball team, etc.)

2. List the cultural facilities that your family utilizes and the fine arts activities in which they participate (concert series, evening courses, lectures, etc.)

3. What recreational facilities does your family frequent?

4. Comment on the quality of the facilities in Queens Village that you mentioned.

5. What evidences of unwholesome activity do you know of? Be specific.

6. How, in your opinion, could the facilities mentioned above be improved? (better movies, longer library hours, etc.) What facilities would you like to see here in Queens Village?

DATA COLLECTED FROM SURVEY

A. Watching Television:
1. Less than 1 hour per day: 5%.
2. 1 to 3 hours per day: 42.5%.
3. 4 to 5 hours per day: 35%.
4. Greater than 5 hours per day: 17.5%.

B. Radio Listening:
1 Less than 1 hour per day: 20%.
2. 1 to 3 hours per day: 50%.
3. 4 to 5 hours per day: 15%.
4. More than 5 hours per day: 15%.

C. Use of the Library:
1. Less than once per month: 35%.
2. 1 to 3 times per month: 37.5%.
3. 4 to 5 times per month: 10%.
4. More than 5 times per month: 17.5%.

D. Movie Attendance:
1. Less than once per month: 57.5%
2. 1 to 3 times per month: 35%.
3. 4 to 5 times per month: 7.5%.
4. More than 5 times per month: 0.0%.

E. Park Attendance (Queens Village)
1. Less than once per month: 67.5%.
2. 1 to 3 times per month.
3. 4 to 5 times per month.
4 More than 5 times per month: 12.5%.

QUEENS BOROUGH PUBLIC LIBRARY CIRCULATION STATISTICS: JUNE 30, 1970–1971, QUEENS VILLAGE BRANCH

[July 1969–June 1970 and July 1970–June 1971]

	Circulation						Increase or decrease	Adult reference statistics			
	Quarterly			Yearly							
	Adult	Juvenile	Total	Adult	Juvenile	Total		Information	Instruction	Research	Total adult reference
1969–70	35,929	18,743	54,672	139,576	73,572	213,148	−13,848	48,987	12,141	8,774	69,902
1970–71	34,055	15,466	49,521	142,630	69,489	212,119	−1,029	64,513	22,485	17,382	104,380

JUVENILE REFERENCE STATISTICS: JULY 1969 TO JUNE 1970; JULY 1970 TO JUNE 1971

	Information	Instruction	Research	Total juvenile reference
1969 to 1970	19,275	9,954	4,158	34,387
1970 to 1971	22,046	10,259	7,320	39,625
Total reference:				
July 1969 to June 1970				104,289
July 1970 to June 1971				144,005

REGISTRATION STATISTICS: JULY 1969 TO JUNE 1970; JULY 1970 TO JUNE 1971

	Annual-New			Total active members		
	Adult	Juvenile	Total	Adult	Juvenile	Total
1969 to 1970	2,857	2,472	5,329	8,212	6,940	15,152
1970 to 1971	2,914	2,422	5,336	8,862	7,121	15,983

HOUSING AND SCHOOL FACILITIES

Even though Queens Village is considered a middle class residential area, it is split into two definite economic sections; Jamaica Ave. is the boundary line between them. The upper middle class is located in the northern section while the lower middle class is in the southern section. The housing in each of these areas reflect positive differences in economic strata.

There are approximately the same number of private houses in both the northern and southern sections of Queens Village. In the north, the houses are between 20 and 40 years old. These houses are in excellent repair and sell between 40 to 70 thousand dollars. On the other hand, in the south, the houses are of lesser quality. Their age runs between 30 to 50 years old and their selling price is in the range of 20 to 40 thousand dollars except for a few newer additions in both sections.

The types of dwellings in the north are ranches, one and two family houses, colonials, up and down houses, old frame houses, and a few split levels. The south has old frame houses, one and two family houses, and some ranches. Comparing the similar type of houses in the north and south, there is one significant difference. The houses in the north are larger and they are on larger plots of land.

About eighty percent of all homes in this community are privately owned. Beside these houses, there is a New York State aided cooperative on both sides of Hillside Ave.; The Bell Park Manor and Terrace is low cost housing for veterans. The number of units are divided equally above and below Hillside Ave. There are also some apartment buildings. Most of these buildings are located on both sides of Jamaica Ave. The size of these apartment buildings vary between five and twelve stories high and cover about one quarter to one half of a city block. One of the largest of these buildings is located on the corner of Springfield Blvd. and Union Turnpike.

The problem of overcrowding and congestion does not exist. There are no places where large numbers of people live in a small area. This is due to the fact that there are no gigantic housing projects, few apartment buildings and large numbers of private homes. There are no slum areas in Queens Village because this is a middle class area which is well kept. Since most houses are owned by their occupants, the occupants have pride in their community and their property.

In 1922, Queens Village started to expand. New houses were being built to accommodate the influx of people moving into this community. Today, there is very little land left to have houses built on. There is only one new housing development in this vicinity. These are two family attached homes situated on Pontiac Street near P.S. 118.

An overall view of Queens Villiage is a middle class community composed basically of private homes with a few small apartment buildings. It has very little room for expansion but it is not overcrowded.

Local board 13 of the Borough President Planning Board is the only active community planning group. The function of this local board is to settle major fights over zoning problems, school problems and other problems of the community. There are twenty-seven representatives from this neighborhood on this board. Mrs. Hayes of the Borough President's Office is present during every meeting and she reports to the main board the results of the meeting.

There are many civic associations throughout Queens Village (over 20). These civic associations deal usually with the same problems the Borough President Planning Board has. These organizations are formed by concerned homeowners. The main functions of these associations is to protect the members from any infringement of their rights. These associations are all members of the Eastern Queens Civic Association. This parent organization is extremely strong because it is backed by a large portion of all the homeowners of Eastern Queens.

Martin Van Buren High School which is located on Hillside Ave. and 232 Street, is overcrowded. The rezoning of certain areas of Queens and the additional busing has caused Martin Van Buren to hold about 1000 students more than its capacity. Martin Van Buren can service Queens Village comfortably but, Van Buren doesn't only take students from Queens Village. Students from Bellrose, Floral Park, Springfield Gardens and parts of Queens Village do attend. Van Buren is the only school in the community which has this overcrowding problem. The following table lists the school's of the community, their enrollment and capacity.

School	Enrollment							Capacity	
		White		Negro		Puerto Rican			
	Total	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Total	Plus or minus
18	386	317	82	64	16	5	1	689	−303
33	1,109	998	90	94	8	17	2	1,278	−169
34	713	564	79	120	17	29	4	702	11
135	1,180	927	79	241	20	12	1	1,310	−130
109	1,541	1,020	65	544	34	17	1	1,701	−120
MVB	4,470	3,933	88	482	11	55	1	3,468	1,002

School	Construction	Grades	Address	Principal
18	1955	k–6	86–35, 235	Charles Strier.
33	1925, 1966	k–6	91–37, 222	Louis Abramowitz.
34	1898, 1930	k–6	104–12 Springfield	Eudice Stadlen.
135	1930, 1955	k–6	89 and 297	Irving Greenberg.
109 Q	1925, 1966	7–9	213–09, 92	Sidney Goodman.
MVB	1955, 1963	9–12	Hillside–232	Maurice Bleifeld.

WELFARE AGENCIES

One of the major problems facing our large cities today is the increasing number of people using the social services provided for the public. New York City is a prime example with almost one-eighth of its population on some form of welfare.

This study is concerned with the areas feeding students to Martin Van Buren High School. While a majority of pupils come from the Queens Village and surrounding areas, a few travel a considerable distance to attend this school. These areas do not truly represent the Van Buren students, and are not included as they would distort the true picture.

The vast majority of financial aid comes from the government: federal, state and local. However, there are a large number of private organizations that provide some service for the community. Church and other religious groups are an example. A spot check of a number of these organizations indicated that most merely provide social advice in the form of consultations and do not aid monetarily. Groups such as the Lighthouse help in rehabilitative areas. Also, a few organizations dealing with financial aid do exist, such as veteran or union groups.

However, problems arise in trying to obtain statistics from these people. They are either not available for public review, or cover such a large geographic area as to make them invalid in this study. Consequently, the bulk of this report deals with governmental assistance only.

All available statistics concerning numbers and locations of the cases can be found towards the end of the report. They are presently in as clear and accurate a manner as possible. It should be noted that some of the forms of comparison and areas involved may be overlapping or divided in seemingly illogical ways. This is due to the fact that the organization conducting these surveys do so in accordance with their own needs. They were adapted as best as possible to show the proper relationships involved in our study.

Governmental funds are made available from three levels: federal, state and local. This includes all types of welfare except for home relief which is shared equally by state and local agencies. Government, of course, obtains funds by the taxation of the populace. This leads into the question as to whether there are enough funds to carry out this project in the proper manner.

Much discussion has centered around this topic in recent months. In general, recipients of welfare feel that aid is at a level below a decent minimum. The average middle class worker on the other hand, resents paying money for someone who is not working. The area under study by this report consists mainly of the latter. Only a small percentage of the families of students attending Martin Van Buren receive some social service in comparison with the remainder of the city.

The only actual social service provided by the school is the free lunch program. It is federally funded and comes under the jurisdiction of the Central Board of Education.

A point Mrs. Anker constantly stressed was that of a very liberal attitude by Van Buren towards the project. They feel that some of the established rules and standards are outdated and thus cases are examined individually. Income versus dependents of the family are the deciding factors. However, Mrs. Anker does not adhere to exact numbers, correcting for such items as increases in the cost of living, abnormal situations, etc.

Each person receives one pass each month with a place on it for the date to be marked off. If the student loses the pass, he must bring his own lunch for the remainder of the month. In the entire history of the program at Martin Van Buren there has not been one reported case of a pass being stolen or lost. Of course, they are tolerant of the student who forgets his pass every once in a while and a call by Mrs. Anker to the cafeteria will allow him to eat that day.

In recent years the necessity for free lunch has decreased due to school policy of elimination as many lunch periods as possible. A majority of students go only for six periods which does not demand a lunch period. There are only fifty to sixty students using this program but there are a great number of people who are eligible but cannot utilize the program as they do not eat in school.

A major problem in getting information is that the people consulted either do not know how to get you the facts you desire, or are not at liberty to divulge it to the public. This was true of the Social Service Bureau in Jamaica which serves the general eastern Queens area. From here we were referred to the main branch located in Manhattan, who referred us to Community Relations, who referred us to the commissioner of Community Relations, who referred us to the Social Service Bureau in Jamaica. Having made a complete circle without obtaining any worthwhile information, we attempted to utilize every other possibility. These included the library, the Mayors Task Force, teachers in the school, etc. These all kept referring us to the Social Service Bureau in Jamaica.

Just before totally giving up we decided to try the telephone circle again. After completing the cycle up to Community Relations, this time the lady gave us a different number which turned out to be The Community Council of Greater New York. Fortunately they had much of the information we needed.

The moral of the story is that somewhere, someone has the information you need. This problem is simply finding a lady who happens to be in a good mood at that particular moment and who will take the time to help you. If we are to cope with welfare problems of the community, Welfare Information should be made readily available to community members.

These are the results of a survey taken in July, 1967. The city was divided into zones. The zones included in this report are: 21.40, 21.60, 21.70, 29.10, 29.20. Students from each of these zones attend Van Buren.

The results are divided into two main categories. They are: With Children and Without Children. These two categories are also divided up. The cases with children are divided into six columns. They are: Type of Aid, Cases (number of cases), Adults, Children Under 5 (CH. UN.) Total Number of Children (Tot. Ch.), and Total Number of People (Tot. Peo.). The different types of aid are: Home Relief, Aid to Dependent Children (A.D.C.), Temporary Aid to Dependent Children (Temp. A.D.C.) Temporary A.D.C. is aid to the family of a worker who temporarily is out of work. Someone who is in between jobs.

The cases without children are divided into eight columns. They are, Home Relief with one parent (H.R. I/P), Home Relief with two parents (FCASE), the number of adults in FCases, Old Age Assistance (O.A.A.), Aid to the Blind (A.B.), Aid to the Disabled (A.D.), Total number of cases (Tot. Cases), and Total number of people (Tot. Peo.). The H.R. I/P is aid given to one person living alone who is under the age of 65. An F Case is where two people (married) are receiving Home Relief. O.A.A. consists only of people over 65.

When you mention Welfare, most people think of Home Relief. There are very few Home Relief cases in the school area, 13 in all. The largest part of them, 9, are in the southern most zone, 29.20. There are 3 in 29.10 and 1 in 21.60. There are none in the two northern most zones 21.70 and 21.40. Zone 29.20 also has the only two Temporary A.D.C. cases in the area. Zone 29.20 has the highest number of welfare cases. It has by far the most A.D.C. cases. It also has the most O.A.A.

Zone 21.70 has the least amount of Welfare. There are 15 cases of A.D.C., 12 cases of O.A.A., 4 cases of A.D. and 2 cases of H.R. I/P. There is no Home Relief given to families. 21.60 has the second lowest number of cases. 21.40 is the third highest. This is due to the high number of A.D.C. cases in the zone. The second highest zone is 29.10. It has 64 Welfare cases.

These statistics show that in the school area, most of the Welfare cases are A.D.C., 184 or 47%. The next highest is O.A.A. with 130 or 34%. The next highest is Aid to the Disabled, with 6%.

In another survey taken in Queens and parts of Brooklyn, there were 22,000 cases. 85% of them were A.D.C. and 10% were O.A.A. In the city approximately 15% of the cases were O.A.A. The school area has an exceptionally high number of O.A.A. cases. Approximately 68% of the cases in the city are A.D.C. The school area has 20% fewer cases. The rest are about the same.

ZONE 21.60—WITH CHILDREN

Type of aid	Cases	Adults	Children under 5	Total children	Total people
Home relief	1	2	2	5	7
ADC	13	13	5	23	36
Temporary ADC	0	0	0	0	0
Total	14	15	7	28	43

WITHOUT CHILDREN

H.R. I/P	F cases	Adults	OAA	AB	AD	Total cases	Total people
4	0	0	19	0	6	29	29

ZONE 29.10—WITH CHILDREN

Type of aid	Cases	Adults	Children under 5	Total children	Total people
Home relief	3	6	5	15	21
ADC	19	17	14	49	66
Temporary ADC	0	0	0	0	0
Total	22	23	19	64	87

WITHOUT CHILDREN

H.R. I/P	F cases	Adults	OAA	AB	AD	Total cases	Total people
7	0	0	34	0	1	42	42

ZONE 29.20—WITH CHILDREN

Type of aid	Cases	Adults	Children under 5	Total children	Total people
Home relief	8	12	9	36	48
ADC	111	92	92	268	368
Temporary ADC	2	4	4	6	10
Total	121	108	105	310	426

WITHOUT CHILDREN

H.R. I/P	F cases	Adults	OAA	AB	AD	Total cases	Total people
14	1	2	51	2	9	77	78

ZONE 21.40—WITH CHILDREN

Type of aid	F cases	Adults	Children under 5	Total children	Total people
Home relief	0	0	0	0	0
ADC	26	28	35	78	106
Temporary ADC	0	0	0	0	0
Total	26	28	35	78	106

WITHOUT CHILDREN

H.R. I/P	F cases	Adults	OAA	AB	AD	Total cases	Total people
4	0	0	14	0	1	19	19

ZONE 21.70—WITH CHILDREN

Type of aid	F cases	Adults	Children under 5	Total children	Total people
Home relief	0	0	0	0	0
ADC	15	14	14	26	40
Temporary ADC	0	0	0	0	0
Total	15	14	14	26	40

WITHOUT CHILDREN

H.R. I/P	F Cases	Adults	OAA	AB	AD	Total cases	Total people
2	0	0	12	0	4	18	18

TOTALS WITH CHILDREN

Type of aid	F cases	Adults	Children under 5	Total children	Total people
Home relief	12	20	16	56	76
ADC	184	164	150	444	616
Temporary ADC	2	4	4	6	10

WITHOUT CHILDREN

H. R. I/P	F cases	Adults	OAA	AB	AD	Total cases	Total people
31	1	2	120	2	21	185	186

Total number of cases with children	198
Total number of cases without children	185
Total number of cases	383
Total number of people with children	698
Total number of people without children	186
Total number of people	884

TRANSPORTATION

Several different forms of transportation are available in Queens Village. Residents have a choice between private transportation and mass transit. Below are discussed the situations and problems with several types of both forms of transportation.

Residents of Queens Village rely heavily on the parkways of the area for transportation. Due to the lack of adequate mass transit facilities, there is often heavy congestion on the parkways.

The Grand Central Parkway runs through part of Queens Village. Westward it connects with the Long Island Expressway and later leads into the Triborough Bridge. Eastward it goes through Nassau County to Eastern Long Island.

Until recently, the part of the Grand Central Parkway running through Queens Village was one of the few remaining parts of the parkway which had only two lanes going in each direction. This should help greatly to alleviate some of these problems. One of the disadvantages of the widening has been the destruction of part of Alley Pond Park and other landscaping adjacent to the parkway.

The Clearview Expressway currently runs from the Grand Central Parkway northward to the Throgs Neck Bridge. Proposals have been made to extend the expressway southward past Hillside Ave. to provide North-South access and to tie together the expressway system of Queens. There has been considerable opposition to the expansion proposal. It centers around the fact that many homes and a great deal of parkland would have to be destroyed to make way for the expressway. Several plans are being considered that would minimize danger to the area. At the present no construction is underway because no plan has been approved by the New York City Board of Estimate.

The Cross Island Expressway is the main route used by residents of Queens Village to get to Kennedy International Airport. To reach the airport, the Cross Island is used in a Southern direction. Going northward, it crosses the Long Island Expressway.

Even though the L.I.E. doesn't run through Queens Village, many residents use it going westward for daily transportation to and from Manhattan.

During the morning and afternoon rush hours, the congestion on these arteries is the greatest. Accidents frequently tie up traffic, especially on the L.I.E. and the Grand Central Parkway. The construction on the Grand Central Parkway has caused increased rates of congestion and accidents.

There are other roads which are smaller than the parkways but are very important within Queens Village. These include Commonwealth Blvd., Hempstead Turnpike, Springfield Blvd., Winchester Blvd., Union Turnpike, Hillside Ave., Jamaica Ave., Braddock Ave., Bell Blvd., and Hollis Court Blvd.

Portions of Springfield Blvd. have recently been repaved and recurbed. Also, parts of Hillside Ave. have been repaved. Braddock Ave. is greatly in need of repair. No plans for it are scheduled in the near future.

Plans for repaving of Union Turnpike from Little Neck Parkway to Francis Lewis Blvd., and this work will be done at some time in the near future. Improvements on Jamaica Blvd. have been recently completed.

Private cars are used by the majority of Queens Village residents. Many of the local streets are greatly in need of improvement. When salt is put on the streets after winter snowstorms, there is a corrosive effect on the streets. This, along with melting ice and snow during the Spring, has caused potholes and cracks.

Some streets flood after rainstorms due to poor drainage. Installation of storm sewers has ended some of these problems in Queens Village, notably in the vicinity of Martin Van Buren High School.

Another problem in the streets is the lack of signs and lights to guide the motorist. Numerous accidents have been caused due to this problem.

One of the main problems of mass transit in Queens Village is the complete lack of subways. It is necessary to take a bus to reach the subway. This means that Queens Village residents must pay double fares to reach Manhattan.

Major improvements in mass transit that will help Queens Village have been approved by the State Legislature and the New York City Board on Estimate. The proposed Northeast Queens Subway Line will run along the Long Island Expressway. It is expected to be built to Kissena Blvd. at first and later extended to Springfield Blvd. This will still not penetrate Queens Village, but will bring the subway closer.

Also, the extension of the subway along Hillside Ave. past 179 Street has been discussed but nothing is on the agenda for the near future. If such action is taken, many Queens Village residents would only have to pay one fare instead of two.

There are several buses which may be taken to reach the subways. One method is to take the Q 43 bus along Hillside Ave. to the IND subway at 179 Street. According to the N.Y.C. Transit Authority, buses run every 2½ minutes during the morning rush hour and every 5 to 7½ minutes during the evening rush hours. During the non-rush hours and on week-ends, service is much less frequent. Waits of up to an hour for a bus are not uncommon. Also, the Q I can be used on Hillside Ave. The Q 36 bus runs along Hillside Ave. until 212 Street, and along 212 Street until Jamaica Ave. and continues along Jamaica Ave.

Another method of reaching the subway is to take the Q 44A bus, which runs along Union Turnpike to the Kew Gardens Station of the IND subway. The Transit Authority says that the buses run every 4 minutes dur-

ing the morning and afternoon rush hours. During non-rush hours, and on week-ends, the service is much less frequent. Waits rarely exceed thirty minutes even on Saturday and Sunday evenings.

The subway can also be reached by taking the Q 27, which runs along Springfield Blvd. in Queens Village to the Flushing Main Street IRT subway station. According to the transit authority, this bus runs every twelve minutes during morning and afternoon rush hours. Waits supposedly never exceed forty minutes on this line. However, the authors of this report know from personal experience that waits usually run about one hour during non-rush hour periods. On week-ends, waits can be considerably over one hour. When taken towards Queens Village, the Q 27 ends by the Queens Village station of the Long Island Railroad.

Express buses which run along Hillside Ave. (stopping at Springfield Blvd. and other places in Queens Village) into Manhattan during the morning rush hours and home during the evening rush hours are being used experimentally. The cost of these buses is one dollar each way.

The Long Island Railroad can be taken from the Queens Village Station (Jamaica Ave. and Springfield Blvd.) either towards Manhattan or eastward towards Long Island. The cost of using these trains into Manhattan is considerably higher than that of the subway. Also, for many residents of Queens Village it would be necessary to take a bus to the railroad station.

The proximity of Queens Village to Kennedy International Airport is both an advantage and a disadvantage. It is an advantage because of the accessibility of the airport. It is an disadvantage because residents are often subjected to the noises emitted by jet planes. The city is cooperating with the Port of New York Authority and with appropriate federal agencies in the search for effective methods to reduce the disturbance. Proposed expansions to the airport are being carefully evaluated because of the noise pollution and other ecological problems.

Taxicabs are not easily obtainable in Queens Village, although it is possible to call a dispatching service and have a cab sent to your home. The cost of taxi transportation prohibits many people from using them.

Although bicycling is on the upswing, there are factors limiting it's use for transportation in Queens Village. For one thing, the designated bicycle paths are not used much because of broken glass and the possibility of crime on these paths. Cyclists are urged by the police not to compete with automobile traffic on main thoroughfares. Quite often, cyclists are involved in accidents.

The extension of the subway system to Queens Village is imperative to alleviate the mass transit deficiencies of the area. Along with the extension of the subway itself, improvement in the quality of existing lines must be made. The service on the bus lines, especially the Q 27, must be improved, also. Availability of express buses should be made more widespread. The price of these buses should be lowered so that they do not exceed the price of going to Manhattan by regular buses and subway. This would encourage people to use these buses who are now prohibited from doing so by the extra cost.

Although the improvements being made on arterial highways are commendable, improvements should be made on the smaller roads of Queens Village. Repaving is badly needed on many streets and should be done as soon as possible.

If the fare on the Long Island Railroad could be kept down and the quality of services improved, this would become a more significantly used means of transportation for Queens Village residents.

If more people would use forms of mass transit, congestion on the highways would be greatly reduced. This would make transportation easier for all residents of Queens Village.

DRUG ABUSE

According to the statistics furnished to us by the 105th Police Precinct, there were 62 felony arrests for narcotics in Queens Village in 1968 as compared to 166 in 1969—a 166% increase within one year. In 1968 there were 213 misdemeanors in comparison to 400 in 1969. There was a 92% increase in the number of misdemeanors between 1968 and 1969. Statistics as to the number of drug crimes in 1970–71 were not available, but we were informed that there was, once again, a startling increase. Various policemen informed us that although, superficially Queens Village appears to be in a state of decadence, it is not actually so; in comparison to many other communities, the drug abuse in Queens Village is small.

Drugs are very common and very easily obtained in Queens Village, In essence, drugs are a very visible phenomenon. Local pushers, adolescents in their tenns, can be seen every day outside of the local high school, junior high school and neighborhood hangouts, with a full array, which include pot, pills, and even heroin, nervously awaiting to make their sales, in many instances to support their own habits. To encounter the bourgeois prevalence of drugs, one only has to walk by some local hangouts to witness throngs of adolescents helplessly laughing from being high on smoke, or "nodding" out from either downs (barbiturates) or heroin.

In doing our research, we contacted Mr. J. Ponz, who in 1970, interviewed 202 people from Queens Village, ranging in age from 13 to 22, in reference to the extent of the use of drugs in the area. The majority of those interviewed ranged between 16 to 18 years of age, with the mean at 17.2. Mr. Ponz stated that out of the 202 people he had arbitrarily chosen to be interviewed, 144 had tried some form of drug or drugs, at least once, for the purpose of getting high or stoned. The remaining 58 had used drugs (e.g. pills, amphetamines or barbiturate) under prescription of a doctor. From his data, we compiled the following table:

Drug	Number of times taken			
	1 to 3	3 to 10	10 to 100	Habitual
Marihuana, LSD, mesculin, methadrine, and other hallucigenics	12	31	40	59
Pills (amphetamines or barbituates)	38	22	20	29
Hard drugs e.g., heroin or cocaine	27	11	6	21
Others e.g., glue or cough sirup	31	44	10	7

After analyzing what information we had obtained, we decided that there are three main reasons why people take drugs. The three main categories are as follows:

1. The person who is trying to escape.
2. The person who is trying to be "cool."
3. The person in search of "kicks."

Many times all three categories are interrelated and it could be difficult to isolate them.

What is the person, who uses drugs for an escape trying to escape from? Queens Village is a very economical and socially stable community. The adolescents in Queens Village do not have to fight for their survival. Queens Village is not dominated by violence in the form of street-gang warfare, nor is it in the midst of economic turmoil. It provides the inhabitant with a relatively stable and secure operating milieu. Then why the emphasis on escape? Listed below are reasons, stated by drug abusers in Queens Village, as to why they take drugs as an escape:

"Man. there's nothing to do around here but get stoned. No parties, no dances, no beaches. This scene is a drag man. I wake up each morning, go to school, get out at 12:30, and got the whole day off. Can't get a job, so what's left to do? I'm totally bored. My only escape is smoke. It makes everything a little groovier—it's like wearing "crystal spectacles." I feel better, more relaxed, not so hung up—like baby, I'm free. I've escaped the doldrums of a dead town. It's like I beat the system."

"The world is a bad place to live, and Queens Village is even worse. There aint a ——— thing to do or a ——— place to split to. As soon as I get my car I'm cutting out for good. Drugs bring me up—give me a boost. They don't really change anything permanently—you got to come down—but for a couple of hours you feel liberated, with no chains. It's a dynamite feeling, man. You oughta try it."

I'm very paranoid. There's too much happening too soon. Too much violence and too much trouble here. The world really scares me. On heroin everything is different. I'm uptight about the habit but it's worth it. When I'm stoned on horse the world's hangups don't get me uptight. I can leave all my problems behind—nothing really matters. When you're high the world's problems seem remote, far away, and vague. You've escaped the reality of a corrupt world. Nothing matters—not war, hate, social injustice—it's all miles and miles away."

"My home life really stinks. My old man cut out years ago and my old lady always hits the juice. I have no communication with my brother or sister. Living at home is hell, so I get high. It shields me from those people. What I'm actually doing is escaping—mentally—not physically, for a couple of hours every day. If I didn't get high I think I'd really flip out and end up in Creedmore. If I had bread, I'd really escape. I'd cut out for good."

"Reality is a bad scene. I'm only twenty but I feel that I have experienced everything positive in life. What is there left to live for? Drugs give me an out. When I'm stoned I feel optimistic—like a release from the misemotion that plagues us. It may be a false feeling of security but it's something to cling to. I don't want to sound too spiritual but that's where it's at. Drugs make things a little brighter, a little bit better."

"Why live—I mean go through all the cruel hassels of life knowing that someday you're going to die. Why become a slave to the system? To me its seems hopeless. Drugs are my avenue of escape into total liberation and self-realization. They let me leave the dismal world of the egomaniacs. They give me temporary happiness, temporary escape."

"Drugs make me free. They restore my faith in my fellow man. They are the only road to self-contentment in a world engulfed by hatred and hostility."

The person who uses drugs to be "cool" is in a completely different situation from the one trying to escape. He is not as pessimistic. His insecurities and sense of hopelessness is not as pronounced although he may also be peer group statue. Generally people are very concerned about being part of the group. This is evident in the following statement:

"All my friends get stoned and I don't want to be different. If I didn't get stoned with them they would think something was wrong with me an they wouldn't accept me. I'd be excluded from all their scenes. They would think I was a freak."

"Everybody, all my friends, use drugs. Why shouldn't I? If I didn't they wouldn't hang around with me. I'd be labeled a drag. Who wants to go out and make a whole new set of square friends? I like the people I stay with and I want them to like me. They get wrecked; I get wrecked."

"I like the people I hang around with. They all think its cool to get high. Why be differ-

ent? Why rebel against the cats I grew up with. I have a groovy time with them. We have groovy smoke parties—we all get stoned. It's what's happening, man."

"I haven't lived around here too long. I'm from Brooklyn. The cats I hang around with from here all turn on. So I get stoned too. In Brooklyn all my friends thought I was hip, and I want to make the same impression around here. Without friends it's a real down—nobody to rap with. I need these people, and I want to be accepted by these people so I turn on with them."

"It's cool to use drugs—just don't abuse them. All my friends, even the chicks, get high, so I do too. If I didn't there'd be nothing to do. Right now I don't want anybody that doesn't at least smoke. So if I didn't turn on what would I do? I'd go crazy."

The third category that we drew was people in search of "kicks". In the fifties, and even very early sixties, youth did things just for "kicks." The only difference between today and yesteryear is that there is a shift in the methods of getting "kicks". Drinking, "hot-rods" and street-fighting are out. Today there is something new—drugs. Drugs are not really a new phenomenon. Beatniks, back in the fifties, were smoking pot, and Black people, in Harlem, were overdosing from heroin in the twenties. Then why has mass media suddenly switched its attention to the drug scene, to the point where at least two major periodicals have given front page coverage to drug users? The answer is that drugs, once thought as only a lower class entity has penetrated into the middle and upper classes. American youth, regardless of their nationality has found a new kick. American youth is turning on in unbelievable proportions. Why is this kick so popular—so fashionable? Some people responded in the following manner:

"Drugs are what's happening. Everything becomes groovier when you're stoned. Your senses are awakened, like you're really alive. Everything is just beautiful when you are high."

"I use to drink but that was a bad scene. I'd become all uncoordinated. I'd get sick and in the morning—forget it. Pot is much different—no sick feeling or hangover—nothing—just a good head."

"When I'm on acid or mesc' I can see things more clearly. I can really introspect—get into my head. It's like a learning experience, except it's a positive one. No teachers, no books—just reality. I really feel fantastic when I'm stoned."

"When you're stoned on acid the whole world looks beautiful. You feel super-groovy. There's nothing that can compare with it."

"When I'm spaced I feel alive. Everything is nice, I feel very happy. I'm not a paranoid person or depressed regularly, so you can imagine how happy I feel when I'm spaced."

The strangest answer received was that of a seventeen year old girl, "The answer my friend is blowing in the wind." She wouldn't explain this statement any further; I can only guess that she meant that not even she knew why she took drugs.

Most of us who live in the Queens Village area noticed that a crowd of about fifteen kids from fifteen to nineteen years old hang around the local candy store every night. The owner, in a conversation about them, identified them as mostly school dropouts. It is obvious to anyone passing by that they use drugs. Pot and pills are freely passed around. At times, one or another of the gang becomes particularly noisy or throws up. We were told that a few of them "snort" heroin—and listening to their conversations confirmed this.

While standing in the store we caught snatches of conversation. No attempt was evident to whisper or hide what was happening. A sample follows:

"Hey man, you got a cigarette?" "Naw I smoked my last one. Did you hear that Jerry copped some dynamite hash and we'll get it at Pat's pad?" "Go inside and see if Frank has any snort left. I can't go in—Sol (the owner) hates me." "Yeah, then we'll go to the laundry (an adjoining store) and get off."

Every night seems to follow this same pattern—at least the same kids are there saying almost the identical things every time we go to pick up a newspaper. Once we saw the group kicked out of the laundry store. The owner yelled, "Get out you dirty bums. Take your lousy pot with you or else I'll get the cops. You should all be in jail." One guy obviously stoned became very abusive and his friends pulled him away, warning him loudly that he had better shut up and leave before they all got into trouble.

Queens Village is not unusual in today's drug oriented society. Queens Village is everywhere, everywhere young people live. America has been struck with a new disease—drugs—and Queens Village is only symptomatic of America's illness. The fifties were characterized by drinking—the sixties by drugs. What about the seventies? No one can be sure. Suicide? Maybe. The rate has been steadily rising. In the meantime something must be done regarding our drug crisis—something positive. Legislation is not the real answer since it does not strike at the root of the problem. The problem is not and has never been political. Its roots go deep beneath our political institutions. America is drowning in a sea of alienation. North and South, Whites and Blacks, youth and their parents are all alienated from each other. Before we can solve any of our drug problems we must put an end to this situation. We must work to make America the America we read about, learned about in school texts, and was taught to protect. America must earn our respect. This is obviously a long range goal. The many addicts alive today need help now. A program of rehabilitation that will truly serve the needs of our community must begin functioning.

Rehabilitation facilities

Interfaith Hospital, 175–10 88th Ave., Jamaica, N.Y.; Executive Director: Thomas W. Matthews, M.D.; Chief of Professional Services: Benjamin Primm, M.D.

Identifying Data: Interfaith Hospital has both an in-patient and an out-patient department which service drug addicts.

Eligibility: Any drug addict is eligible.

Service: Medical service is offered in the form of detoxification and methadone maintenance. Hospitalization is arranged. Individual and group therapy as well as a therapeutic community are provided. Religious, family and vocational counseling is given. In addition, temporary food and shelter is provided.

Staff: 1 psychiatrist, 2 psychologists, 24 ex-addicts, 15 social workers, 14 physicians, 32 nurses, 1 teacher, 6 clergy, 251 volunteers. There are also staff members engaged in arts, crafts, music and recreation.

Program: There is a preventive program as well as a youth program in operation.

Statement by Director: (not verbatim): Dr. Matthews disclosed that the drug detoxification program at Interfaith Hospital is quite effective. His estimates indicated success with percentages ranging from 80 to 85 of the addicts who require treatment. He bases the success to the complete drug education program given to addicts. Besides using standard methadone treatment (to physically kick the habit), individual and group therapy are introduced. Ex-addicts themselves advise incoming patients.

Community and Narcotic Action Center, 602 Bergen Ave., Queens, N.Y., Director: Mrs. Elsie Brown.

Identifying Data: The Community and Narcotic Action Center is a private non-sectarian facility located in a storefront. Attendance is voluntary. The agency is accredited and funded by ASA.

Eligibility: A client can be paroled to the agency and also accepted if a court case is pending. He may remain in treatment if using drugs. There is no fee.

Staff: Full-time, 2 ex-addicts plus the director.

Services: Clients receive individual and group therapy as well as vocational counseling. Referrals are made to private doctors and hospitals for medical detoxification. Referrals for urinalysis are also made.

Program: The agency participation in general community program meetings.

Additional comments: The agency subscribes to the philosophy of "different strokes for different folks."

Jewish Community Services of Long Island, 97–45 Queens Blvd., Rego Park, N.Y., Contact Mrs. Mildred Heller.

Identifying Data: Jewish Community Services of Long Island is a private family service agency which began a special experimental out-reach program for the young drug abuser in September 1969. It is a multifunction agency offering a wide range of services to families and children including marital counseling, psychiatric and psychological consultation and homemaker service. The agency is funded by the Federation of Jewish Philanthropies.

Eligibility: The agency services all of Queens, Nassau and Suffolk Counties with special concentration by the Drug Abuse Projects in Northern Queens. Heroin addicts referred elsewhere. Indigenous workers make initial contact with troubled youngsters on the street and set up appointments between adolescents and caseworkers in the project. Although parents are not seen initially, early involvement of parents in treatment process is a goal.

The agency continues to accept other referrals through its regular intake. Clients who have a court case pending are accepted by the agency but not paroled to the agency. A fee based on eligibility to pay is charged. Attendance is voluntary. Non-jewish clients accepted.

Staff: full-time, 3 social workers, 2 case aides; part-time, 2 psychiatrists, 1 psychologist.

Service: Individual and family therapy.

Program: The agency offers parent education workshops and special programs of family life education. Speakers and workshop leaders are available.

Samaritan Halfway Society, 130–15 89th Road, Richmond Hill N.Y., Director: Mr. Richard Balbi.

Identifying data: Samaritan Halfway Society is a private, non-sectarian facility with an in-patient capacity of 160 and out-patient capacity of 80. The facility was opened in 1966 and is accredited by NACC, ASA, and the Queens Medical Society.

Eligibility: No age or sex limitations. Telephone calls for interviews are preferred, but walk-in appointments are accepted. Clients may be paroled to the agency, and are accepted with a court case pending. Clients must detoxify first, and cannot remain in treatment if using drugs. There is a waiting period of two weeks, and no fee is charged.

Staff: full-time: 2 clergy acting as administrators, 10 ex-addicts, 1 physician, 1 nurse; part-time: 5 social workers, 1 psychiatrist, 2 psychologists, 1 vocational counselor, 4 teachers, 1 nurse.

Service: individual, group, family, recreational and occupational therapy as well as therapeutic community are provided. Vocational and employment counseling are also offered and urinalysis, medical and psychiatric examinations are given. Remedial tutoring is provided, and field visits made.

Program: Speakers and films upon request.

We interviewed rehabilitated people at various centers. We always asked the same basic questions before getting into a deep conversation with them. Below, are the ques-

tions we asked. The responses to them were extremely similar; the answers listed below were typical of approximately 75% of the people.

1. How long have you been hooked on drugs? This varied from six months to three years.

2. Why did you first try drugs? "Well, at first I was kinda pushed into it by my friends. Ya' know they'd come over and talk me into trying some of their cheap stuff and after a while, I just got to like the stuff. I mean there's nothing to do around this place anyway."

3. What if there were community activities? "Yea, man! Are you kidding! It's just boredom around here."

4. Why did you take drugs after knowing all the dangers involved? "Well, look—you take booze—it's just as bad. Now I don't give a damn what you tell me—you get high on booze just as easily as on drugs. Besides if you know what you are doing you won't get hurt."

5. Would you recommend drugs to your friends, now that you've tried it? This answer varied. Two of the most typical responses are as follows: "Yea, just as long as you stay clear of the hard stuff. It's a good experience." "No way man! I made a mistake. I can tell you what Hell is and how to get there—use drugs—it's a one way ticket there."

Whether the people of this community know it or not, they are all involved in the drug problem. No longer can any of us escape. The problem lies before us, and we must resolve it. Unfortunately for us, there is no simple solution.

The rest of the problem does not seem to lie in the emotional state of the user. We have observed that many of the drug users do not have conflicts that must be resolved. It seems in this community that simple boredom is a catalyst for use. Community recreation centers would be a great help. One student from Martin Van Buren High School indicated that when the night center was active, he and his friends stayed off their nightly drug habit. But this year, according to him, the night center is bad.

Fear is another cause of the problem. People are simply afraid of getting involved, reporting incidents, etc. A specific example of this is the local candystore. This store is a major hangout for drug pushers. When we asked the owner of the store why he has done nothing for the situation, he replied, "How can the police do anything—they'll be back again to attack me!" People must realize that they themselves are the only ones that can rid the community of pushers.

But, in spite of all this there is still hope for the community. On January 25 of next year the Parent Association of Martin Van Buren High School will give a program designed to discuss problems of our community. Of course we will be present. This program will concentrate specifically on the drug scene in Martin Van Buren. Hopefully, programs such as these will continue throughout the year as to increase parental knowledge of the drug scene in this community.

One of the problems that face us here today is the lack of knowledge of specific "tried and true" methods of preventing youngsters from falling prey to the drug habit, and of rehabilitating those who are already addicted. Recently, a meeting was held to discuss the possibility of opening a center at Creedmore. Those in favor of the project hoped that children and young adults could receive methadone. The Parents Association of Van Buren became involved. The President, Mrs. Helene Zaro, told us that the executive board had had ambivalent feelings and could not agree. Many of these parents stated that they did not approve of the center. While they wanted to help the addicted youngster, they felt that the center could not succeed if he were forced to return to the environment that had helped lead him to drugs. Mrs. Zaro stated "Unless the child can return to a home that offers him love and security, a school in which he is willing to function, a job when he needs one, the program is doomed." In addition, some parents feared the influence of "drug addicts" in the neighborhood. The proposal was defeated.

Jack Perna, the drug counselor in a Bronx school, informed us that there is a new approach to rehabilitation. In the past, most agencies felt that an informational approach, warning of the dangers of drug addiction was the best method of discouraging the would-be-explorer. Slides indicating graphing how heroin is prepared and injected were supposed to horrify the onlookers. Studies indicated they merely informed those who wanted to take drugs of the possible methods of preparation. The latest theory requires that there be a change—that an approach to change one's attitude towards himself, his family, his goals, and towards drugs was necessary. This is the approach to be developed in District 8. Perhaps District 26 will be working towards these same goals. Whether or not they will be successful remains to be seen. Only time will tell!

BIBLIOGRAPHY

History

Pamphlet on the history of Queens communities from the New York City Library—Queen Village Branch.

Various newspaper articles of the New York Times, Long Island Press, Queens County Times taken from the "Clipping" files of the Jamaica Public Library.

"Clipping file" of the Queen Village Centennial at the Martin Van Buren High School Library.

Various pamphlets—Alley Pond Restoration Committee, Queens Historical Society.

People

Bureau of Community Statistical Services. Research Department, Community Council of Greater New York, June 16, 1962. Table 1, 1a, 2, 2a, 3, 3a, 4.

Census Tracts. New York City Volume. Table P1 and Table P2 Tract 1301, 1960.

City Plan of New York—Queens Volume. District of Glen Oaks, Bellerose, Floral Park, Queens Village, Belaire, Cambria Heights, Laurelton, Rosedale and Springfield Gardens.

New York Market Analysis—Population and Housing. Prepared by New York Mirror, New York Times, New York News, General Outdoor. Queens—Queens Village.

No information available or dispensed at: 105th Police Precinct, Creedmore State Hospital, Cultural Organization on the Arts.

Queens Lutheran Study—Profile of Community R. Lutheran Church of America, 1966 publication, three volumes.

Sources of Information:

Queens Village Centennial 1871–1971.

Queens Village Green Book 1969–1970.

Queens Village Yellow Pages 1971–1972.

Church Planning for Ministry and Mission to Queens.

Queens Telephone Directory 1971–1972.

City Planning Commission Guide 1970–1971.

Special expression of Appreciation to: Mrs. Irene Handler—Chamber of Commerce; Mr. George Schylinski—Kiwanis Club (Immediate past President); Mr. Thomas Vallely—Lions Club; Mr. John Errett—Rotary International Club; Rev. David Schult—House of Hope Church.

Physical Setting

Park Department.

Mr. Steven Robinson.

Mr. Noah Rosenhouse.

Queens Village Chamber of Commerce.

Borough President's Office.

Lutheran Study of Queens, Book 3.

Plan for New York City, Queens, 1969.

Queens Community Times.

Size of Community

Census Tracts New York, N.Y. 1960.

Current Population Reports Special Censuses, Special Census of New York City, April 1, 1957; Plan for New York City, 1968.

Queens Community Population Character, Neighborhood Social Resources, 1960.

The United States Census, 1969.

Occupations

Better Business Bureau.

Borough President's Office (Agnes Hayes).

Bureau of the Census.

Bureau of Labor Statistics.

Bureau of Vital Statistics.

Census of 1960.

Community Council of Greater New York.

Human Resources Administration—New York City.

Labor Market Analysis Association.

Lutheran Study.

Queens Chamber of Commerce.

Queens Village Chamber of Commerce.

State Department of Labor (Public Relations).

Troy, Matthew, City Councilman.

United States Department of Commerce Library.

Community organization and government

Queens Village Chamber of Commerce, Mrs. Irene Handler, Station Plaza.

Queens Board of Elections, 77–40 Vleigh Place.

Voter Registration Roles—June, 1971.

Maps of Election Districts—1970 (not reproduced).

A Plan for Neighborhood Government for New York City—June, 1971.

New York Times—November 4, 1971, August 21, 1971, August 17, 1971, July 27, 1971, July 7, 1971.

Voters' Directory (Published by Citizens' Union)—1970.

101 Tables and Charts (New York City Council on Economic Education).

Queens Communities—Population Characteristics and Neighborhood Social Resources—Volume II—Compiled by the Community Council of Greater New York.

Queens Village Public Library.

Health

Bleifeld, Maurice—Principal of Martin Van Buren High School. Interviewed; referred to Mrs. E. Purnell.

Bureau of Records and Statistics, Miss Stephens—658–6600, Unable to be reached at that number.

Bureau of Sanitation—566–2717, referred to several sources; finally connected to someone who had very little information to provide.

Department of Mental Health, sent pamphlets concerned with the problem of mental health.

Department of Water Supply—566–4077, called the main office in Manhattan and was finally connected to someone who handled this matter in Queens.

Food and Nutrition Council of Greater New York—PL97200, no information provided.

Index of Health Agencies 1960 Kaplan, Samuel and Tauler Gilbert.

New York City Handbook.

Plan for New York City—Queens 1969, District 13 section.

Pitchon, Mrs. Home Economics teacher in Martin Van Buren High School, interviewed.

Purnell, Mrs. Edith—Chairman of the Home Economics Department in Martin Van Buren High school, interviewed.

Purnell, Mr. Morris—Teacher of Health Careers course in Martin Van Buren High School, interviewed.

Social Services in New York City 1969–1970.

Vital Statistics by Health Areas, 1965.

Recreation and culture

Books: Comparative Recreation Needs and Services in New York Neighborhoods by Shirley Jenkins of the Research Dept. of the Community Council of Greater New York

(163); Plan for New York City: Queens; Plan for New York City: Major Problems.

Interviews: Mrs. Irene Handler, secretary for the Queens Village Chamber of Commerce; Mr. Sidney G. Elstein, head of evening community center and Adult Education Center at Van Buren; Mr. Bleifeld, principal of Van Buren; Mrs. Schwartz, Librarian at Van Buren Library; Personnel at Century Theater Home Office.

Housing

Queens Village Chamber of Commerce.

Borough President Office.

Queens Borough Library Main Branch Long Island Room: Queens Village Folder, The Plan of New York City—Queens, The 1960 New York City Census, Church planning for Ministry and Mission Council of Churches of New York City, Lutheran Study of Queens Book III N.Y. Synod of Lutheran Church in America.

City Planning Board-Long Island City.

Welfare

Jamaica Social Services Center, 92-16 147 Place, Jamaica, N.Y. 11435 9905793.

Queensboro Council for Social Welfare, Inc. 90-04 161 Street, Jamaica, N.Y. 2972121.

Queens Village Task Force, 657 4536, 699 7100.

Municipal reference and Research Center, Municipal building, N.Y. 566 4283.

Office of Community Relations, 433-3880.

Commissioners Office, 349-6775.

Community Council of Greater New York, 225 Park Ave. So., N.Y., N.Y. 777-5000.

1960 Census; City Plan.

Interview

Mrs. Shapiro, Mrs. Kostron, Mrs. Anker, Martin Van Buren High school.

Transportation

New York City Transit Authority Bus Schedule and Guide for the following routes: Q44A, Q43, Q27, Q36, Q1.

Plan for New York City-Queens District 13.

WCBS radio traffic reports.

Call to Precinct 107 of the New York City Police Department—to find out about traffic problems.

General observation of construction being done and personal knowledge of bus routes.

Drug Abuse

In addition to the people and organizations interviewed, listed in this report, the following books were of assistance: Chauncey, Hal and Kirkpatrick, Laurence, *Drugs and You*, N.Y.: Oxford Book Co., 1969.

Nowlis, Helen. "Why Students Use Drugs", *American Journal of Nursing*, Vol. 68, No. 8, August 1968.

"Heroin in the High Schools, *Life*, Feb. 29, 1970, Vol. 68, No. 6.

"Someone close to you is on Drugs", City of N.Y. Human Resources Administration, N.Y. 1969.

"Turning On: Two Views", *Time*, Vol. 94, No. 13, Sept. 26, 1969, pp. 72.

We also used pamphlets distributed by the organizations listed on pages nine through eleven, the Chamber of Commerce, the New York Police Department, the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Board of Education.

THE LATE AIME J. FORAND

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1972

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, the passing of my good friend and former colleague in the House, Aime J. Forand, has stilled the strongest voice of our day on behalf of our senior citizens.

This is not in any way to reflect on or minimize the diligent work of many, many others in this field. Indeed, I believe that all will agree with me that Aime Forand was the leader and inspiration for Federal action to assist our senior citizens.

My first term in the Congress was Aime Forand's last term. In those 2 years I came to know him well and respect his ability as a legislator and distinguished public servant.

In the years that followed, I found Aime Forand working harder than ever in behalf of the cause he felt needed urgent attention. I was and am in complete sympathy with his views.

He organized the National Council of Senior Citizens and mustered tremendous public support for legislative action. When President Johnson signed the medicare bill in 1965, Aime Forand was on hand and was singled out by the President for his persistent efforts over the years.

I appreciate the opportunity to join my colleague from Rhode Island (Mr. ST GERMAIN) in paying tribute to Aime Forand. I extend my deepest sympathy to the members of the Forand family in their great loss.

THE PLIGHT OF JEWS IN ARAB NATIONS

HON. HERMAN BADILLO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 3, 1972

Mr. BADILLO. Mr. Speaker, in the 25 years since the United Nations voted for the partition of Jerusalem, much attention has been focused on the problems experienced by the Palestinian refugees. Yet, the world has almost virtually ignored the plight of the almost 1 million Jews who resided in Arab countries before 1948—a number which has now dwindled to 57,000.

Only during the aftermath of the 6-day war and at the time of the barbaric acts of the Iraqi Government in killing a number of Jewish citizens a few years later did most of the world realize that there are Jews still residing in a number of Arab nations. In some countries the Jews have faced bitter persecution and, eventually, expulsion. In other Arab lands they still remain, even though they are denied basic civil liberties and are victims of harassment and intimidation and of political, economic, social, and cultural oppression.

A most interesting and well-written article about the status of Jewish refugees from Arab countries appeared in the November 1971 issue of the "Middle East Information Series," a publication of the American Academic Association for Peace in the Middle East. Written by Dr. Heskel M. Haddad, president of the American Committee for Rescue and Resettlement of Iraqi Jews and clinical professor of opthalmology at the New York Medical College, this very perceptive piece not only discusses the problems experienced by Jews residing in Arab countries but also describes the difficulties Jewish refugees from these Arab States have encountered in adjusting to life in Israel and in fully enjoying the rights of Israeli citizenship.

I am pleased to present this article herewith, for inclusion in the RECORD, and commend it to our colleagues' attention.

THE JEWISH REFUGEES FROM THE ARAB COUNTRIES

(By Heskel M. Haddad *)

November 29, 1947, when the United Nations voted overwhelmingly for the establishment of a Jewish and an Arab state in Palestine, opened a fateful chapter in Middle East history. The Arab world rejected the resolution outright, a bloody war ensued and approximately two million people, both Arabs and Jews, were caught up in a great human tragedy. It involved not only those people living in the vicinity of British Mandatory Palestine, but, as it affected the Jews, those living in the vast expanses of the whole Arab world, from the borders of Persia and the Persian Gulf to the shores of the Atlantic Ocean of Africa, where a million Jews had lived for some 2,000 years. The refugee problem has continued to plague the region for two decades, with periods of ups and downs, depending on two major factors: the fluctuations in the degree of hostility between Israel and its Arab neighbors, and the revolutionary patterns of the Arab countries in which these Jews live.

Before 1948, there were 951,000 Jews living in Arab lands. In 1970, there were about 57,000, the majority having fled as refugees to Israel between 1948 and 1951. During the Arab-Israel war of 1948, 650,000 Arabs fled from their homes in the war zone and became the Palestinian Arab refugees. The plight of the Arab refugees has been a sad one for the past twenty-three years, because the neighboring Arab countries have generally refused to absorb these unfortunate people in their midst, and have forced the majority to live in makeshift refugee camps which were only intended as temporary. They have been used by the Arab states as a political weapon against Israel. On the one hand, their human tragedy has been stressed, while on the other, they are hostages.[1]

The Jewish refugees, uprooted from their homes in the various Arab countries, had no alternative but to immigrate to Israel, where they too faced the hardships of living in camps and tents, of making a cultural adjustment to a society which was largely European and Western, and of being refugees—hardships only a refugee can appreciate and understand. Yet, despite all the difficulties and the trauma of extreme change, these immigrants were quite speedily rehabilitated in the newly created, war-torn State of Israel. They were immediately granted citizenship and every effort was made to teach them Hebrew and to make them useful citizens. They lived in *ma'abarot* (tent cities) for an average of 4-6 years but then were able to move into permanent homes, as these were constructed, although their social and economic conditions still remain inadequate in housing, skills and education as compared with Israelis of European background (Israel is still paying the price of the mass immigration of impoverished, under-privileged Jews from Arab countries).

---

*Dr. Haddad is Clinical Professor of Ophthalmology at the New York Medical College and President of the American Committee for Rescue and Resettlement of Iraqi Jews.

[1] They are "hostages" in the sense that they have generally not been permitted to leave their camps to live among the urban population of their host Arab countries.

To be a refugee is to have to endure all the traumatic processes, from flight to rehabilitation. It is an unhappy fact that the Arabs who fled Palestine as refugees were not given the same opportunity of rehabilitation by their compatriots as the Jewish refugees received in Israel. It is impossible to equate the suffering of one refugee with that of another on a balance sheet, and thus, one can never have a balanced reciprocal reparation. Yet it would be only appropriate to seek a just solution to this tragic problem. The Jewish refugees from Arab lands suffered as severe a trauma in the process of being displaced from their homes, environment and cultural habitat, of arriving in a Western-oriented and war-torn country, of being compelled to live in tents and huts in Israel as did the Arab refugees in their camps in the Arab states.

When the Arab countries, particularly Iraq, Syria, and Egypt and to some extent Lebanon, Algeria and Morocco decided to expel their Jewish populations, they announced publicly that they would like to create new homes for the Palestinian Arab refugees out of the dwellings vacated by the Jews. To some extent they have done so, as can be seen by anyone visiting the former Jewish quarters of Damascus and Baghdad. In a sense, therefore, the Arab governments did practice some sort of population exchange with Israel when they expelled their Jews. Yet, they kept the vast majority of the Arab refugees from Palestine in camps, and refused to rehabilitate them, merely dinning into their ears the theory that the only solution to their problem is repatriation to their lost homes in Palestine.

The 57,100 Jews who still live in the Arab states are badly treated by the host governments, who, since 1948, have been introducing progressively restrictive laws against them. Like the Arab refugees, they too are being used as virtual hostages both for the purpose of political bargaining with Israel and as scapegoats for the benefit of the military demagogic and dictatorial regimes which exist in many of these states. Worst off are the 2,500 Jews in Iraq and the 4,000 Jews in Syria. The regime in these two states is ultra nationalist, Ba'athist, strongly Arabist in sentiment, and highly repressive in action. The human rights and civil liberties of the Jews in both these countries have been completely suspended. The Jews of Iraq and Syria live under virtual house arrest. They cannot travel. They are debarred from communicating with one another and with their Arab neighbors. They are prohibited from working in their professions in order to earn a livelihood. They cannot own a car or have a telephone. They can be detained without warning or reason. For them, the rights of *habeas corpus* are completely suspended. Some of them were jailed and publicly hanged following sham trials. Some were tortured and secretly executed in prison as "Israeli spies" or "CIA Agents." Their property and assets have been frozen; they cannot sell their belongings for cash and even those who still have money in the bank cannot draw more than a severely restricted amount each month—a sum barely sufficient to keep them alive. The Jews of Iraq and Syria have virtually become paupers and beggars.

The lot of the Jews in Egypt has not been any better, and in fact deteriorated after the June, 1967 war.

Egyptian Jews were forced out of that country as refugees in two waves. The first came soon after the war of 1948 and the second came after the Sinai Campaign of 1956. After the war of 1967, the small remnant of the Jewish community still living in Egypt was placed under virtual house arrest. All the men were detained in jails. However, the late President Nasser did concede to the efforts of the United Nations High Commissioner of Refugees, Prince Sadrudin Agha Khan, and to the intervention of the Spanish Government, and allowed almost all the Jews of Egypt to assume refugee status and to leave Egypt.

The 3,000 Jews in Lebanon and the 10,000 Jews in Tunisia today live in relative freedom, though with the status of second class citizenship, and still fearful of reprisals whenever incidents occur between Israel and the Arab states. The condition of the 35,000 Jews of Morocco is a very sad one. Sequestered in a highly populated and impoverished ghetto, they have been reduced to extreme poverty and are not allowed to leave Morocco freely. And this despite the pro-Western policies of King Hassan II.

There are no Jews in Libya or Yemen and virtually none are left in Algeria. All of the Jews of these countries were forced out, immigrating mainly to Israel and also to France and Italy between 1948 and 1960.

But these 850,000 Jewish refugees left behind them considerable wealth in assets, belongings, and property. Even if each individual had been allowed to take out a mere $1,000, a reparation sum of $8.5 million would still be due to them. In Baghdad alone, in 1951, the pro-Western government of Nuri Al Said, confiscated £35 million held in cash by the banks ($140 million), in addition to vast amounts of other assets and property left behind in Iraq by the 150,000 Iraqi Jews. Assets, belongings, and other property of a similar amount have been confiscated in Syria, Egypt, Algeria, Yemen, Morocco and most recently, in Libya.

EDITOR'S NOTE.—The Association of Jewish Victims of Egyptian Persecution, composed of refugees who had been imprisoned in Egypt during the wars of 1948, 1956 and 1967, said in Tel Aviv on August 13, 1971 that it was claiming $1,000 million compensation for confiscated property. A convention of the refugees, meeting in Paris on July 23, recommended that legal steps be instituted for recovery of $500 million in personal compensation, $300 million for Jewish community property, and $200 million for confiscated religious articles. The association also demanded that Egypt pay a minimum of $10,000 to families who were forced to leave their homes and additional damages for those who were held in detention.

JEWS IN ARAB COUNTRIES

	1948	1970	Number of immigrants in Israel	Year
Algeria	140,000	[1] 1,500	110,000	1960
Egypt	100,000	[1] 500	90,000	1948-56
Iraq	150,000	2,500	125,000	1947-51
Lebanon	6,000	3,000	1,000	1948
Libya	35,000	[1] 100	33,000	1950
Morocco	300,000	[1] 35,000	250,000	1949
Syria	40,000	4,000	35,000	1948
Tunisia	100,000	10,000	75,000	1950
Yemen (and Aden)	80,000	[1] 500	75,000	1948
	951,000	57,100	794,000	

[1] Or less.

Note: There are no Jews in Jordan, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, or the emirates or sheikdoms of the Arabian Peninsula.

RESTORING POWER TO THE PEOPLE IN YUGOSLAVIA

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 3, 1972

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, on May 10, 1971—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 117, part 11, page 14276—I pointed out that General Tito, self-proclaimed "humanistic Marxist" dictator of Yugoslavia, faced serious opposition from his people and a possible counterrevolution.

According to press reports of the 3-day Congress of self-managers held in May 1971 at Sarajevo and attended by some 2,300 delegates from factories, firms, and institutions, Tito vigorously supported the concept of decentralization of government and sought to stem the open criticism among the country's ethnic groups, particularly the most numerous groups, Serbs and Croats.

President Tito even threatened a purge of Communist party members and bureaucrats opposing constitutional changes designed to limit the power of the central government and strengthen the authority of the 6 national republics.

In a special report from Zagreb, Yugoslavia, appearing in the Washington Evening Star of February 2, 1972, we learn that a massive purge of Yugoslav Communists—initiated by Tito's attack on the leadership of Croatia, Yugoslavia's second largest state—has been underway since mid-December.

Tito's denunciation of the Croatian nationalists apparently was motivated by the opposition of the Croatian leaders to the "power of centralist and authoritarian party bureaucracies and financial monopolies in Belgrade." Belgrade is the capital of Serbia as well as the Federal capital.

It is obvious from this latest development in Croatia that decentralization and democratization which would reform the government by restoring power to people at the local level are incompatible with the whims of a dictator. Decentralization to a dictator is acceptable only if ultimate power resides with the dictator and not with the people. Hence, the purge. The shadow of Mikhailovich looms again.

A very significant question is raised in the report:

> Is it true, as the official line now maintains, that the situation in Croatia, has become so threatening to the unity of the country, to peace among its nationalities (President Tito and others have spoken of the risk of a Serb-Croat civil war), or to Titoist socialism that drastic action was unavoidable.

The answer to the question, according to the writer of the news account, is regrettably yes as based on a view "more widespread in Zagreb than many Serbs are prepared to believe."

It appears that the decentralization of power which Tito ostensibly supported to appease nationalist groups has gotten out of hand. Tito has created a crisis for himself. His subjects believed him.

While the purgists have been proceeding in Yugoslavia, it is noteworthy that in December this body adopted S. 2819, the Foreign Assistance Act of 1971 which not only makes additional U.S. tax dollars available to Tito to continue his financial monopolies but the bill provides:

OVERSEAS PRIVATE INVESTMENT CORPORATION

SEC. 104. Title IV of chapter 2 of part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, relating to the Overseas Private Investment Corporation, is amended as follows:

* * * * *

(g) Except for the provisions of this title, no other provision of this or any other law shall be construed to prohibit the operation in Yugoslavia * * *

The above provision gives discretion to the President of the United States to guarantee Tito's financial monopolies with the full faith and credit of the U.S. taxpayers by the OPIC.

This week the House passed H.R. 8750 to increase the participation of the United States in the Interdevelopment Association, a branch of the World Bank in which operation Tito will also be permitted to obtain development funds—thanks to the U.S. taxpayers.

Pertinent news clippings follow:

[From the Washington Star, Feb. 2, 1972]

PURGE OF CROATIANS CREATES CRISIS FOR TITO

(By Dennison I. Rusinow)

ZAGREB, YUGOSLAVIA.—A massive purge of Yugoslav Communists continues to decimate the higher ranks of the Croatian League of Communists in what is the most serious domestic political crisis the Titoist regime has faced since 1948.

The purge, which got its impetus last month when President Tito denounced the leadership of Croatia, Yugoslavia's second largest state, for pandering to nationalists and separatists and for "rotten liberalism" in the face of a "counter-revolution," has been variously interpreted as:

An action necessary to preserve the unity of Yugoslavia and avoid the risk of civil war or an excuse for foreign (Soviet) intervention.

A coup, perhaps under army pressure, to restore Serbian domination over an eternally hapless and exploited Croatian nation.

A move by "conservative" Belgrade Communists to stop a Prague-like "liberalization" in Croatia.

The only way to stop development of a quasi-Fascist Croatian dictatorship based on a marriage of extreme nationalism and corrupted socialism.

Since the mid-December resignations of the triumvirate who had run the Croatian party since 1968, at least 300 resignations or dismissals of party or government officials at all levels have been recorded in the press. The total list undoubtedly is much larger.

Popular former Croatian leaders, originally accused only of letting Croatian nationalism get out of hand because they underestimated the danger and permitted nationalists and separatists to organize a dangerously powerful movement outside party control, are now being accused of deliberately encouraging or even leading separatist, antisocialist factions.

Although some low-level demands have been made that these leaders be arrested on criminal charges, they have not yet lost their party memberships.

The only arrests at first were of students who had led the late November strike at the university which precipiated the crisis, or who participated in later demonstrations in favor of deposed party and youth leaders. Most of the 550 arrested youths have been released, fined (276 of them), or given light sentences for disturbing the peace (155).

CRIMINAL PROCEEDINGS

But now criminal proceedings have begun against a group of older persons, some of them party members, who had been prominent in an allegedly separatist movement organized around the Matica Hrvatska, a Croatian cultural institution that had escaped party control and was now said to be controlling the party.

Meanwhile, although the continuing purge and the escalating accusations prevent a dust-free view of the crisis in Croatia, no evidence has been produced to support any of the widely circulating but contradictory rumors that Tito acted under pressure of the army (said to have threatened a coup if he did not move), the Russians, the West or anyone else.

Vladimir Bakaric, the astute 60-year-old Zagreb politician who was the undisputed boss of Croatia from the end of the war until he was summoned to Belgrade in 1969, categorically told two West European journalists in December that such rumors, and especially those alleging army pressure, were false and "a lie spread by Croatian nationalists."

CHALLENGE TO PROCESS

Tito acted, Bakaric contended, when he became convinced that nationalist forces in Croatia were attempting to turn to their own political purposes the process, which Tito himself had begun, of building genuine national equality among Yugoslavia's jealously competing ethnic groups.

Croatian politicians who opposed the nationalist course of the now ousted leaders were about to act on their own when Tito moved, Bakaric said in another interview.

Bakaric, who was the leader of this pro-Yugoslav or "unitarist" opposition within Croatia, was threatened with political extinction on the eve of the purge.

Revelations in recent weeks about such pre-purge infighting at the top of the Croatian party have exposed a far more complex political situation than most interpretations, in Yugoslavia or abroad, have recognized.

While roles and motives involved in the drama of the past weeks remain obscure, the picture of what was happening before the purge is becoming clear.

YOUNGER LEADERS

A group of younger, "progressive" Communist leaders came to power in Croatia in the late 1960s, as Bakaric's proteges, on a platform of decentralization, democratization and economic liberalism.

Such a platform was seen and welcomed as consistent with Croatia's long-term aspirations for a fairer deal in a Yugoslav federation in which Croats had, with some justice, felt exploited and oppressed by a centralized system in which their more numerous but poorer ethnic rivals, the Serbs, enjoyed preponderant influence.

In office and in alliance with like-minded comrades in other region, the new Croatian leadership therefore continued the battle against the power of centralist and authoritarian party bureaucracies and financial monopolies in Belgrade, which is not only the federal capital but also the capital of Serbia.

In seeking wider support in this political struggle for decentralized power, the Croatian new guard began to play with Croatian national sentiment, historically the easiest and surest way of arousing mass enthusiasm while also frightening one's negotiating partners with the implicit threat that nationalist forces may get out of hand if one's demands are not met.

DEMANDS ESCALATE

More extreme Croatian nationalists, in and outside the party, appeared with escalating demands.

Their activities centered around the Matica Hrvatska, which became again the aggressive defender of Croatian national interests that it had been in the late years of the Hapsburg Monarchy. To many, the Matica began to look increasingly like the nucleus of a new, nationalist political party outside Communist control and a challenge to it.

This development, combined with the "progressive" party leadership's toleration of nationalist "excesses" (which frightened non-Croatian minorities in multinational Croatia), and increasingly rigid negotiating positions in disputes with the federal center, frightened Croatia's allies in other regions.

The consequent isolation of the Croatian leadership forced it into greater dependence on mass popularity inside Croatia—a popularity based on nationalism.

The process was exaggerated further by splits within the Croatian leadership.

Bikaric and some members of the progressive new leadership, such as Josip Vrhovec and Jure Bilic, argued that the opening to the masses was proving an opening to chauvinism and separatism. They were accused of pro-Serbian "unitarism" and anti-democratic conservatism.

In fighting this internal Croatian battle, it is now said, the leaders whose platform had been liberal nationalist communism became more nationalist and less liberal, using every means to eliminate their "unitarist" opponents from political life and creating an atmosphere now described by many in the Croatian party as "intellectual terror."

It was this situation, in which it seemed to men in power everywhere except in Zagreb that the Croatian nationalist tail was wagging the Crotian Communist dog and moving in the direction of separatism or facism, that led to the crisis.

WELL-ORGANIZED STRIKE

The crisis was precipitated when students at Zagreb University, under partly non-Communist and strongly pro-nationalist leadership, went on a well-organized strike at the end of November and then refused to listen to the pleas of the belatedly alarmed party leadership that they go back to class.

The student revolt against party leaders who had claimed that nationalism was not dangerous and could be harnessed persuaded Tito that the party in Croatia had lost control of the situation and that those who were responsible must go.

But as the charges of "separatism" and "counterrevolution" grew and the purge continued, Yugoslavs here in the Croatian capital as well as in Belgrade have begun asking three basic questions:

1. Is it true, as the official line now maintains, that the situation in Croatia had become so threatening to the unity of the country, to peace among its nationalities (President Tito and others have spoken of the risk of a Serb-Croat civil war), or to Titoist socialism that drastic action was unavoidable?

2. Even if the answer is yes, are the actions now being taken the most appropriate ones? Or by including charges of "counter-revolution," do they contain what one observer called a dangerous dose of "ideological overkill" that will lead to an excessively widespread purge with criminal trials inevitable? And will this generate even more genuine separatists—prepared, perhaps, to support terrorism—among a disbelieving and embittered Croatian nation?

3. Will a widespread use of purge and police, backed by Tito's repeated demands for a strengthened Communist party, more central control and an end of "democracy for the enemies of our socialist democracy," carry Yugoslavia back toward the centralized party dictatorship of a few years ago?

The official line is that the Croatian leadership now being purged either deliberately or stupidly had permitted Croatian nationalists to organize a dangerously powerful separatist and anti-social movement, and that the nationalists' political methods were undemocratic and even Stalinist.

Thus desperate and even "undemocratic" measures were required. Nothing less than the current massive "cleansing" would have done the job.

At the other extreme are those who feel that the ousted but still popular Croatian leaders were merely trying to create the genuine, mass-supported socialist democracy that is Titoism's proclaimed goal.

Their flirtation with nationalism, it is argued, was not only a harmless positive con-

tribution to mass popularity for the party and socialism, but also the best way to cut the ground from under the real nationalists and separatists who would appear and compete for popularity in a genuinely democratized atmosphere.

Another view, more widespread in Zagreb than many Serbs are prepared to believe, holds that the answer to the first basic question is regrettably yes, but the answer to the second is that the remedy now being applied is almost as deadly as the disease it is meant to cure.

Some people find particular alarming President Tito's statement, in his strongest post-purge speech, that the rot had started with the 1952 Congress of the Yugoslav Communist party, and that he personally had never liked that Congress.

For the "progressive" Communists who have dominated the party established since 1966 to call in question the 1952 Congress is to call in question most of the things that distinguish Yugoslav from Soviet communism.

So far, there are at most only marginal signs, like the recent flurry of arrests in Zagreb and elsewhere and pressures against "liberal" Communist leaders in the Serbian, Macedonian and Slovene parties, that this kind of alarm is justified.

It is discounted by those who are convinced—perhaps a little anxiously—that political and economic forces with a vested interest in the level of pluralism and decentralization already achieved are now too numerous and too powerful for the clock to be turned back more than an hour or two, even by Tito.

SENATE—*Monday, February 7, 1972*

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. ELLENDER).

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, who at the beginning gave man freedom under grace to have dominion over his own life, bless the people of this Nation and all whom they have set in authority, that this may be a good land where liberty is cherished and truth and righteousness mark our common endeavor. Set us free from pride and self-interest and all that obstructs Thy spirit in our national life. May we learn to lose the lower self and find the higher self in service and sacrifice and love. Guide the President and the Congress and all who assist them that the peace of the world and the betterment of all mankind may transcend all lesser concerns.

In the Redeemer's name we pray. Amen.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Leonard, one of his secretaries.

REPORT ON ACTIVITIES UNDER THE UNIFORM RELOCATION ASSISTANCE AND REAL PROPERTY ACQUISITION POLICIES ACT—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Government Operations:

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with Section 214 of Public Law 91-646, I am transmitting today the first annual report of each Federal agency whose activities are governed, in part, by the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970.

The agency reports describe initial steps which have been taken under the Act to provide for the uniform and equitable treatment of persons displaced from homes, businesses or farms by Federal and federally assisted programs and to establish uniform and equitable real property acquisition policies for these programs. The reports cover the period January 2, 1971 through June 30, 1971.

To assure equitable treatment and essential uniformity in administering the law, I requested in a letter to Federal agencies, dated January 4, 1971, that a number of actions be taken. First, the Office of Management and Budget was asked to chair an interagency task force to develop guidelines for all agencies to follow in the issuance of regulations and procedures implementing the Uniform Relocation Assistance Act. The Departments of Justice, Transportation, Defense, and Housing and Urban Development, and the General Services Administration were requested to assist in this development. These guidelines were issued February 27, 1971, and supplemental instructions were issued on August 30, 1971. As noted in the attached reports, the agencies have now promulgated regulations and procedures to implement the Act pursuant to the guidelines.

Secondly, I requested Federal agencies administering mortgage insurance programs to determine whether guarantees could be given to individuals who were displaced and might otherwise be ineligible because of age, physical, or other conditions. Studies completed early in 1971 indicated that such guarantees could be made, and I am advised that these agencies are now fully implementing Section 203(b) of the Act.

Thirdly, I directed the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to develop criteria and procedures whereby all Federal and federally assisted programs could use the authority provided by Section 206(a) of the Act to construct replacement housing as a last resort. These criteria and procedures to assure uniform and equitable policies and practices by all agencies have been published in the Federal Register, and the Department is evaluating comments received for consideration in the preparation of final instructions on this subject.

The Department of Housing and Urban Development, pursuant to my request, is also developing criteria and procedures for implementing section 215 of the act. That section concerns loans for planning and other preliminary expenses necessary for securing federally insured mortgage financing for the rehabilitation or construction of housing for displaced persons. These procedures and criteria should be issued shortly.

I also directed the Office of Management and Budget to form and to chair a Relocation Assistance Advisory Committee. This committee includes representatives of the Departments of Agriculture; Defense; Health, Education, and Welfare; and Transportation; the General Services Administration; the Office of Economic Opportunity; and the United States Postal Service.

This Committee will continually review the Government's relocation program for the purpose of making recommendations to the Office of Management and Budget for improvements in the guidelines and for new legislation. In the interests of uniform and equitable administration of the law, it will also provide a vehicle for coordinating the relocation programs of each of the agencies.

Executive branch review of the relocation assistance program and of the provisions of the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970 has disclosed a number of problem areas which require legislative consideration. The principal areas identified are detailed as enclosure 4 of this report, while other problem areas are identified in individual agency reports. Corrective legislation will be submitted to the Congress.

RICHARD NIXON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 4, 1972.*

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session, the President pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The nominations received today are printed at the end of Senate proceedings.)

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, February 4, 1972, be dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

WAIVER OF THE CALL OF THE THE CALENDAR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the legislative calendar, under rule VIII, be dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.