

Wilner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MEEDS:

H.R. 19838. A bill for the relief of Donald L. Bulmer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHMITZ:

H.R. 19839. A bill for the relief of Jaime Pena-Pena; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEAGUE of California:

H.R. 19840. A bill for the relief of Fumihito

Morikawa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOB WILSON:

H.R. 19841. A bill for the relief of Ruben Platte; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

PUBLIC LAND LAW REVIEW COMMISSION REPORT

HON. LEN B. JORDAN

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, November 19, 1970

Mr. JORDAN of Idaho. Mr. President, on November 6, in Boise, Idaho, I spoke at a statewide discussion forum conducted by the Idaho Commission on Federal Land Laws concerning the Public Land Law Review Commission report issued earlier this year. I ask unanimous consent that my remarks be printed in the RECORD.

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

REMARKS BY SENATOR LEN B. JORDAN

Soon after I reported for duty on the Public Land Law Commission back in 1964, I learned that at least some of the public members of the commission regarded the public lands of the nation as belonging to all the people and not to the private fiefdom of that state whose boundaries enclosed the public lands.

Having grown up in the public land states of the West I had assumed, like most Westerners, that even though some of our lands were designated as federal, they did belong, for all intents and purposes to the people of the public land states rather than to the whole U.S. public at large.

Those members from the non-public land states lost no time in attacking our concept which they regarded as parochial and proprietary.

Admittedly there is considerable diversity of opinion on land-use problems. Many people are not aware, for instance, that Gem state residents control only about one-third of the acreage in this so-called sovereign state. The remaining 64 percent of Idaho, as you who are attending this conference are well aware is Federal domain.

This percentage of Federal ownership is not the highest among the 50 states. The Federal ownership is slightly larger in neighboring Utah and rises to 86 percent in Nevada and to 97 percent in Alaska. The Federal District of Columbia, by contrast, is only 28 percent Federally owned.

In the two centuries which have elapsed since the 13 colonies became a nation, a considerable body of statutory and administrative law has developed pertaining to the Federal acreage. Back in 1964, when I was assigned to the Public Land Law Review Commission, we embarked on a four-year study of some 5,000 laws relating to the public lands. Our study period ultimately stretched out to six years and involved expenditure of nearly \$7 million in public funds.

One of my first discoveries as a member of this Commission was that this was not the first study of this kind. Similar reviews were conducted in 1879, in 1904, and in 1931, and, ironically, these previous studies had reviewed many of the basic public land laws that are in effect today.

The present review and report differ from the earlier studies in at least two respects:

(1) It is more thorough than any previous studies.

(2) As never before, the awareness of public land use as a factor in maintaining the quality of our environment has been properly recognized and emphasized.

Some early critics of the Report labeled it as a sell out to special interests. Those who make such criticism simply could not have read the Report. In order to refute such unwarranted attacks I shall quote several excerpts directly from the Report:

(1) Environmental quality should be recognized by law as an important objective of public land management, and public land policy should be designed to enhance and maintain a high quality environment both on and off the public lands.

(2) Federal standards for environmental quality should be established for public lands to the extent possible, except that, where state standards have been adopted under Federal law, state standards should be utilized.

(3) Congress should require classification of the public lands for environmental quality and enhancement and maintenance.

(4) Congress should specify the kinds of environmental factors to be considered in land use planning and decisionmaking, and require the agencies to indicate clearly how they were taken into account.

(5) Congress should provide for greater use of studies of environmental impacts as a precondition to certain kinds of uses.

(6) Existing research programs related to the public lands should be expanded for greater emphasis on environmental quality.

(7) Public hearings with respect to environmental considerations should be mandatory on proposed public land projects or decisions when requested by the states or by the Council on Environmental Quality.

(8) Congress should authorize and require the public land agencies to condition the granting of rights or privileges to the public lands or their resources on compliance with applicable environmental control measures governing operations off public lands which are closely related to the right or privilege grants.

(9) Federal land administering agencies should be authorized to protect the public land environment by (a) imposing protective covenants in disposals of public lands, and (b) acquiring easements on non-Federal lands adjacent to public lands.

(10) Those who use the public lands and resources should, in each instance, be required by statute to conduct their activities in a manner that avoids or minimizes adverse environmental impacts, and should be responsible for restoring areas to an acceptable standard where their use has an adverse impact on the environment.

(11) Public land areas in need of environmental rehabilitation should be inventoried and the Federal Government should undertake such rehabilitation. Funds should be appropriated as soon as practical for environmental management and rehabilitation research.

I mentioned the earlier studies as a reminder that recommendations of Federal Review Commissions are not necessarily followed by implementing changes in the statutes. But this observation should be fol-

lowed with the cautionary statement that perhaps never before has there been such active public interest and momentum generated in the effort to revise and modernize our public land laws.

The interest taken by the Idaho Federal Land Review Commission in this incipient legislative phase is well warranted, and I hope that it will continue unabated as the Congress begins consideration of potential legislation beginning next January. This legislative follow up to the PLLRC Report is tremendously important to Idaho and the other eleven public land states of the West, which average more than 50 percent Federal ownership, and I am interested in official and informal comment and participation from a broad segment of interests within the State.

You will be discussing details of the Public Land Law Review Commission report in your conference sessions, so I shall try to avoid duplication by confining these remarks to a few general conclusions and recommendations.

First, I feel that the most important public lands legislation that will be brought up in the forthcoming session of Congress will be a proposal to make payments to the states in lieu of taxes for acreage to be retained permanently under Federal control and therefore immune to state taxation.

The merits of such compensation have been recognized in the Forest Highways, Public Lands Highways, Impacted Aid to Education, and other programs. In-lieu payments also have been incorporated in specific legislation for large Federal withdrawals, such as the Teton National Park legislation in neighboring Wyoming.

The in-lieu payment proposal of the Public Land Law Review Commission has urgent interest to Idaho in view of the large acreages of multiple-use National Forest land in this spectacularly beautiful State which have been proposed for preservation in a wild or natural condition in Wilderness and Wild River systems set aside for a single purpose use.

Before leaving Washington for the current election recess, I asked the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation to sketch in on a map of Idaho some of these proposed or potential wild areas. The areas delineated by BOR—and the list is by no means complete—involve about 4½ million acres of prime forest land, and scenic upland country, some of which may be mineralized. The land areas and the river stretches also lie athwart roads, drainage basins, and communications corridors and presumably could deny access to State and private lands and otherwise increase the costs of developing our natural resources or utilizing our precious water supplies. Also suggestions have been advanced that these protected areas be surrounded by "buffer zones" of varying size.

If the value of the economic interests which are to be diminished or eliminated in such land withdrawals is correctly assessed and reflected in in-lieu payments, Idaho will be better able to continue to operate the affairs of the 13th largest State in geographic size while preserving as a national asset some of the world's choice natural areas. Hence this legislation is of serious interest to both the taxpayers of Idaho and to conservationists who are sincerely interested in helping us preserve some of

Idaho's natural beauty without adversely affecting our economy.

I am drafting legislation to provide in-lieu payments along the lines proposed in the PLLRC report and would appreciate any suggestions this conference has to offer to help me produce a soundly-conceived bill that can enlist the united support of the public land states, and, hopefully, of other states and reasonable conservation groups.

It appears to me from a cursory review of the study on which this PLLRC recommendation was made that Idaho can expect to receive about \$7 million more annually in the proposed in-lieu payments than the State receives now in revenue-sharing programs, if the payments are based upon 90 percent tax equivalency. The study estimated Idaho receipts from revenue sharing and payments in lieu of taxes at about \$1½ million in 1966.

Of course, there are implications that shares to public land states will be further reduced by the elimination of funding concessions made to them under the Federal-Aid Highway ratio, Forest road and highway construction, and other programs. And there is no doubt that the sparsely-populated public land States may wake up to find that a Pandora's box of trouble has been opened up when such legislation reaches the urban-dominated House. But there has been talk of changes in these programs for years; the Public Land Law Review Commission Report merely provided some facts and some measured recommendations on which to base such legislative action.

Second, the Report recommends retention by the Federal government of most public lands. If the Federal Government is destined to remain as the landlord for a substantial portion of the Nation's real estate, then I think it only proper that Uncle Sam act the part of a responsible steward. In other words, I think that he should properly operate and maintain his property in a responsible fashion.

As is frequently the case with non-resident landlords, Uncle Sam has skimmed on or deferred necessary maintenance. For example, he has permitted Canadian thistle to take over a vast acreage on the watershed above Sun Valley. He has permitted tumbleweed to flourish on the public domain adjacent to good potato and sugar beet cropland in Southern Idaho, thereby adding to the infestation of the leafhopper and the viral plant diseases associated with that plant pest. Sometimes because of a penny wise—pound foolish attitude he has not been able to find funds for range improvement projects to provide better grazing for livestock and habitat for wildlife. Forest re-seeding and the clean-up of burned areas have suffered from lack of funds.

Even though the Commission heard both praise and criticism of present management of public lands, no one expects that the landlord of one-third of the Nation's land area is about to be deposed. We must make a strong and persistent legislative effort to put Federal property management on a more stable basis. I am currently working on legislation to provide more assured and adequate funding for Federal property management and I expect to introduce a bill, or bills, next session. Again, I solicit your interest and your recommendations.

Third, I think that the Congress should enact legislation to help the States finance State-wide land use planning. This is another recommendation of the PLLRC Report, and the Senate Interior Committee has reported out such a land use planning bill after the election recess.

This bill has been extensively revised in Committee, and I think that it will undergo further improvement before it is enacted. Action cannot be completed this session, however, because the House has not held

hearings on similar legislation, but the momentum gained by Committee action this year will do much to give this legislation priority in the Senate next session.

As a Westerner, I am impressed that this Senate committee bill assigns land-use planning to the State water resource planning agencies facilitated by previous legislation. All of us recognize the interdependence of land and water and their inseparability in total resource planning. Most of us in the West appreciate the primacy of water supply in land-use planning and I am sure that the work of the Idaho Water Resource Board has done much to convince the people of this state of the need for such planning in the water resource field. Land-use planning also will help a State like Idaho to participate actively in Federal legislation involving land-use policies and future permanent reservations on Federal land and resources within the State.

I heartily endorse the concept of State planning as an integral part of regional and national planning. A fully coordinated effort is essential. The States need to adequately staff and finance their planning agencies. Provisions also need to be made for adequate State, regional, and local participation in Federal Congressional hearings on legislation bearing upon public lands policy and management. To that end, I shall endeavor to arrange for public hearings on major Federal administrative and legislative matters directly affecting Idaho resources and the interests of State and local governmental agencies.

Fourth, if there can be one general characterization of the philosophy which dominated the proceedings of the Public Land Law Review Commission, I think it can be summed up in two words: Balanced Use. During the past quarter century, we had heard much about "multiple use" of our resources. In fact, legislation was passed during the 1960's which prescribed "multiple use" as the dominating policy of the Forest Service, which manages some 20 million acres of Idaho's land area.

I think that "balanced use" conveys more accurate meaning than "multiple use," which has come to mean many things to many people.

Under multiple use, broadly defined, there is no ground for wilderness preservation, because that results in an abandonment of the multiple use principle for largely single-use management. The broad definition of multiple use also precludes a recognition that some lands should be given priority for one major or "dominant" use, such as mining, forestry, water supply, or wildlife propagation.

After many years of struggling with problems of management of publicly-owned resources, I remain convinced that we can achieve a balance in the use and conservation of those resources. Under the balanced use concept, I believe that we can properly manage our public land resource, and that we can clean up our waterways and our air, restore our lands that have been abused, and properly husband our fish and wildlife resources. I believe that we can do these essential things and, at the same time develop our resources, with due attention to preserving a suitable environment.

The recommendations of the Public Land Law Review Commission, I believe, were dedicated to this management ideal. If accepted and applied, they can contribute to modernization and coordination of the legislative and administrative policies of our public lands.

The task of translating recommendations into statutory and administrative policies and orders is both complex and challenging, and demands great patience and perseverance. I greatly appreciate your interest and solicit your cooperation in a commendable remedial effort in the public interest.

GOVERNMENT EXECUTIVE SENIOR EDITOR LEON SHLOSS AUTHOR OF ARTICLE ON YOUNG U.S. GENERALS—ASSERTS UNITED STATES FACES LEADERSHIP PROBLEM IN THE MILITARY

HON. STUART SYMINGTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, November 19, 1970

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, the very able senior editor of Government Executive, Leon Shloss, has written an informative article entitled, "The Young Generals: One-Stars Headed for Stardom." Mr. Shloss reports that officers running the armed services in the late 1970's and early 1980's will emerge from a group of 519 one-star generals at present in the armed services.

Shloss searched out a typical example of the kind of career man our future military leaders will be. He came up with 46-year-old twin brothers, Brig. Gen. Charles C. Patillo and Brig. Gen. Cuthbert A. Patillo of Atlanta, Ga.

The article is well written and interesting. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE YOUNG GENERALS: ONE-STARS HEADED FOR STARDOM

(By Leon Shloss)

HIGHLIGHTS

1. U.S. armed forces are facing a leadership problem because within 10 years nearly all of today's general officers will have been retired.

2. The problem is being faced up to, by development of systems whereby the most promising younger officers can be identified and groomed for top command posts.

3. What kind of person is the one-star general of today who will be entrusted in the future with military leadership of the U.S.? What is he doing now, what is his service background, what are his management skills? Would he be able to cope with the problems inherent in a \$100-billion defense budget?

The Armed Forces of the United States face a leadership problem. For example, in the Air Force practically all of today's 13 four-star generals will be retired by 1975. So will 95 to 98 percent of the three-stars. Within 10 years nearly all of today's AF general officers, including 159 two-stars, will be gone.

The same percentages hold true, largely, in the Army and the Marine Corps. The Army now numbers 16 four-stars, 43 three-stars and 198 two-stars. The Marine Corps has two four-stars, eight three-stars, 26 two-stars.

Parenthetically, the armed forces face a similar problem in the ranks of their civilian employees. The top civil servants, forged in the fires of World War II, and in the Korean and Vietnam conflicts, will be retired, and hard to replace.

But the problem facing the services is being intensively and realistically confronted, by placing emphasis on youth. The officers running the services in the late '70s and early '80s will emerge from today's crop of one-stars. Of these there are, in the Air Force, Army and Marine Corps, a total of 519 today.

PICKING "PICK OF THE PICK"

The Chiefs of Staff of the not-too-distant future are in their number, as are the of-

Officers who will come to occupy all the high command posts. Many of today's most capable colonels—and there are many aged 50 to 52—will of necessity be bypassed in the needful search for greater longevity of management.

The services recognize their problem so systems to meet it have been created. In the case of the Air Force, its Career Management System seeks to identify those young officers who have demonstrated the potential to advance to the highest grades.

These officers then are given the opportunity to realize their potential. They are placed in challenging jobs. If their performance and potential warrant it they are promoted ahead of their contemporaries. They are given the opportunity to expand their military knowledge at professional military schools and the opportunity to expand their specialized knowledge in graduate education programs conducted by the Air Force Institute of Technology.

WHAT KIND OF MAN IS HE?

The career development process is continuous, with the timing of jobs, promotion, and education being closely coordinated so that the right opportunities occur at the right time.

The basic tool used in identifying the officers who will be afforded these special career opportunities is the Officer Effectiveness Report which assesses not only performance but also potential. In effect, the outstanding young officers identify themselves. Positive career development actions clear the path for their progress.

The Air Force system does not identify specific young officers as future generals, but it is designed to identify those who *might* become generals and to insure that they are given every opportunity to improve their capabilities and advance to the limit of their ability.

What kind of man is today's one-star general, who will be entrusted in coming years with the military leadership of this country? What are his present responsibilities? What is his service background? Possibly most important, what are his management skills? Will he be able to cope with the problems inherent in a \$75-billion to \$100-billion dollar defense budget?

Government Executive set out to find a typical example and came up with two—twin brothers: Brigadier General Charles C. "Buck" Pattillo and Brigadier General Cuthbert A. "Bill" Pattillo. They were born June 3, 1924 in Atlanta, Ga. Buck is senior—he was born seven minutes before Bill.

Buck today is Vice Commander of the Oklahoma City Air Materiel Area (OCAMA), Tinker Air Force Base, Okla. Bill is Assistant Deputy Chief of Staff (Plans) of Headquarters Tactical Air Command, Langley Air Force Base, Va. They enlisted in the then U.S. Army Air Corps together on November 12, 1942, and until three years ago were never separated in their duty assignments.

At OCAMA Buck is the number 2 man in an operation encompassing a geographic area of 15 states. The base covers 4,100 acres, includes a major AF airfield and industrial real property consisting of 490 buildings valued at \$141 million, operation and maintenance of which costs \$400 million a year. More than 28,000 military and civilian personnel work at this installation and are paid \$246 million annually.

OCAMA's multiple missions include:

Worldwide System Support Management of 11 major USAF weapon systems, including the B-52 and KC-135; 23 Communication, electronic and meteorological systems, which include SAC and USAF Command and Control; Nuclear Detection and Reporting; USAF Air Weapons Control, and the ADM-20, AGM-69, and AGM-28 missiles.

Inventory Management of 14 types of jet engines as well as 20 complete AF Property Classes and parts of 32 others. Item Management encompasses 304,143 items.

Specialized Repair Activity for the B-52 and KC-135, six types of jet engines and 29 Federal Property Classes comprising many of the aircraft instruments and accessories used by USAF. Total inventory value is \$1.8 billion.

Maintenance or Specialized Repair of major AF weapon systems and components. This constitutes the major organic workload, requiring 14 million manhours annually. Shop area covers 4.1 million square feet. Tools and facilities are valued at \$116 million.

Operation of Supply, Storage and Transportation activities. The receiving, storage and shipment of this material to DOD and AF activities all over the world necessitates the processing of 2.5 million requisitions to move 1.6 million worldwide shipments of 276 million pounds of cargo annually.

There are more—many more—functions but the foregoing provides a broad-brush picture of the duties for which this 46-year-old shares top responsibility.

PATILLOS AS EXAMPLES

The USAF directive setting up the job of OCAMA Vice Commander reads: "Shares in the performance of his (the OCAMA commander) duties of command with responsibility for planning, organizing, directing and controlling total OCAMA mission accomplishment. Exercises direct supervision over subordinate OCAMA Staff Officers and Commanders without regard to seniority of rank among officers of the same grade." The directive continues, significantly:

"Because of the installation's unique combination of military and industrial missions and objectives, the incumbent of this position should possess both the qualities of an Air Force officer who is thoroughly familiar with the mission, needs and objectives of the Air Force and with the qualities of a top-ranking executive of the private sector who is thoroughly familiar with industrial methods, processes and techniques characteristic of large corporations."

At TAC headquarters in Langley, Va., Bill Pattillo's mission as Assistant Deputy Chief of Staff (Plans) is described as follows:

"Assists and acts in the absence of the DCS (Plans) in his responsibility for promulgating concepts, policies, and doctrine for the utilization of tactical air power; the development of plans for accomplishing TAC/USAFSTRIKE/USAFSLANT wartime responsibilities; the development of the command manpower program to include resource requirements, policies and structures, and manpower management engineer-activities, and the preparation of command operating programs for base utilization and major unit deployments and provides program guidance to the command."

How do promising young general officers get that way? What has been their training, for combat, and, more important, for assumption of high command posts?

Again using the Pattillos as examples, they both were graduated from the Technical High School in Atlanta, Ga., and, at age 18, enlisted immediately in the Army Air Corps. Following intensive training, they received their pilot wings and commissions as second lieutenants.

Both flew fighters in World War II in the European Theater of Operations. Buck earned the Distinguished Flying Cross and three Air Medals. Bill amassed 135 combat hours before being shot down and captured by the Nazis. He downed a Luftwaffe ME-262 jet fighter in a dogfight while flying a propeller-driven plane, and destroyed six more Nazi aircraft on the ground. For his exploits he

was awarded, like Buck, a DFC and three Air Medals.

PARALLEL CAREERS

At war's end, both Pattillos returned to civilian life and enrolled in the Georgia Institute of Technology. Before they could be graduated they were recalled, in 1948, to active duty with the 31st Fighter Group at Turner AFB, Ga., and less than a year later they were assigned to the 36th Tactical Fighter Wing at Furstfeldbruck, Germany, where they assisted in forming and flying with the *Skyblazers*, the aerial demonstration team of the United States Air Forces in Europe (USAFE).

The team was unofficial, flew on its own time, and encountered difficulty in getting top-level sanction. About that time Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower returned to duty in Europe and, seeing the *Skyblazers* in action, gave them his blessing saying:

"They represent not only the most economical but the most effective means of demonstrating to our allies the high quality of our pilotage and of American-built aircraft."

Buck Pattillo flew left wing and alternate lead for the team in more than 250 air shows throughout Western Europe, North Africa, Greece, and Turkey. For that service he was awarded the Legion of Merit.

Returning to the States the Pattillos were, in 1953, assigned to Luke AFB, Ariz., where they were instrumental in forming the U.S. Air Force's first and to date only official aerial demonstration team—the world-renowned *Thunderbirds*.

From 1956 to 1959 the Pattillos served with the 401st Tactical Fighter Wing at England AFB, La., Buck as a squadron commander, Bill as air operations officer with the 613th Fighter Bomber Squadron of that wing.

In 1960 they matriculated together at the University of Colorado, from which they were graduated in 1962 with BA degrees in mathematics. Next stop was Langley AFB, where Buck was Chief, Jet Fighter-Reconnaissance Division, 4442nd Standardization and Evaluation Group and Bill was operations staff officer, executive officer, policy and plans branch chief with the 4450th Standardization and Evaluation Group.

EXPERIENCING EDUCATION

In August, 1964, the Pattillos entered the U.S. Army War College at Carlisle, Pa., and simultaneously studied at the George Washington University Graduate School, where both were graduated with masters' degrees in international affairs.

In 1965 they were assigned to Germany. In 1968 Buck went to Southeast Asia as Vice Commander of the 8th Tactical Fighter Wing in Thailand, shortly to assume the wing command. He became Vice Commander of the Oklahoma City Air Materiel Area in July 1969.

Meanwhile, also in '68, Bill arrived in Vietnam to be Vice Commander of the 3rd Tactical Fighter Wing, shortly to be named Commander of the 31st TFW, thence to his present command at TAC.

That, briefly, is how they "got there."

Too often overlooked are the families of officers which have to move around the world from duty station to duty station, or remain at home when their men are ordered into combat areas.

In the case of the Pattillos the similarities of the twins and their careers continue on the home front. Buck is married to former Bobbie Brown. They have four children—girls Deborah Ann and Cheri Leigh and boys Jon Scott and Charles C. Jr. Bill is married to the former Joyce Matthews and they too have four children—two are girls, Patricia and Peggy, and two are boys, Bob and Joe.

STATEMENT ON THE MATTER OF
CONFIDENCE IN U.S. PARTICIPA-
TION IN FREE WORLD COLLEC-
TIVE SECURITY ARRANGEMENTS

HON. GERALD R. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 19, 1970

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, it is commonplace to state that in all of our deliberations we seek, more than any other one thing, to serve the American national interest. If we were asked to describe this American national interest, we would all make different points and use different language and examples, for our national interest is a many faceted thing and different aspects of it are more important or more urgent at one time than at another. But I think we would all agree with one formulation: That the greatest single American national interest is the avoidance of a Third World War—a war which could destroy all mankind.

Now the realities of life in this half of the 20th century are that the predatory instincts and appetites of aggressors—either actual or potential—must be deterred. They are deterred at present by a free world system of collective security arrangements such as NATO, SEATO, CENTO, the ANZUS Pact, and so forth. In all of these free world collective security arrangements, there is one constant and indispensable ingredient: The power of the United States of America and the credibility of this power—the recognition by the world at large of the fact that the United States will use its power to deter aggression and to support its friends and allies if they come under attack. The credibility of the American deterrent is vital to the prevention of aggression—either by calculation or by miscalculation—aggression which could lead to a third world war.

We live in an era of remarkable achievements in the field of communications. The smallest incident taking place in one far-off part of the world can be reported immediately to every other corner of the globe. By the same token, if the United States fails to meet its responsibilities in one part of the world, this is immediately known in all other parts, and especially in Moscow and Peking.

The war in Indochina seems to be winding down. Soon the number of American troops there will be one-half of what it was when President Nixon took office. Casualties are at the lowest point in the last 5 years. Vietnamization is working, pacification is going forward. Vietnam, while still a terribly important problem, no longer appears quite so critical.

But there are other explosive situations. There is the problem of avoiding war and achieving a lasting peace in the Middle East. The United States is determined to assist the democratic state of Israel to defend itself from aggression—supported and encouraged by the same Communist powers which support and encourage Hanoi's aggression in East

Asia. Should any uncertainty develop in the mind of the leaders of these Communist states as to the determination of the United States to help its own friends and allies, the danger of war by miscalculation would be vastly increased. If the Communists detect weakness in our attitude in Cambodia or Vietnam, they might well take this as a sign that they can proceed with a freer hand in the Middle East or Europe. The dangers of war by miscalculation are, if anything, greater than the dangers of war by deliberate design. And the steadfast support which we propose to give to Cambodia's struggle against Communist invaders is as sure a way as any of making clear our willingness to assist other nations, such as Israel, which are resisting other aggressions thousands of miles away.

THE FIRST BIG STEP

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 18, 1970

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the voters of the State of Illinois approved a \$750 million antipollution bond issue on November 3. I direct the attention of the Members to this fact since it dramatically demonstrates the public desire to effectively control water and air pollution.

WGN Broadcasting Co., Chicago, was a vigorous supporter of the bond issue and in its Saturday, November 7, editorial properly commends the voters of the State and emphasizes the significance of their action.

The editorial follows:

THE FIRST BIG STEP

The anti-pollution bond issue, which won approval in Tuesday's election, had several unusual aspects. First, the voter support was overwhelming. Eighty-five out of 100 people went to the trouble of voting FOR the plan.

This is encouraging. It is fair to draw the assumption that the people of Illinois have given a mandate to all public officials. The people say we want clean streams . . . better waste disposal . . . an environment we can live in and ENJOY.

The Bond issue passed rather narrowly, however, when compared to the total vote. Although the vote count showed high public concern, the issue almost failed because some hundreds of thousands could not find, or did not look for, that lever or paper ballot in their voting booth.

WGN supported the anti-pollution bond issue from the start. The voter reaction shows most of you feel the same way. Now that it is a reality, no longer just an idea, WGN feels the politicians of Illinois should approach this task with a clear bipartisan, public service attitude.

The \$750 million must go through the political chain-of-command in Springfield. The highest standards must be followed in establishing priorities for this project and allocating the money.

The people have spoken. Now, our elected officials must act. We hope their actions match the words of the people of Illinois. You the people want clean streams, better sewage and waste disposal. You have a right to expect prompt, efficient handling of your monies.

FOREIGN INVESTMENT VERSUS
FOREIGN AID

HON. JOHN G. SCHMITZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 19, 1970

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, a most interesting article by famed economist Henry Hazlitt appeared in the October issue of the Freeman magazine. It is a chapter from Mr. Hazlitt's forthcoming book "The Conquest of Poverty."

In this article Mr. Hazlitt outlines the advantages of private capital investment in foreign nations as opposed to government to government aid programs which promote "statism, centralized planning, socialism, dependence, pauperization, inefficiency, and waste." In short programs which produce all the things which they are supposed to clear up, or at least not exacerbate.

He points out that the \$131 billion in foreign aid the United States has doled out from 1947-70—this does not include the \$68 billion interest on the funds borrowed—could well have been used to promote prosperity here at home. Not only would the well-being of the American taxpayer have been significantly improved but also the well-being of American industry which is the seed from which private capital investment overseas flows.

Mr. Hazlitt goes into detail on the advantages which private foreign investment has over our numerous foreign aid programs no matter how well or how poorly they are run.

The secret of helping the rest of the free world consists in promoting the export of private capital to other nations. It does not consist of further penalizing the American taxpayer, already staggering under the yoke of excessive taxation. The more we tax our people the less there is for them to invest in private enterprise here at home. This naturally retards the spread of our amazing industrial base to other free nations—the very thing which would really help lift them out of their economic doldrums.

We are caught in a vicious circle of our own making. The more we give away in foreign aid the more we inhibit private investment overseas. We can burst the chains which have been retarding economic growth at home and abroad by discarding once and for all time the ultra-reactionary socialist and welfare concepts which have so long dominated both our internal and external economic policies.

The article follows:

FOREIGN INVESTMENT VERSUS FOREIGN AID

(By Henry Hazlitt)

At the beginning of Chapter III of his *History of England*, Thomas Babington Macaulay wrote:

"In every experimental science there is a tendency toward perfection. In every human being there is a wish to ameliorate his own condition. These two principles have often sufficed, even when counteracted by great public calamities and by bad institutions, to carry civilization rapidly forward.

No ordinary misfortune, no ordinary misgovernment, will do so much to make a nation wretched as the constant effort of every man to better himself will do to make a nation prosperous. It has often been found that profuse expenditures, heavy taxation, absurd commercial restrictions, corrupt tribunals, disastrous wars, seditions, persecutions, conflagrations, inundations, have not been able to destroy capital so fast as the exertions of private citizens have been able to create it. It can easily be proved that, in our own land, the national wealth has, during at least six centuries, been almost uninterruptedly increasing. . . . This progress, having continued during many ages, became at length, about the middle of the eighteenth century, portentously rapid, and has proceeded, during the nineteenth, with accelerated velocity."

We too often forget this basic truth. Would-be humanitarians speak constantly today of "the vicious circle of poverty." Poverty, they tell us, produces malnutrition and disease, which produce apathy and idleness, which perpetuate poverty; and no progress is possible without help from outside. This theory is today propounded unceasingly, as if it were axiomatic. Yet the history of nations and individuals shows it to be false.

It is not only "the natural effort which every man is continually making to better his own condition" (as Adam Smith put it even before Macaulay) that we need to consider, but the constant effort of most families to give their children a "better start" than they enjoyed themselves. The poorest people under the most primitive conditions work first of all for food, then for clothing and shelter. Once they have provided a rudimentary shelter, more of their energies are released for increasing the quantity or improving the quality of their food and clothing and shelter. And for providing tools. Once they have acquired a few tools, part of their time and energies can be released for making more and better tools. And so, as Macaulay emphasized, economic progress can become accelerative.

One reason it took so many centuries before this acceleration actually began, is that as men increased their production of the means of subsistence, more of their children survived. This meant that their increased production was in fact mainly used to support an increasing population. Aggregate production, population, and consumption all increased; but per capita production and consumption barely increased at all. Not until the Industrial Revolution began in the late eighteenth century did the rate of production begin to increase by so much that, in spite of leading to an unprecedented increase in population, it led also to an increase in per capita production. In the Western world this increase has continued ever since.

So a country can, in fact, starting from the most primitive conditions, lift itself from poverty to abundance. If this were not so, the world could never have arrived at its present state of wealth. Every country started poor. As a matter of historic fact, most nations raised themselves from "hopeless" poverty to at least a less wretched poverty purely by their own efforts.

SPECIALIZATION AND TRADE

One of the ways by which each nation or region did this was by division of labor within its own territory and by the mutual exchange of services and products. Each man enormously increased his output by eventually specializing in a single activity—by becoming a farmer, butcher, baker, mason, bricklayer, or tailor—and exchanging his product with his neighbors. In time this process extended beyond national boundaries, enabling each nation to specialize more

than before in the products or services that it was able to supply more plentifully or cheaply than others, and by exchange and trade to supply itself with goods and services from others more plentifully or cheaply than it could supply them for itself.

But this was only one way in which foreign trade accelerated the mutual enrichment of nations. In addition to being able to supply itself with more goods and cheaper goods as a result of foreign trade, each nation supplied itself with goods and services that it could otherwise not produce at all, and of which it would perhaps not even have known the existence.

Thus foreign trade educates each nation that participates in it, and not only through such obvious means as the exchange of books and periodicals. This educational effect is particularly important when hitherto backward countries open their doors to industrially advanced countries. One of the most dramatic examples of this occurred in 1854, when Commodore Perry at the head of a U.S. naval force "persuaded" the Japanese, after 250 years of isolation, to open their doors to trade and communication with the U.S. and the rest of the world. Part of Perry's success, significantly, was the result of bringing and showing the Japanese such things as a modern telescope, a model telegraph, and a model railway, which delighted and amazed them.

SOME STEPS MAY BE SKIPPED

Western reformers today, praising some hitherto backward country, in Africa or Asia, will explain how much smarter its natives are than we of the West because they have "leaped in a single decade from the seventeenth into the twentieth century." But the leap, while praiseworthy, is not so surprising when one recalls that what the natives mainly did was to import the machines, instruments, technology, and know-how that had been developed during those three centuries by the scientists and technicians of the West. The backward countries were able to bypass home coal furnaces, gas light, the street car, and even, in most cases, the railroad, and to import Western automobiles, Western knowledge of road-building, Western airplanes and airliners, telephones, central oil heaters, electric light, radio and television, refrigerators and air-conditioning, electric heaters, stoves, dishwashers, and clothes washers, machine tools, factories, plants, and Western technicians, and then to send some of their youth to Western colleges and universities to become technicians, engineers, and scientists. The backward countries imported, in brief, their "great leap forward."

In fact, not merely the recently backward countries of Asia and Africa, but every great industrialized Western nation, not excluding the United States, owes a very great part—indeed, the major part—of its present technological knowledge and productivity to discoveries, inventions, and improvements imported from other nations. Notwithstanding the elegant elucidations by the classical economists, very few of us today appreciate all that the world and each nation owes to foreign trade, not only in services and products, but even more in knowledge, ideas, and ideals.

INTERNATIONAL INVESTMENT

Historically, international trade gradually led to international investment. Among independent nations, international investment developed inevitably when the exporters of one nation, in order to increase their sales, sold on short-term credit, and later on longer-term credit, to the importers of another. It developed also because capital was scarcer in the less developed nation, and interest rates were higher. It developed on a larger scale when men emigrated from one country to another, starting businesses in the new country, taking their capital as well as their skills with them.

In fact, what is now known as "portfolio" investment—the purchase by the nationals of one country of the stocks or bonds of the companies of another—has usually been less important quantitatively than this "direct" investment. In 1967 U.S. private investments abroad were estimated to total \$93 billion, of which \$12 billion were short-term assets and claims, and \$81 billion long-term. Of American long-term private investments abroad, \$22 billion were portfolio investments and \$59 billion direct investments.

The export of private capital for private investment has on the whole been extremely profitable for the capital-exporting countries. In every one of the twenty years from 1945 to 1964 inclusive, for example, the income from old direct foreign investments by U.S. companies exceeded the outflow of new direct investments. In that twenty-year period new outflows of direct investments totaled \$22.8 billion, but income from old direct investments came to \$37.1 billion, plus \$4.6 billion from royalties and fees, leaving an excess inflow of \$18.9 billion. In fact, with the exception of 1928, 1929, and 1931, U.S. income from direct foreign investments exceeded new capital outlays in every year since 1919.

Our direct foreign investments also greatly stimulated our merchandise exports. The U.S. Department of Commerce found that in 1964, for example, \$6.3 billion, or 25 per cent of our total exports in that year, went to affiliates of American companies overseas.

It is one of the ironies of our time, however, that the U.S. government decided to put the entire blame for the recent "balance-of-payments deficit" on American investments abroad; and beginning in mid-1963, started to penalize and restrict such investment.

The advantages of international investment to the capital importing country should be even more obvious. In any backward country there are almost unlimited potential ventures, or "investment opportunities," that are not undertaken chiefly because the capital to start them does not exist. It is the domestic lack of capital that makes it so difficult for the "underdeveloped" country to climb out of its wretched condition. Outside capital can enormously accelerate its rate of improvement.

Investment from abroad, like domestic investment, can be of two kinds: the first is in the form of fixed interest-bearing loans, the second in the form of direct equity investment in which the foreign investor takes both the risks and the profits. The politicians of the capital-importing country usually prefer the first. They see their nationals, say, making 15 or 30 per cent annual gross profit on a venture, paying off the foreign lender at a rate of only 6 per cent, and keeping the difference as net profit. If the foreign investor makes a similar assessment of the situation, however, he naturally prefers to make the direct equity investment himself.

But the foreigner's preference in this regard does not necessarily mean that the capital-importing country is injured. It is to its own advantage if its government puts no vexatious restrictions on the form or conditions of the private foreign investment. For if the foreign investor imports, in addition to his capital, his own (usually) superior management, experience, and technical know-how, his enterprise may be more likely to succeed. He cannot help but give employment to labor in the capital-importing country, even if he is allowed to bring in labor freely from his own. Self-interest and wage-rate differentials will probably soon lead him to displace most of whatever common or even skilled labor he originally brings in from his own country with the labor of the host country. He will usually supply the capital-importing country itself with some article or amenity it did not have before. He will raise the average marginal productivity of labor in the country in which he has built his plant

or made his investment, and his enterprise will tend to raise wages there. And if his investment proves particularly profitable, he will probably keep reinvesting most of his profits in it as long as the market seems to justify the reinvestment.

There is still another benefit to the capital-importing country from private foreign investment. The foreign investors will naturally seek out first the most profitable investment opportunities. If they choose wisely, these will also be the investments that produce the greatest surplus of market value over costs and are therefore economically most productive. When the originally most productive investment opportunities have been exploited to a point where the comparative rate of return begins to diminish, the foreign investors will look for the next most productive investment opportunities, originally passed over. And so on. Private foreign investment will therefore tend to promote the most rapid rate of economic improvements.

FOREIGNERS ARE SUSPECT

It is unfortunate, however, that just as the government of the private-capital-exporting country today tends to regard its capital exports with alarm as a threat to its "balance of payments," the government of the private-capital-importing country today tends to regard its capital imports at least with suspicion if not with even greater alarm. Doesn't the private-capital-exporting country make a profit on this capital? And if so, mustn't this profit necessarily be at the expense of the capital-importing country? Mustn't the latter country somehow be giving away its patrimony? It seems impossible for the anticapitalist mentality (which prevails among the politicians of the world, particularly in the underdeveloped countries) to recognize that both sides normally benefit from any voluntary economic transaction, whether a purchase-sale or a loan-investment, domestic or international.

Chief among the many fears of the politicians of the capital-importing country is that foreign investors "take the money out of the country." To the extent that this is true, it is true also of domestic investment. If a home owner in Philadelphia gets a mortgage from an investor in New York, he may point out that his interest and amortization payments are going out of Philadelphia and even out of Pennsylvania. But he can do this with a straight face only by forgetting that he originally borrowed the money from the New York lender either because he could not raise it at all in his home city or because he got better terms than he could get in his home city. If the New Yorker makes an equity investment in Pennsylvania, he may take out all the net profits; but he probably employs Pennsylvania labor to build his factory and operate it. And he probably pays out \$85 to \$90 annually for labor, supplies, rent, etc., mainly in Pennsylvania, for every \$10 he takes back to New York. (In 1969, American manufacturing corporations showed a net profit after taxes of only 5.4 per cent on total value of sales.) "They take the money out of the country" is an objection against foreign investors resulting even more from xenophobia than from anticapitalism.

FEAR OF FOREIGN CONTROL

Another objection to foreign investment by politicians of the capital-importing country is that the foreign investors may "dominate" the borrowing country's economy. The implication (made in 1965 by the de Gaulle government of France, for example) is that American-owned companies might come to have too much to say about the economic decisions of the government of the countries in which they are located. The real danger, however, is the other way round. The foreign-owned company puts

itself at the mercy of the government of the host country. Its capital in the form of buildings, equipment, drilled wells and refineries, developed mines, and even bank deposits, may be trapped. In the last twenty-five years, particularly in Latin America and the Middle East, as American oil companies and others have found to their sorrow, the dangers of discriminatory labor legislation, onerous taxation, harassment, or even expropriation, are very real.

Yet the anticapitalistic xenophobic, and other prejudices against private foreign investment have been so widespread, in both the countries that would gain from importing capital and the countries that would profit from exporting it, that the governments in both sets of countries have imposed taxes, laws and regulations, red tape, and other obstacles to discourage it.

At the same time, paradoxically, there has grown up in the last quarter-century powerful political pressures in both sets of countries in favor of the richer countries giving capital away to the poorer in the form of government-to-government "aid."

THE MARSHALL PLAN

This present curious giveaway mania (it can only be called that on the part of the countries making the grants) got started as the result of an historical accident. During World War II, the United States had been pouring supplies—munitions, industrial equipment, foodstuffs—into the countries of its allies and cobelligerents. These were all nominally "loans." American Lend-Lease to Great Britain, for example, came to some \$30 billion and to Soviet Russia to \$11 billion.

But when the war ended, Americans were informed not only that the Lend-Lease recipients could not repay and had no intention of repaying, but that the countries receiving these loans in wartime had become dependent upon them and were still in desperate straits, and that further credits were necessary to stave off disaster.

This was the origin of the Marshall Plan.

On June 5, 1947, General George C. Marshall, then American Secretary of State, made at Harvard the world's most expensive commencement address, in which he said:

"The truth of the matter is that Europe's requirements, for the next three or four years, of foreign food and other essential products—principally from America—are so much greater than her present ability to pay that she must have substantial additional help, or face economic, social, and political deterioration of a very grave character."

Whereupon Congress authorized the spending in the following three-and-a-half years of some \$12 billion in aid.

This aid was widely credited with restoring economic health to "free" Europe and halting the march of communism in the recipient countries. It is true that Europe did finally recover from the ravages of World War II—as it had recovered from the ravages of World War I. And it is true that, apart from Yugoslavia, the countries not occupied by Soviet Russia did not go communist. But whether the Marshall plan accelerated or retarded this recovery, or substantially affected the extent of communist penetration in Europe, can never be proved. What can be said is that the plight of Europe in 1947 was at least as much the result of misguided European governmental economic policies as of physical devastation caused by the war. Europe's recovery was far slower than it could have been, with or without the Marshall Plan.

This was dramatically demonstrated in West Germany in 1948, when the actions between June 20 and July 8 of Economic Minister Ludwig Erhard in simultaneously halting inflation, introducing a thoroughgoing currency reform, and removing the strangling network of price controls, brought the German "miracle" of recovery.

As Dr. Erhard himself described his action: "We decided upon and re-introduced the old rules of a free economy, the rules of *laissez-faire*. We abolished practically all controls over allocation, prices, and wages and replaced them with a price mechanism controlled predominantly by money."

The result was that German industrial production in the second half of 1948 rose from 45 per cent to nearly 75 per cent of the 1936 level, while steel production doubled that year.

It is sometimes claimed that it was Germany's share of Marshall aid that brought on the recovery. But nothing similar occurred in Great Britain, for example, which received more than twice as much Marshall aid. The German per capita gross national product, measured in constant prices, increased 64 per cent between 1950 and 1958, whereas the per capita increase in Great Britain, similarly measured, rose only 15 per cent.

Once American politicians got the idea that the American taxpayer owed other countries a living, it followed logically that his duty could not be limited to just a few. Surely that duty was to see that poverty was abolished everywhere in the world. And so in his inaugural address of January 20, 1949, President Truman called for "a bold new program" to make "the benefits of our scientific advances and industrial progress available for the improvement and growth of underdeveloped areas. . . . This program can greatly increase the industrial activity in other nations and can raise substantially their standards of living."

Because it was so labeled in the Truman address, this program became known as "Point Four." Under it the "emergency" foreign aid of the Marshall Plan, which was originally to run for three or four years at most, was universalized, and has now been running for more than twenty years. So far as its advocates and built-in bureaucracy are concerned, it is to last until foreign poverty has been abolished from the face of the earth, or until the per capita "gap" between incomes in the backward countries and the advanced countries has been closed—even if that takes forever.

The cost of the program already is appalling. Total disbursements to foreign nations, in the fiscal years 1946 through 1970, came to \$131 billion. The total net interest paid on what the U.S. borrowed to give away these funds amounted in the same period to \$68 billion, bringing the grand total through the 25-year period to \$199 billion.

This money went altogether to some 130 nations. Even in the fiscal year 1970, the aid program was still operating in 99 nations and five territories of the world, with 51,000 persons on the payroll, including U.S. and foreign personnel. Congressman Otto E. Passman, chairman of the Foreign Operations Subcommittee on Appropriations, declared on July 1, 1969: "Of the three-and-a-half billion people of the world, all but 36 million have received aid from the U.S."

DOMESTIC REPERCUSSIONS

Even the colossal totals just cited do not measure the total loss that the foreign giveaway program has imposed on the American economy. Foreign aid has had the most serious economic side-effects. It has led to grave distortions in our economy. It has undermined our currency, and contributed toward driving us off the gold standard. It has accelerated our inflation. It was sufficient in itself to account for the total of our Federal deficits in the 1946-70 period. The \$199 billion foreign aid total exceeds by \$116 billion even the \$83 billion increase in our gross national debt during the same years. Foreign aid has also been sufficient in itself to account for all our balance-of-payments deficits (which our government's policies blame on private foreign investment).

The advocates of foreign aid may choose to argue that though our chronic Federal budget deficits in the last 25 years could be imputed to foreign aid, we could alternatively impute those deficits to other expenditures, and assume that the foreign aid was paid for entirely by raising additional taxes. But such an assumption would hardly improve the case for foreign aid. It would mean that taxes during this quarter-century averaged at least \$5 billion higher each year than they would have otherwise. It would be difficult to exaggerate the setbacks to personal working incentives, to new ventures, to profits, to capital investment, to employment, to wages, to living standards, that an annual burden of \$5 billion in additional taxation can cause.

If, finally, we make the "neutral" assumption that our \$131 or \$199 billion in foreign aid (whichever way we choose to calculate the sum) was financed in exact proportion to our actual deficit and tax totals in the 25-year period, we merely make it responsible for part of both sets of evils.

In sum, the foreign aid program has immensely set back our own potential capital development. It ought to be obvious that a foreign giveaway program can raise the standards of living of the so-called "underdeveloped areas" of the world only by lowering our own living standards compared with what they could otherwise be. If our taxpayers are forced to contribute millions of dollars for hydroelectric plants in Africa or Asia, they obviously have that much less for productive investment in the U.S. If they contribute \$10 million dollars for a housing project in Uruguay, they have just that much less for their own housing, or any other cost equivalent, at home. Even our own socialist and statist do-gooders would be shaken if it occurred to them to consider how much might have been done with that \$131 or \$199 billion of foreign aid to mitigate pollution at home, build subsidized housing, and relieve "the plight of our cities." Free enterprisers, of course, will lament the foreign giveaway on the far more realistic calculation of how enormously the production, and the wealth and welfare of every class of our population, could have been increased by \$131 to \$199 billion in more private investment in new and better tools and cost-reducing equipment, and in higher living standards, and in more and better homes, hospitals, schools, and universities.

THE POLITICAL ARGUMENTS

What have been the economic or political compensations to the United States for the staggering cost of its foreign aid program? Most of them have been illusory.

When our successive Presidents and foreign aid officials make inspirational speeches in favor of foreign aid, they dwell chiefly on its alleged humanitarian virtues, on the need for American generosity and compassion, on our duty to relieve the suffering and share the burdens of all mankind. But when they are trying to get the necessary appropriations out of Congress, they recognize the advisability of additional arguments. So they appeal to the American taxpayer's material self-interest. It will redound to his benefit, they argue, in three ways: 1. It will increase our foreign trade, and consequently the profits from it. 2. It will keep the underdeveloped countries from going communist. 3. It will turn the recipients of our grants into our eternally grateful friends.

The answers to these arguments are clear:

1. Particular exporters may profit on net balance from the foreign aid program, but they necessarily do so at the expense of the American taxpayer. It makes little difference in the end whether we give other countries the dollars to pay for our goods, or whether we directly give them the goods. We cannot grow rich by giving our goods or

our dollars away. We can only grow poorer. (I would be ashamed of stating this truism if our foreign aid advocates did not so systematically ignore it.)

2. There is no convincing evidence that our foreign aid played any role whatever in reversing, halting, or even slowing down any drift toward communism. Our aid to Cuba in the early years of the program, and even our special favoritism toward it in assigning sugar quotas and the like, did not prevent it from going communist in 1958. Our \$769 million of aid to the United Arab Republic did not prevent it from coming under Russian domination. Our \$460 million aid to Peru did not prevent it from seizing American private properties there. Neither our \$7,715 million aid to India, nor our \$3,637 million aid to Pakistan, prevented either country from moving deeper and deeper into socialism and despotic economic controls. Our aid, in fact, subsidized these very programs, or made them possible. And so it goes, country after country.

3. Instead of turning the recipients into grateful friends, there is ever-fresh evidence that our foreign aid program has had precisely the opposite effect. It is pre-eminently the American embassies and the official American libraries that are mobbed and stoned, the American flag that is burned, the Yanks that are told to go home. And the head of almost every government that accepts American aid finds it necessary to denounce and insult the United States at regular intervals in order to prove to his own people that he is not subservient and no puppet.

So foreign aid hurts both the economic and political interest of the country that extends it.

THE UNSEEN COSTS OF UTOPIAN PROGRAMS

But all this might be overlooked, in a broad humanitarian view, if foreign aid accomplished its main ostensible purpose of raising the living levels of the countries that received it. Yet both reason and experience make it clear that in the long run it has precisely the opposite effect.

Of course, a country cannot give away \$131 billion without its doing something abroad (though we must always keep in mind the reservation—instead of something else at home). If the money is spent on a public housing project, on a hydroelectric dam, on a steel mill (no matter how uneconomic or ill-advised), the housing or the dam or the mill is brought into existence. It is visible and undeniable. But to point to that is to point only to the visible gross gain while ignoring the costs and the offsets. In all sorts of ways—economic, political, spiritual—the aid in the long run hurts the recipient country. It becomes dependent on the aid. It loses self-respect and self-reliance. The poor country becomes a pauperized country, a beggar country.

There is a profound contrast between the effects of foreign aid and of voluntary private investment. Foreign aid goes from government to government. It is therefore almost inevitably statist and socialistic. A good part of it goes into providing more goods for immediate consumption, which may do nothing to increase the country's productive capacity. The rest goes into government projects, government five-year plans, government airlines, government hydroelectric plants and dams, or government steel mills, erected principally for prestige reasons, and for looking impressive in colored photographs, and regardless of whether the projects are economically justified or self-supporting. As a result, real economic improvement is retarded.

THE INSOLUBLE DILEMMA

From the very beginning, foreign aid has faced an insoluble dilemma. I called attention to this in a book published in 1947, *Will*

Dollars Save the World?, when the Marshall Plan was proposed but not yet enacted:

"Intergovernmental loans [they have since become mainly gifts, which only intensifies the problem] are on the horns of this dilemma. If on the one hand they are made without conditions, the funds are squandered and dissipated and fail to accomplish their purpose. They may even be used for the precise opposite of the purpose that the lender had in mind. But if the lending government attempts to impose conditions, its attempt causes immediate resentment. It is called 'dollar diplomacy'; or 'American imperialism'; or 'interfering in the internal affairs' of the borrowing nation. The resentment is quickly exploited by the Communists in that nation."

In the 23 years since the foreign-aid program was launched, the administrators have not only failed to find their way out of this dilemma; they have refused even to acknowledge its existence. They have zigzagged from one course to the other, and ended by following the worst course of all: they have insisted that the recipient governments adopt "growth policies"—which mean, in practice, government "planning," controls, inflation, ambitious nationalized projects—in brief, socialism.

If the foreign aid were not offered in the first place, the recipient government would find it advisable to try to attract foreign private investment. To do this it would have to abandon its socialistic and inflationary policies, its exchange controls, its laws against taking money out of the country. It would have to abandon harassment of private business, restrictive labor laws, and discriminatory taxation. It would have to give assurances against nationalization, expropriation, and seizure.

Specifically, if the nationals of a poor country wanted to borrow foreign capital for a private project, and had to pay a going rate of, say, 7 per cent interest for the loan, their project would have to be one that promised to yield at least 7 per cent before the foreign investors would be interested. If the government of the poor country, on the other hand, can get the money from a foreign government without having to pay interest at all, it need not trouble to ask itself whether the proposed project is likely to prove economic and self-liquidating or not. The essential market guide to comparative need and utility is then completely removed. What decides priorities is the grandiose dreams of the government planners, unembarrassed by bothersome calculations of comparative costs and usefulness.

THE CONDITIONS FOR PROGRESS

Where foreign government aid is not freely offered, however, a poor country, to attract private foreign investment, must establish an actual record of respecting private property and maintaining free markets. Such a free-enterprise policy by itself, even if it did not at first attract a single dollar of foreign investment, would give enormous stimulus to the economy of the country that adopted it. It would first of all stop the flight of capital on the part of its own nationals and stimulate domestic investment. It is constantly forgotten that both domestic and foreign capital investment are encouraged (or discouraged) by the same means.

It is not true, to repeat, that the poor countries are necessarily caught in a "vicious circle of poverty," from which they cannot escape without massive handouts from abroad. It is not true that "the rich countries are getting richer while the poor countries are getting poorer." It is not true that the "gap" between the living standards of the poor countries and the rich countries is growing ever wider. Certainly that is not true in any proportionate sense. From 1945 to 1955, for example, the average rate of

growth of Latin American countries in national income was 4.5 percent per annum, and in output per head 2.4 percent—both rates appreciably higher than the corresponding figure for the United States.

INTERVENTION BREEDS WASTE

The foreign aid ideology is merely the relief ideology, the guaranteed-income ideology, applied on an international scale. Its remedy, like the domestic relief remedy, is to "abolish poverty" by seizing from the rich to give to the poor. Both proposals systematically ignore the reasons for the poverty they seek to cure. Neither draws any distinction between the poverty caused by misfortune and the poverty brought on by shiftlessness and folly. The advocates of both proposals forget that their chief attention should be directed to restoring the incentives, self-reliance, and production of the poor family or the poor country, and that the principal means of doing this is through the free market.

In sum, government-to-government foreign aid promotes statism, centralized planning, socialism, dependence, pauperization, inefficiency, and waste. It prolongs the poverty it is designed to cure. Voluntary private investment in private enterprise, on the other hand, promotes capitalism, production, independence, and self-reliance. It is by attracting foreign private investment that the great industrial nations of the world were once helped. It is so that America itself was helped by British capital, in the nineteenth century, in building its railroads and exploiting its great national resources. It is so that the still "underdeveloped areas" of the world can most effectively be helped today to develop their own great potentialities and to raise the living standards of their masses.

A POINT OF NATIONAL PRIDE

HON. LEN B. JORDAN

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, November 19, 1970

Mr. JORDAN of Idaho. Mr. President, on November 11, I was privileged to take part, in Boise, Idaho, in the traditional Veterans' Day ceremonies—both at the Idaho Veterans' Home and at the Veterans' Administration in Boise. The Boise Veterans' Day featured speaker was one of my State's outstanding educators, Dr. John B. Barnes, president of Boise State College. Dr. Barnes delivered one of the most perceptive speeches that I have been fortunate to hear on this vitally significant day to all Americans. So that Senators and the many other readers of the RECORD may share Dr. Barnes' observations, I ask unanimous consent that the speech, entitled, "A Point of National Pride" be printed in the RECORD.

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

A POINT OF NATIONAL PRIDE

(By John B. Barnes)

INTRODUCTION

This is the modern world of Tiny Tim, Spiro Agnew, Cassius Clay and Englebert Humperdinck, and it is our world, our generation. It is not unusual to note that every generation is made up of some people whose perspectives differ from ours, whose views seem warped. Actually, this may seem an unusual era in history. Further reflection, however, indicates that in generations past, we have also

had a few people in every community, state and region of the country who were equally unique. Because of our rapid communication and the literacy of our people, we are simply more aware of the variety of voices that we hear. This same variety of voices existed on November 11, 1919 when Veterans' Day was originated. This annual event is still celebrated in France, Great Britain, Canada and the United States.

PATRIOTISM IS NOT A PARTISAN AFFAIR

As in its earliest days, today, patriotism is not a partisan affair. Patriotism is a personal affair—not related to political party, race, creed or age. Many people who never served in the military forces of this great nation are nonetheless patriotic. While Veterans' Day was begun to express public and private thanks to many men and women who served their country in war and in peace, I think that it should be more than that. It should be a kind of national pride in the accomplishments of our nation. Accomplishments made due to the hard work and dedication of men and women everywhere. National pride, like any other kind of pride, best not be blind. Pride can be bigoted or pride can be enlightened, intelligent, self-critical. The great need is not for national idolatry nor for the rejection of national ideals. The national pride of which I speak is a dedicated, year-round pride in this country, past and present, tempered by an active desire to improve ourselves as we practice democracy so that the nation may reach the ideals stated in its historic documents. This nation is not yet what its founders dreamed it could become, but it is certainly the world's greatest civilization and one of the bulwarks of freedom for its people under the rule of representative government.

Some among us desire to have the country united and have one mind on most major issues. While I doubt that this is possible, I also doubt that it is desirable. One of the dangers of being completely united, one voice, is that the one voice might be wrong. It is far better to live in a nation which debates among itself and yearly sees change balanced by the grand scale of state and national elections than to dream of a huge country with one set of vocal cords.

THOSE HORRIBLE INCONSISTENCIES

In this environment of debate, it seems inevitable that inconsistencies will develop. Look at a few of our present inconsistencies:

1. Some of the most vigorous opponents of the Indo-China war who cry peace in the streets, actually participate in violence at home as a method of solving problems. They castigate violence abroad and proclaim it at home.

2. Chester F. Carlson gave \$10,000,000 to the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions knowing that most of the money would be spent in criticizing the corporate structure of American business when the \$10,000,000 that he contributed was made in that same competitive marketplace.

3. The ringing voice of elected officials pleading for clean air and clean water, but their failure to insure the enforcement of the laws and regulations passed by cities, counties and states.

4. The great abundance of talk about the problems of these times contrasted with a timid and meager development of solutions which to many looks like a premium on language and a deficit on action.

5. A small group of college students at the University of Minnesota physically prevented the University orchestra from holding its regular concert program until 60 percent of the organization's numbers signed a petition opposing the war, but some of the same members of this cohesive group demanded the right to celebrate Christ's Communion in the nude. As Krislov has

said, "The assumption is that the square world must accept deviant behavior, but that the deviants have the right to demand conformity." Stated another way, "The groups to which I belong should have a wide threshold, but the groups to which you belong should conform to my views."

You could name a good many other inconsistencies. They are the kind of things which make progress difficult, inflame tempers, breeds irrationality.

My middle years have convinced me that what plagues our society, hampers peace at home and abroad, confuses and beclouds our rational thoughts is the rattle that comes from the extreme ends of such inconsistencies. Too many of us have learned to trust the tug of our emotions and the permanence of our prejudices when indeed emotions are not always the best signals to either progress or retreat.

THE RIGHT TO SERVE

With the wide freedoms that exist in our country, one of the rights so often forgotten is the right to serve. We recognize this right in the right to serve this country through its armed forces. Those who now serve in the various branches of the military service, serve the country not because they believe that war is popular. It seldom is. They serve not because our nation is always right on every issue. We too are fallible. They serve not because the armed forces is the only way to serve the country of one's birth or of one's choice. They serve in the military for the same reasons people in all walks of life serve their communities and their states or serve the companies for which they work, or the church or political party of their choice.

You may ask why do men and women choose to serve their country through a few years or a lifetime in a branch of military service. I can best answer that by asking ten brief questions:

1. Who cares enough about others that, when necessity arises, he will risk his life to prove it?

A serviceman.

2. Who will give his prime years to a career which he knows may terminate at the very peak of his ability?

A serviceman.

3. Who will stand on call, in crises or not, firing a weapon or repairing a jeep?

A serviceman.

4. Who has a wife who loves him so much she'd rather see him in danger than know he sought just safety?

A serviceman.

5. Who knows the deepest meaning of devotion and discipline to a selfless call?

A serviceman.

6. Who can curse hell and cry to heaven with an equally sober and sensible voice?

A serviceman.

7. Who can live with himself in a crowded barrack, on a lonely reconnaissance mission, or in a holiday parade and still be proud of what he is and what he does?

A serviceman.

8. Who knows best that major wars or personal crises are seldom fought on flat plateaus but that the mountains and valleys of life challenge men?

A serviceman.

9. What career blends best the need for a healthy body, an alert mind, and a resolute spirit?

The military service.

10. Who knows that arrogance is not strength and that even in war, opportunities for service to others outnumber enemy encounters?

A serviceman.

CONCLUSION

That's what a serviceman is and thank God for it. We need more like him in all walks of life.

RICHEST FARMERS GET MOST
SUBSIDY MONEY

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN
OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 19, 1970

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, the House has passed the new agriculture bill. This bill included payment limitations on some crops but the payments were so high and the future cost of the program so excessive I could not support this bill.

There was another reason why I could not support this bill—the fact that the payments for the most part went not to small farmers but to giant combines. There are now additional data on this facet of the agriculture program. Charles Schultze, former Director of the Bureau of the Budget and now an economist with the Brookings Institution, has completed a study which demonstrates that 42 percent of the approximately \$8 billion in the direct Federal payment and the market price supports goes to the largest 7 percent of farmers with sales above \$40,000 per year.

For the benefit of my colleagues I insert in the RECORD a brief article that covers some of the findings of the Schultze study:

RICHEST FARMERS GET MOST SUBSIDY MONEY
(By David R. Francis)

WASHINGTON.—Contrary to the image, this nation's farm program is not a welfare program, says former budget director Charles L. Schultze.

Most of the subsidy money does not go to the poor farmer. Rather it goes to the wealthier farm operators.

Farm economists always have known that federal subsidy money is distributed largely in relation to production. This has meant that the trend to concentrating farm production in a minority of farms during the post-war period also has brought about a concentration of benefits to the larger farms.

Dr. Schultze, now an economist with Brookings Institution, has just completed the most thorough analysis yet of the distribution of benefits from the farm program. It will be published soon by the institution.

Congress is expected to pass a new farm bill when it returns from the election recess. But this new legislation will alter barely the distribution of the benefits from the program. It still will help the richer farmers the most, despite a ceiling of \$55,000 per crop per farm in Federal subsidies.

Dr. Schultze hopes his program analysis may affect congressional thinking about the farm program when the bill comes up for renewal three years from now. Urban congressmen in particular may want to further limit the program costs.

Farm price-support programs provide two kinds of benefits to the farmer:

1. Direct federal payments. These have averaged in the past three years about \$3.75 billion per year.

2. Market price supports. By limiting production, the price of farm products is boosted above what it would be without these limits. These raise farm income and cost consumers an additional \$4.25 billion a year.

PRICE HIKE SEEN

Some calculations indicate market price supports may hike the price of farm products as much as \$6 billion.

These two benefits thus total roughly \$8 billion.

Adding in storage costs, administrative costs, loan costs, and other program costs, Dr. Schultze reckons the total transfer of income from consumers and taxpayers to the farm economy to be in the range of \$9.5 to \$11 billion.

"For comparative purposes," he writes, "the total federal, state, and local cost of various public-assistance (welfare) programs, including Medicaid, was \$9 billion in 1969.

"Procurement, operation, and maintenance of this nation's strategic nuclear forces also cost about \$9 billion in fiscal 1969."

Looking at the distribution of the subsidy benefits actually received by the farmers, Dr. Schultze finds that 42 percent of the roughly \$8 billion goes to the largest 7 percent of farmers with sales above \$40,000 per year. Their total net income from farm and nonfarm sources averages \$33,000. The subsidy benefits provide an average \$16,000 per farm for this class of farmers.

MUCH GOES TO FEW

Some 64 percent of the subsidies goes to the top 19 percent of farmers with annual sales of \$20,000 or more. These 568,000 farms produce some three-fourths of total farm-product sales.

Their average income in 1969 was \$20,900; their average subsidy \$9,100.

By contrast, the 1.5 million farmers with sales below \$5,000 per year have average incomes of \$7,900—primarily from off-farm sources—and receive \$500 per farm in subsidy values. Many of these small farms are worked only part time. But many farmers in this class are poor.

These figures make clear that the more a farm produces, the greater the value of price supports.

This, of course, would be the expected result of the government's efforts to keep the prices of farm products at a high level. But also it is true of the government's cash payments to farmers. These depend on the size of a farmer's acreage allotment or his production, both of which vary directly with the size of his farm.

DIRECT PAYMENTS

Of the \$3.75 billion of direct payments, some 54 percent goes to the 19 percent of * * * farmers got 73 percent of the benefits. The 1.5 million farmers with sales below \$5,000 receive 13 percent of payments.

In the case of the \$4.25 billion of price-support benefits, the top 19 percent of farmers got 73 percent of the benefits. The 1.5 million farmers at the other end of the scale, comprising 51 percent of all farmers, got only 5 percent of the benefits.

Dr. Schultze's figures for the size of price-support benefits from the farm program are based on the "short run" effect of establishing a free market in farm products. Over a considerably longer period, the resulting lower prices would hasten the exodus from farming. Supply would come closer to demand and farm prices would rise once more.

One study finds that the long-run difference between income projected under current farm programs and free-market income would be \$1.4 billion. This assumes prices would eventually stabilize at levels sufficient to cover all major costs of production, including family labor.

One major effect of the farm program is to increase the price or rent of farm lands, Dr. Schultze writes.

Most farm-subsidy programs are "vested" not in the farmer as an individual but in the land on his farm. When a farm is sold, the subsidy privileges go with the land. As a result, the value of the annual subsidy tends to get reflected, at least partially, in the price of the farmland.

In combination with a number of other factors, says Dr. Schultze, this capitaliza-

tion process has tended to drive the price of farmland up.

Thus the chief benefits of farm subsidies have fallen to those who purchased land many years ago before subsidies became prevalent. Farmers buying or renting land in later years get less advantage from the farm program. The added costs from higher land prices or farm rents partially offset the farm program benefits.

In other words, the farm program has resulted in large capital gains to longtime owners of farmland. The new generation of farmers has benefitted relatively little.

A cut in farm subsidies would mean a reduction in paper capital gains for those farmers who have held their land for a long time; it would mean actual capital losses for more recent farm owners.

THE NATIONAL WATERED-DOWN
COMMISSION

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, November 19, 1970

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, in 1968 Congress established the National Water Commission. The Commission, composed of seven members appointed by the President, was directed to review present and anticipated national water resource problems and to consider economic and social consequences of water resource development. The Commission was charged with advising on such specific water resource matters as may be referred to it by the President and the Water Resources Council. The Commission was further directed to submit reports on its findings to the President and to Congress, which limited the Commission's life to 5 years, expiring September 26, 1973.

President Johnson appointed an outstanding, bipartisan commission. The chairman was Charles Luce, former Under Secretary of the Interior and Bonneville Power Administrator, now the head of Consolidated Edison. Serving with him were Ray Lindsley, professor of hydraulic engineering at Stanford; Frank C. Diluzio, former Assistant Secretary of the Interior for Water Pollution Control; Mike Wright, the chief executive officer of Humble Oil; Russell Train, then head of the Conservation Foundation and now head of the Council on Environmental Quality; Sam Baxter, Philadelphia's water commissioner and chief engineer; and Clyde Ellis, a former Representative from Arkansas who for years served as the general manager of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association.

Under the law, these members serve at the pleasure of the President. Confirmation of commissioners by the Senate is not required, an unfortunate short coming of the law regarding so important a commission. The Senate and its Interior Committee had provided for confirmation in the enabling legislation, S. 20, but the contrary view of the House prevailed in conference.

Key Government officials and commission members routinely submit pro forma resignations to incoming Presidents. Usually an incoming President does not

accept resignations of persons who are involved in complex and long-range studies for the benefit of both the executive and legislative branches. To the best of my knowledge, all seven members of the National Water Commission, which had assembled a highly competent staff, were willing to continue this important study. Yet only two of the seven remain on the Commission. The other five have been removed by President Nixon.

The first to be replaced was Mr. Train. Under the law, he could not serve on the Commission and as Under Secretary of Interior, the position he held prior to going to the Council on Environmental Quality. Mr. Train was replaced by Howell Appling of Portland, Oreg., a farm equipment dealer and former Oregon secretary of state.

Late last year Mr. Diluzio and Mr. Wright were replaced. President Nixon appointed in their stead Roger Ernst of Phoenix, who had been Assistant Secretary of the Interior for public lands under President Eisenhower; and Josiah Wheat of Houston. Mr. Wheat had been president of the State bar and a water association. He had also headed Democrats for Nixon in Texas.

By letters dated October 30, 1970—and mailed on November 6—the President removed Mr. Baxter and Mr. Ellis. He replaced them with James Reed Ellis, a Seattle lawyer, and James E. Murphy, a Kalispell, Mont., lawyer who has long served as Montana's Republican national committeeman.

Mr. President, I am one of the many Members of Congress who worked for the establishment of the National Water Commission and has looked forward to its findings and recommendations. It is because of my concern, and that of many Members of Congress, for the Commission's task that I now raise questions about the changes which the President has made in the Commission.

President Nixon has been having trouble with Presidential commissions. His people tried to discredit the Commission on Campus Unrest—the Scranton commission—before its report was published. His appointee to the Commission on Obscenity and Pornography would not attend its meetings. Portions of the \$2 million Eisenhower Commission Report on Violence are still unpublished. Nevertheless, the President is busily appointing more commissions—more than 40 during his first 17 months in office, according to press reports.

The National Water Commission is, in my view, in a category above the commissions which the President almost casually establishes in order to do something about a bothersome or difficult problem. The National Water Commission was established by Congress. It is charged with making a report to the Congress, as well as to the President. If the President is going to, without cause, keep changing members of the Commission, after they have devoted many months of conscientious work to the job assigned them, the final product will, I fear, be more mediocre than authoritative.

Why did the President quietly, without any public notice, and just 3 days after this month's election, remove an outstanding and knowledgeable Philadelphia water commissioner—Mr. Baxter—who recently has been recognized by his professional colleagues by election to the presidency of the American Society of Civil Engineers? Why did he similarly remove Mr. Ellis, the one member of the Commission who truly represented and understood rural America?

These men brought to the Commission an understanding of water problems in other regions of the country than the West, which is overrepresented on the Commission. As Senators well know, I want representation in Government and its commissions to be by capable persons who know the Western States, one of which I am honored to represent. But this is a National Water Commission, or at least it was thus intended. Its members should have some understanding of national water problems or special expertise in the field. I regret very much that the new Commission member from Montana has neither. Political credentials alone, with whatever party, are insufficient for membership on such a Commission. President Johnson recognized that fundamental point in making the original, outstanding appointments to the Commission. I submit that the National Water Commission deserves better treatment than it has received from President Nixon.

Mr. President, I believe that Congress must bear part of the responsibility in this matter. We have been prone to delegate too much responsibility to the President, who in turn delegates responsibility to commissioners whose membership he redesigns for his own purposes or to executive agencies which turn to industry advisory groups which are more than ready to delay action and modify policy.

I believe that the next Congress should make its own studies of important issues. We should expand our own expertise, through additional expenditures for existing committees and through establishment and funding of special or select committees. I believe that through such action we will be in a better position to come to grips with problems which cannot be swept into commissions which the incumbent President remolds.

VOICE OF AMERICA HEADING FOR
POLICY SHOWDOWN

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 19, 1970

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, a matter of special interest to observers of the international scene is the vehement attack on the USIA and its Director, Frank Shakespeare, by Soviet Union propagandists. It is interesting to note that the ultra-liberal establishment in the United

States parrots the Moscow anti-Shakespeare line.

Two Washington correspondents who have made an intensive study of the propaganda battle between the free world and Communist empire are Ray McHugh, Washington Bureau chief of the Copley Press, and Dumitru Danielopol, international correspondent of the Copley Press. Mr. McHugh in his column in the San Diego Union, November 12, and Mr. Danielopol in the Aurora, Ill., Beacon News, November 12, both touch on the current status and complications facing the USIA and Director Frank Shakespeare:

[From the San Diego Union, Nov. 12, 1970]

VOICE OF AMERICA HEADING FOR POLICY
SHOWDOWN

(By Ray McHugh)

Once in awhile the struggle between differing viewpoints inside the U.S. governmental structure takes a sudden turn; the curtains fly apart and offer a fleeting glimpse of the contest.

The determined efforts of U.S. Information Agency Director Frank Shakespeare to make his organization and the Voice of America adhere to the foreign policy of the United States has provided such a moment.

Shakespeare in recent weeks has borne down heavily on tenure-protected writers, broadcasters and information specialists who are known to have been at odds with the U.S. commitment in Southeast Asia and American attitudes vis-a-vis the Soviet Union.

Working from the constitutional basis that the President is the steward or executor of U.S. foreign policy and that USIA and VOA have an obligation to state that policy clearly, Shakespeare has been outraged at what he considers deliberate attempts to embarrass the President or to over-emphasize negative aspects of American life.

Two Voice of America broadcasts have been widely cited as examples.

VOA last spring gave priority rating to a "peace" protest in Washington by a group of New York attorneys, but on the same day it virtually ignored a demonstration by more than 100,000 New York construction workers in support of the United States' Cambodia operation.

The priority system assured that the anti-war protest was carried on every VOA broadcast overseas. The pro-Cambodia story got inaccurate two-sentence mention on only one regional VOA broadcast.

During the President's recent trip to Europe, VOA one day gave prominence to predictions that an unimportant group of Irish dissidents planned to protest President Nixon's visit to that country. The same broadcast minimized the President's gala reception in Madrid, a reception rivaled only by his 1969 appearance in Bucharest.

A showdown is now developing.

Shakespeare has ordered the USIA and VOA to achieve a clear, well-balanced enunciation of American policies. He also is insisting that it alert the world to the menacing Soviet arms buildup and Soviet collusion with Egypt in emplacing missiles along the Suez Canal in flagrant violation of the Middle East cease-fire and stand-still agreement.

The pressure from the former New York television producer triggered a predictable response. The State Department complained that Shakespeare was attempting to make foreign policy. The director shrugged off the charge and pointed out that he is responsible not to the State Department, but to the President.

Now a whispering campaign has begun. At Washington receptions Shakespeare critics

frequently describe him as a "McCarthyite" or a "Fascist."

One report printed recently in a Washington newspaper claimed that Shakespeare sent Mr. Nixon a memorandum suggesting that the U.S. break off the strategic arms limitation talks in view of the Soviet performance in the Middle East and its apparent moves toward establishing a nuclear submarine base in Cuba. Shakespeare and the USIA staff denied the claim, but it persists.

The test of strength was inevitable. It has been developing for several years as American prestige declined around the world and U.S. overseas representatives joined in the debate over Vietnam, NATO, Russia, Red China, etc.

President Johnson was the subject of their ridicule before Mr. Nixon. The anti-Vietnam pose of some USIA men in embassies abroad reached scandal proportions in 1966, 1967 and 1968. Instead of answering foreign criticism, some actually encouraged it.

Shakespeare has now set out to shatter these descending attitudes. Those who hold them are fighting back with claims that Shakespeare is trying to "muzzle" his agency, trying to make it conform to his personal views. Some have called for his resignation.

"USIA is going to represent fairly the policies of the U.S. government," Shakespeare says. "That was the order I received from the President. I have no intention of resigning. I intend to carry out my orders."

[From the Aurora (Ill.) Beacon News, Nov. 12, 1970]

SOMEONE HAS SHARP AX FOR USIA'S SHAKESPEARE

(By Dumitru Danielopol)

WASHINGTON.—The long knives have been unsheathed in an effort to get Frank Shakespeare, director of the U.S. Information Agency.

Editorial attacks by large eastern liberal newspapers have been followed by a whispering campaign designed to compromise and ridicule the tough, dynamic former television producer who was picked by President Nixon to revive American prestige abroad.

Shakespeare has been accused of political gaffs; of giving directives which counter U.S. foreign policy; of having advised President Nixon to withdraw from the SALT negotiations, of urging a break in diplomatic relations with the Soviet Union, etc. etc.

The allegations have all been denied both by Shakespeare and his USIA staff. There will be more.

The clash between the "Liberals" and Shakespeare was inevitable.

There are men in the State Department, the USIA and the Voice of America who resent Shakespeare's allegiance to the President and his determined efforts to find the cause of a collapsing American image abroad.

For several years, particularly since the U.S. involvement in Southeast Asia, these men have refused to defend American positions abroad. They have been bitter critics. They have leaned backward to emphasize the bad in America rather than presenting a balanced picture.

To emphasize U.S. achievements, they said, was to engage in propaganda. To emphasize U.S. problems, they said, was to establish "credibility."

The efforts of Shakespeare and of Kenneth Giddens, director of the VOA, to improve operations have been hindered by these same men, most of them well protected by foreign service or civil service "tenure."

The new attacks on Shakespeare coincided with the second annual conference on the Heritage Groups of the Republican party.

Some 300 ethnic leaders representing 34 nationalities, a group with a total membership of 22 million, passed a unanimous resolution citing serious problems in USIA and VOA and charging that "the efforts to re-

dress the situation . . . have been negated by the opposition of members of the staff of these agencies."

The ethnics urged President Nixon to take "urgent steps to remedy the situation—by directing a thorough and massive overhaul of the operations that aim at presenting a fair image of America abroad."

They also gave a vote of confidence to Shakespeare and Giddens "for their continuous efforts to improve the operation of their agencies."

UTAH—BEST SKIING IN THE WORLD

HON. SHERMAN P. LLOYD

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 19, 1970

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, the November 1970 issue of Holiday magazine confirms what knowledgeable skiers throughout the world have known for many years, and that is that the best skiing in the world is to be found in Utah. Utah has a multitude of ski resorts, of which Alta is the best known, and is the subject of the Holiday article. It is pointed out that this Utah snow is "a light, fluffy, desert-dried powder that falls on the surrounding slopes in great abundance—up to 40 feet per year."

Alta is 30 minutes from downtown Salt Lake City, and there are many other similar skiing facilities within easy reach of Salt Lake City and, in fact, very near virtually every city and town in Utah, where our mountains provide year-round, unexcelled recreational opportunities.

Today, although the streets of Salt Lake City are snow-free there is 6 feet of snow at Alta and some of our other skiing resorts, and the sport is in full swing.

I invite my skiing colleagues, of whom there are dozens in this House, to read the message being communicated this month by Holiday magazine:

ALTA IS FOR SKIING

Tucked away at the end of Little Cottonwood Canyon high above Salt Lake City is a little-known ski resort that knowledgeable skiers have long claimed offers the best skiing in the world. Alta was one of the very first U.S. ski resorts—a primitive chair lift was fashioned out of an old mining tramway in the late 1930's. Ever since, adventurous skiers have been joyfully trekking across the 10,000-foot-high mountain passes of the Wasatch Range or skillfully catapulting off virgin high-altitude snow cornices. Alta's popularity has been limited by its relatively restricted accommodations (at present, fewer than 500 beds in five lodges) and the absence of the sort of frantic ski life that draws winter vacationers to the Alps and some of the more social Western resorts. Time was when Alta's 8,600-foot base altitude and lack of novice and intermediate slopes limited its appeal to advanced skiers. This has long since been remedied, however, and another new double chair lift, serving some of the less terrifying slopes, goes into operation this season. Even bigger things are in store for Alta. Construction is rapidly proceeding on an ambitious year-round resort called Snowbird, located a few miles down the canyon from the present ski center. The first phase of the development, scheduled for completion in time for the 1971-72 season, includes a condominium lodge and an

aerial tramway that will yield a vertical drop of 3,000 feet. There are those who view the accelerating development of the canyon as a mixed blessing. Yet it is doubtful if Snowbird, even in full swing, will dramatically change the ski scene at Alta and the type of skier who comes to enjoy it. Alta's character is formed by its snow—a light, fluffy, desert-dried powder that falls on the surrounding slopes in great abundance (up to 40 feet per year). Although Alta packs many of its trails, its chief glory is the matchless, deep-powder, off-trail skiing. Deep-powder skiing is not for novices and ski bunnies. It is for the expert and the ardent. Bluntly, Alta is for skiers. The Alta skier is youthful—in spirit if not always in years. He doesn't give a hoot for ski fashion, but looks carefully to his equipment. He skis well and on all terrain and in all weather. All this elan and expertise comes to a head in the spring when Alta plays host to the National Gelande Contest—a Wild West version of Nordic ski jumping. The walking wounded as well as many hundreds of other enthusiasts turn out to watch the best skiers from all over the West compete for cash and glory on a jump built atop an old silver-mine dump. The jumpers strive for form and distance and seek to outdo each other acrobatically in the final event of the day. The prize for the most spectacular jump was won last year by a skier from Alaska who completed a double somersault before landing perfectly on the outrun at 35 miles per hour. Yes, Alta is for skiers.

ALTA, UTAH

For the 450 lucky skiers who get to live in, this is the best skiing in North America and possibly the world. The first miracle is Alta's infinite supply of light, dry powder. Alta has intermediate and even novice runs, but what is unusual is the variety and vastness of the expert terrain: Rustler, the Baldy Chutes, Peruvian Gulch. Finally, Alta is merely a clutch of five lodges on a dead-end road, with one quasi-nightclub that sells only 3.2 beer. Yet its après-ski life is a sophisticated delight. After an infallibly fine Alta meal, everyone sits around a fireplace, mountain-dropping and adventure-swapping. Joy of this caliber is usually limited to unreachable places, but Alta is a thirty-minute cab ride from Salt Lake City's jetport. The lodges are traditional, excellent in direct proportion to price; highest and best is the Alta Lodge, where the seven-day package (Modified American Plan, including lifts and five two-hour lessons) runs from \$139 for a dormitory single up to \$461 for a luxury double.

ENDORSEMENT OF DR. SIDNEY P. MARLAND TO BE U.S. COMMISSIONER OF EDUCATION

HON. RICHARD S. SCHWEIKER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, November 19, 1970

Mr. SCHWEIKER. Mr. President, the RECORD of last Monday, November 16, contains a number of letters and telegrams which I have received from educators in Pennsylvania, endorsing Dr. Marland. I have since that time received from Dr. Mark Shedd, superintendent of the Philadelphia public schools, another letter strongly backing Dr. Marland.

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

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

THE SCHOOL DISTRICT
OF PHILADELPHIA,
BOARD OF EDUCATION,
November 10, 1970.

HON. RICHARD SCHWEIKER,
Senate of the United States,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR SCHWEIKER: As a member of the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee, may I once again urge your support of Sidney P. Marland for the position of U.S. Commissioner of Education. He is a person, I am sure, who will exercise the duties of the office without prejudice or bias concerning any interest group—public or private. I know he will provide the necessary leadership to American education—especially urban education.

Sincerely yours,

MARK SHEDD,
Superintendent.

DECLINED BUT NOT YET FALLEN?

HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 19, 1970

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, perhaps it is scant solace to those able to say "I told you so" on the basis of their prior statements, but modern-day permissiveness produces remarkable analogies to Rome before its decline and fall. In this connection a recent column by Smith Hempstone is of interest.

No society unwilling to recognize something greater than earthly materialism, unwilling to apply itself to work, reckless of basic truths and historically proven values such as thrift, respect, humility, devotion, patriotism, and responsibility, can possibly survive for long in competition with other societies whose laws and institutions insist on the preservation of these values. Our forefathers came here to establish freedom under God with liberty and justice for all. This freedom is not license to peddle filth, distribute drugs, desecrate the flag or burn draft cards. Neither is it freedom to advocate the overthrow and destruction of our society by violence in the mistaken notion that our forefathers sanctioned this by the Constitution's first amendment.

Only a society bent upon self-destruction would tolerate a judicial decision that pontificates that freedom includes the right to destroy freedom itself. This is judicial extremism and enormously harmful to the United States and all its people as witness the violence that is taking place in America at this time.

The article follows:

LOST MOORINGS IN A SOCIETY UNDER STRESS

The battle-hardened veterans return from the war to a nation fundamentally changed, to a society vastly different from that which they left. There was a sense of political uncertainty in the air; the stench of moral corruption, almost as perceptible as the noxious odors emanating from the slow-flowing river, hung over the capital.

The flight from the countryside, begun long before they took up arms, had been completed. The family farm was a thing from the past; only the vast (and hence more viable) estates survived. Great masses of unskilled men, unable to find jobs and their small

savings eaten by inflation, crowded into the rotting inner-cities to swell the welfare rolls and make the streets unsafe for honest people. The alienated muttered of revolution.

The old virtues of thrift and probity were publicly flaunted by members of the upper and middle classes, who sought to outdo one another in extravagance and ostentation, in private sexual depravity and in public speculation. The family, once the staunchest of institutions, had been weakened by the collapse of paternal authority. Women threw off the old restraints, disdaining chastity and taking to the streets to demand equal status with men.

Religion, the traditional backbone of the state, had become an empty formality to which most men paid no more than lip-service. To fill the vacuum created by their own disbelief, many of the young joined oriental cults whose emotional rituals and drug-induced mysticism were an affront to those who still clung to the old faith.

There had been great changes, too, in the ideals, method and content of education. The old philosophy that one of the primary purposes of schooling was to inculcate in the young patriotism, morals, respect for the law and a reverence for national traditions had pretty well gone by the board. In its place, the intellectuals espoused a new permissiveness.

In the political arena, the two major parties battled viciously for supremacy. One continued in the minds of most people to be associated with the preservation of economic and social privilege.

The other, led frequently by wealthy liberals convinced of the necessity for reform, was plagued by a lack of unity as leaders ambitious for personal power vied with each other in their demagogic appeals to the restless masses. As a concomitant of partisan strife, both parties cynically disregarded the Constitution and public morality fell to a new low as scandal after scandal rocked the capital and the country.

Political violence became a feature of the times, with large-scale demonstrations in the cities and rival gangs of extremists battling each other in the streets.

Meanwhile, the nation's enemies abroad continued their military buildup. But the new wars were not to be fought by citizen-soldier conscripts, rather by an all-volunteer army, the creation of which was to have a profound effect on the future of the Republic.

The inadequacies of institutions designed by the founders for the governance of a small, uncomplicated state became apparent and led to pressure for electoral reform. A new criminal code was enacted in an attempt to deal with the growing lawlessness. But politicians continued to play upon the social issue for partisan advantage, rather than seeking an equitable and lasting solution to it.

The increasingly frequent assassinations of public figures and the continued use of violence as a political tool led to a concentration of power at the center and a diminution of the liberties of all citizens.

Military defeat in Asia had an unsettling political effect at home. In the end, all the maneuvering proved in vain. The burden of defense spending coupled with a vast public works program was more than the debased currency could bear. The spectacles of sadism and violence to which the public had become inured had aroused passions always only thinly papered over.

The venality and corruption of an establishment which had given itself over to licentiousness and sensual gratification offered neither example nor leadership to a people who had forgotten both God and patriotism. Although the creaking institutions of government no longer were capable of responding to the demands placed upon them, the senators prattled on.

Finally, on the night of Jan. 10, 49 B.C., Julius Caesar splashed across the Rubicon with his legions at his back, an act which was to lead to the destruction of the Roman republic. But all that was in another time and, of course, has nothing to do with us and our country.

WITHDRAWING FROM THE FAR EAST

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 19, 1970

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, in a recent review George Melloan covers two new books on Japan. The first by Herman Kahn of the Hudson Institute and the second by Robert Guillain, a reporter for *Le Monde*. In analyzing these two books, Mr. Melloan points out the divergence of the two authors on the direction that the Japanese will take in their future international political posture.

The reviewer points out that this divergence of analysis comes from the same data base and reflects the current inability of Western political analyst to understand political motivations in the Far East.

This review has merit and should be of interest to readers of this RECORD:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Nov. 18, 1970]

WITHDRAWING FROM THE FAR EAST

(By George Melloan)

Because of the intense public focus on the beginnings of a United States disengagement in Vietnam, a more general withdrawal from the Far East has received less attention.

Okinawa is to be returned to Japan in 1972. American bases in Japan are beginning to go back to Japan. The U.S. military strength in South Korea is being reduced.

So what happens next in this theater where American bases in Japan are beginning to go back to Japan. The U.S. military strength in South Korea is being reduced.

So what happens next in this theater where Americans have endured three wars and much pain, cost and confusion since Pearl Harbor? Is there in fact a historic transition taking place? If American influence wanes, what—or who—will replace it?

Red China comes to mind quickly. But the real answer could rest with that American protege and economic prodigy, Japan. The time may well be approaching when Japan, out of necessity and natural inclination, will begin to reassert itself as a political and military force.

With a sense of national purpose perhaps unmatched in history, the Japanese have built an economic engine that now ranks as the world's third most productive, behind the U.S. and the Soviet Union. They still are building full tilt. They could afford a much larger military force and nuclear weapons. They could discard the protection, and restraint, of the American nuclear umbrella.

But do they dare make the break, with all the risks and responsibilities it would entail?

There is no easy answer to this important question. Since Hiroshima, no Japanese leader has found it politic to advocate nuclear armament. The lingering trauma of the only nation ever to have suffered a nuclear attack is not easily dispelled. But as the U.S. reduces its Far Eastern forces, Japan already has begun to rebuild its conventional military capabilities. Who is to say that it

might not at some future time decide that its security demands that it enter the nuclear club?

For readers who want to draw their own conclusions, two new books offer provocative theories on this subject as well as a more general view of Japan and its possible future role in the world. The theories do not always agree, but that makes them no less interesting.

One book is by the American "futurologist" Herman Kahn. It is called "The Emerging Japanese Superstate, Challenge, and Response" (Prentice-Hall, 274 pages, \$7.95). The other is "The Japanese Challenge, The Race to the Year 2000" (Lippincott, 352 pages, \$8.50.) by Robert Guillian, a Frenchman who is, Tokyo correspondent for the respected Paris daily, *Le Monde*.

Mr. Kahn admits to some uncertainties but nevertheless predicts that Japan will be acquiring nuclear weapons within five to 10 years and exercising ever increasing political power. Mr. Guillian, on the other hand, foresees an indefinite reliance by Japan on its close political and economic relationship with the U.S. and a continuing rejection of nuclear arms.

Of the two authors, Mr. Kahn carries the more impressive credentials in the prophetic visions department. He directs the Hudson Institute, which has become somewhat renowned for its "scenarios" that attempt to forecast the long-range future course of individual nations and the world. In this work, Mr. Kahn says, "We have increasingly found ourselves interested in and even focusing on Japan as in many ways a key nation. . . ." The institute will continue its rather intensive study of Japan.

Mr. Kahn bases his predictions largely on his assumption that the Japanese will not be content to accept indefinitely the status of economic giant and political pygmy. He feels that questions of hierarchy are deeply important to Japanese at all levels. Japan's defeat in World War II caused it to voluntarily accord itself a "proper place" well below the Western powers, but its economic achievements since the war will just as certainly set it in search of a higher place, Mr. Kahn believes.

"This moral issue among the Japanese is going to come up again when, if current conjectures on the Japanese growth rate are proven correct, the Japanese attain 'super' status as an economic, technological and financial power and have the capability of becoming a superpolitical and supermilitary power," Mr. Kahn says. The essence of the "challenge" in his book title, he says, refers less to the Japanese challenge as an economic, technological and financial superstate than to the political and military consequences of that challenge. "Japan's decisions on this issue will be a challenge to the Japanese themselves, to the Americans, the Europeans, the Soviets, the Chinese and especially to those nations . . . occupying non-Communist Pacific Asia," he declares.

As Japan attempts to deal with these problems of national purposes, Mr. Kahn believes there will be conflicting pressures within Japan itself. "On the one hand, there will be some desire for Japan to become an integral part of a Western Pacific grouping or of the developed world generally," he says. "On the other, there will be inevitable pressure toward an 'Asia for the Asians.' In either case there will be pressure for attaining full status and acceptance of Japan as a superpower."

Mr. Guillian takes an almost exactly contrary view to all this. "Japan," he declares, "has hardly any interest in being the third great power in the sense that the first and second understand such words, and what is more, it knows that the facts forbid any such state of affairs." He argues that for Japan to have a "100 percent Japanese" foreign policy,

it would have to get rid of its still very close ties with the U.S., which buys some 30% of Japanese exports, supplies Japan with many of its patents and gives it military protection.

"To infer that these bonds negate greatness is, as far as the Japanese are concerned, an assumption based on an obsolete conception of what a great power can and should be in the worlds of today and tomorrow," Mr. Guillian says. "Throughout the rest of this century and the century to come, we shall live to an ever increasing extent in a world whose key word is interdependence—a world in which interdependence will become more widespread and essential, forcing us to reconsider and perhaps discard the old notion of national independence."

Instead of developing its own nuclear power, Mr. Guillian feels Japan will continue its close link with the U.S., but more on the basis of equal partnership than in the past. He feels it will further seek to insure its security by seeking guarantees from the Soviet Union and, eventually, Red China.

How could Mr. Kahn and Mr. Guillian, both of whom are excellent analysts and self-professed admirers of the Japanese and Japanese culture, come up with such totally different views of Japan's political future? Part of the answer lies in the normal difficulties of crystal gazing and in the still riskier business of political crystal gazing. But a larger part of the difficulty may lie in something that both authors and many past students of Japan agree upon. Japan is a land of paradoxes. Mr. Kahn quotes another author, Ruth Benedict, as saying that "the Japanese have been described in the most fantastic series of 'but also's' ever used for any nation of the world." For example, they are supposed to be "unprecedentedly polite" but also "insolent and overbearing."

* * * * *

These seeming paradoxes, which lead Mr. Kahn and Mr. Guillian from similar observations to entirely separate conclusions, help to explain why the U.S. has suffered so many difficulties in the Orient. Despite the countless books that have gone before these latest two, there has always been very little real Western understanding of the way Japanese, Chinese and, of course, Vietnamese, think.

Perhaps the greatest contribution Mr. Kahn and Mr. Guillian make in their books is not in terms of estimates of the future, although these are most interesting, but in shedding further light on the Japanese. Both, for example, dwell at some length on the cultural kinship between the Japanese and the Chinese. Mr. Guillian feels that Japan, like China, is not merely interested in economic progress but in creating a "new man."

In a striking parallel, Mr. Kahn believes that there is and will be a "moral" competition from China that will influence a wealthier Japan. He observes that in the traditional Japanese culture, the "austere, dedicated, cultured and faithful Samurai warrior is at the top of society, even though he is relatively poor, and the mercantile class, while relatively rich, is at the bottom of the social ladder." This concept, he feels, makes Japan susceptible to the new "morality" fostered by Mao Tse-tung and his cultural revolution.

Another point on which both authors largely agree is that despite the pervasive American presence in the Far East since World War II, Japan has not been "Americanized" in anything other than a highly superficial sense. The same might just as easily be said of China, despite its long experience with American missionaries and military men before Mao. It might also be said of Vietnam.

It is a cliché, but the "East is East" line of Kipling always comes to mind when reading such books. Could it be that after Pearl Harbor, Korea and Vietnam, that line still is the key to the future in the Far East?

BANDWAGON TO OBLIVION

HON. JOHN G. SCHMITZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 19, 1970

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, George Washington said in 1776:

Our cruel and unrelenting enemy leaves us only the choice of a brave resistance, or the most abject submission. We have, therefore, to resolve to conquer or to die.

The protracted global conflict thunders around us. The concentric attack on the Western World by the Communist bloc is pressing home rapidly through the intermediate strata of Asia, Africa, and Latin America. The change expected when the present administration took over from the badly faltering Democrats has not materialized. Significant enemy advances have been made in Ceylon, Libya, Sudan, Somalia, Chile, and Bolivia.

We cry for peace. We ask to negotiate. We plead for a breathing space. We continue to disarm.

The Soviets redouble their efforts. They recognize the attitude of wishful thinking and vacillation on the part of their main enemy. They sense that the compromisers have managed to become a dominant influence in the new administration. They are again dealing with the equivocal men. They know from long experience what to do.

The old Soviet foreign policy has taken on increasing sophistication and new dimensions due to the confusion in the minds confronting them. In the past it was necessary to alternate periods of attack with periods of consolidation and simulated good will. The Soviets used to operate on the principle that if they stopped kicking us for a while we would be grateful. They thought that if they were to transfer the dagger from the right hand to the left hand we would seize the temporarily outstretched right hand out of feelings of cowardly relief. They were right.

Now the shift is no longer necessary. The Soviets have found that they can continue the blows in Indochina, Latin America, and Africa while at the same time reaping all the advantages of Western good will. The spirit of détente has been institutionalized, in the middle of the global war. It is now an unquestioned "new reality" with the State Department, an article of faith. To refrain from any activity which might upset the Soviets has become the mainstay of U.S. foreign policy.

Working against Western governments obsessed with what has become the officially certified delusion, the Soviets are dividing the Western World as they conquer the intermediate strata. The recent agreements between West Germany and the Soviet Union and Canada and Red China are the logical outcome of our current foreign policy position. The advanced non-Communist nations are being separated. If events are clearly analyzed it can be seen that the Sino-Soviet split has, in fact, split the West. Without our

acquiescence this would not be happening.

Appropriately signed on the anniversary of the building of the Berlin Wall, the West German-Soviet Treaty strips the western part of Germany of any right to assist the Germans living under Soviet domination, ratifies Soviet post-World War II gains in Europe through violation of other agreements, and opens up West German technology to Soviet exploitation. The State Department expressed its satisfaction and acknowledged that it had been consulted before the treaty was signed. In return for all this the Soviets agree not to attack West Germany. Everybody concerned seems to have conveniently forgotten the Soviet blitzkrieg into Czechoslovakia less than 2 years ago in violation of multitudinous nonaggression pacts.

Canada's recognition of the dictatorship of Stalin's protege in China follows close on the heels of several changes of 20-year-old U.S. policies. The State Department announced last December that henceforth American products could be shipped to Red China with approval of the Office of Export Control, and in August of this year it was announced that free world vessels bound for Communist China could use American fueling facilities for nonstrategic cargoes.

If we seem to be the trendsetter, it is because we are. As the most powerful non-Communist nation of the world accommodates itself more and more in every sphere to the desires of the world Communist movement, most of the rest of the non-Communist world follows right along. As they follow us, we, in turn, observe them and announce further moves along the same line, citing our allies' moves a rationale. It is a vicious circular bandwagon effect. Let no one doubt, however, that we are leading the band.

Fortunately, some of the smaller non-Communist nations have refused to follow the hordes galloping down the low road of history. Chiang Kai-shek spoke out in the spirit that led our own Nation to freedom, echoing George Washington's decisiveness and principle:

Fellow countrymen, in this period of worldwide uncertainty and confusion, many people are stooping to seek monetary security by cloaking their cowardice under the pretense of love of peace. Degeneracy and confusion are to be seen in all four cardinal points of the compass. Only we retain both our stability and our spirit. All those around us are at a loss.

Would that our leaders spoke in the same manner—for only the strongest nation in the free world can keep the world free.

RELATIONSHIP OF THE SUPPLEMENTAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM TO THE NEGOTIATED SETTLEMENT OF CONFLICTS

HON. GERALD R. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, November 19, 1970

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, no lesson of history stands clearer than that which cautions against the tempting

of aggressors. Such temptations are enflamed when threatened nations negotiate from positions of deteriorating strength. Should weakness go unremedied because U.S. commitments went unfulfilled, aggressors may well conclude that protracted conflict will result in a certain and decisive victory.

As a period of negotiation hopefully takes form, thanks largely to our efforts in the Middle East and Southeast Asia, the United States must exercise care that the agreements arrived at are not solely agreements reflecting narrow interests. If we have a true and honorable commitment to an ally, if we are pledged to remain at his side until the accomplishment of our mutual aims, then it is unreasonable for us to expect him to negotiate at our side from a position of weakness, to negotiate when the balance of power has been allowed to deteriorate in favor of the aggressor. Hence there is a critical and reasonable requirement within the context of limited U.S. commitments, to provide the assistance needed to enhance the economic and political stability of our friends and allies.

In the Middle East, moderate Arab States need self-assurance—as does Israel—that the assumption of a moderate negotiating position at the peace talks will not in itself trigger radical forces from within or without which might seize their government or threaten their very existence. U.S. assistance is intended to build the type of stability, self-assurance and self-sufficiency on which a realistic negotiating stance can be based.

In Southeast Asia, the United States must stand ready to support those nations who are willing to put U.S. assistance to good use in the preservation of their independence. In its absence genuine and fruitful negotiations are not possible.

It is clear, whether speaking of Southeast Asia, Korea or the Middle East that the pursuit of a negotiated settlement of major conflicts by threatened nations is difficult at best. But it is also true that it is in our best interest to pursue such settlements.

The array of supplemental assistance now planned by the United States to countries which have clearly indicated a will and an ability to defend themselves is a critical though admittedly costly link in this basic chain of U.S. foreign policy objectives.

The failure of the United States to respond in a timely fashion and on a continuing basis, to the needs of such countries would not only discourage the negotiated settlement of conflicts, it would also tend to encourage the repeated probing of U.S. resolve at all imagined points of weakness.

THOMAS JEFFERSON'S PRAYER

HON. JOHN M. ZWACH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, November 19, 1970

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, once again, we approach Thanksgiving Day. Rather than the day of prayer and thankfulness

which marked the origin of this day, in too many instances it is devoted solely to family gatherings and feasting and its original purpose is forgotten.

To help us remember the true significance of this holiday, I would like to insert in the RECORD a prayer attributed to Thomas Jefferson and urge its wide use in our churches and homes on Thanksgiving Day.

The prayer follows:

THOMAS JEFFERSON'S PRAYER

Almighty God, Who has given us this good land for our heritage: we humbly beseech Thee that we may always prove ourselves a people mindful of Thy favor and glad to do Thy will. Bless our land with honorable industry, sound learning, and pure manners.

Save us from violence, discord, and confusion, from pride and arrogance, and from every evil way. Defend our liberties, and fashion into one united people the multitude brought hither out of many kindreds and tongues.

Endow with the spirit of wisdom those to whom in Thy name we entrust the authority of government, that there may be justice and peace at home, and that through obedience to Thy law, we may show forth Thy praise among the nations of the earth.

In time of prosperity, fill our hearts with thankfulness, and in the day of trouble, suffer not our trust in Thee to fall; all of which we ask through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

WEST POINT CADET COMMENDED

Hon. G. V. (SONNY) MONTGOMERY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 19, 1970

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, in a recent issue of my hometown newspaper, the Meridian Star, there was an article concerning the excellent record of Cadet Alton Latimer while attending field training at Fort Hood, Tex., this summer. I am quite proud of Cadet Latimer for two reasons: He is from my hometown of Meridian and I had the privilege to appoint him to the U.S. Military Academy. I would like to share with my colleagues the article on Cadet Latimer.

The article follows:

WEST POINT CADET LATIMER COMMENDED

Cadet Alton Latimer, son of Mr. and Mrs. A. P. Latimer of 3731 19th Street has received a letter of commendation from the commanding general of the Second Armored Division, Fort Hood, Texas, for his outstanding leadership abilities while attending field training at Ft. Hood.

Cadet Latimer, a member of the Corps of Cadets at the United States Military Academy, West Point, New York, is an appointee of Congressman G. V. (Sonny) Montgomery. Latimer's parents and Montgomery's Meridian office recently received the news of the special letter of commendation.

"SUPERIOR MANNER"

Cadet Latimer, while attached for training to the Sixth Squadron, First Cavalry, Second Armored division as Platoon leader, Third Platoon, A Troop, was given complete responsibility for the training and welfare of the troopers of the Third Platoon as well as responsibility for maintenance of ten complex combat vehicles. He performed his duty "in such a superior manner" as to warrant the commendation.

The letter of commendation reads:

"Cadet Latimer demonstrated his initiative, and leadership in his first assigned duty, which was responsibility for preparing his platoon for a motor pool inspection conducted by the Assistant Division Commander, 2nd Armored Division. I consider that Mr. Latimer's platoon was the best prepared platoon in the Squadron on the morning of the inspection. This firmly attests to the outstanding qualities of this young cadet.

"Subsequent to the Motor Pool Inspection, this Squadron was tasked to provide a full TO&E Cavalry Platoon to the US Army Combat Developments Command in support of a documentary film. Mr. Latimer was given complete responsibility for this mission to include preparation movement and conduct of tactical maneuvers. Mr. Latimer performed in a superb manner. Mr. Latimer was highly complimented by all who were involved in filming. His actions represent a tour de force of qualities which far exceed that normally expected of someone with his experience.

He demonstrated an extraordinarily sound group of the most difficult tactical maneuvers. He accomplished this through intensive study of field manuals at night.

CITES LEADERSHIP

"Mr. Latimer's leadership, bearing, ability, and drive are equaled by only a very few of the commissioned officers I have known. In his training with this Squadron he has earned the admiration and respect of his superiors and subordinates alike. He materially contributed to the ability of this Squadron to perform its mission. His devotion to duty, military bearing and initiative reflects great credit upon himself, the Corps of Cadets, and the United States Army. I am very proud and pleased to have had Cadet Latimer in my command."

STOCK EXCHANGE

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 19, 1970

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I herewith offer a very interesting and telling letter I have received from my friend, Morris A. Schapiro, head of the bank securities firm of M. A. Schapiro & Co., Inc., New York City. He writes:

NOVEMBER 18, 1970.

MY DEAR FRIEND: I believe in insurance for investors just as we have insurance for deposits with savings institutions through the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation. However, before Congress passes a bill involving such insurance protection, it should insist that the New York Stock Exchange enact long overdue reforms concerning its operations.

Among these reforms I would recommend the following:

A. Broker-dealers should be prohibited from using customers' money or securities in the conduct of their business. Any securities firm whose capital is exposed to risk should be required to segregate all monies and securities belonging to customers.

At the beginning of 1970 New York Stock Exchange member firms held about \$3 billion of customers' free balances, funds withdrawable on demand. These free credit balances are used by member firms to "maintain positions in securities, to finance margin purchases of other customers, and for other general purposes." (See the report of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency on S. 2348, page 2, September 21, 1970.) The total of cash and securities held in the custody of brokers for the accounts of customers is approximately \$50 billion. These

assets, in many cases, can be reached by creditors of brokerage firms where adequate segregation practices have not been followed.

B. A securities firm to be eligible for insurance must meet high standards which should be established by Congress for membership in the proposed Securities Investor Protection Corporation.

To qualify for membership in the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, a bank must first be examined and found to be in sound condition. Then it must abide by strict governmental regulations.

C. The directors of the proposed Securities Investor Protection Corporation should represent the investing public, not the securities industry.

Railroad officials do not serve on the Interstate Commerce Commission, nor are public utility officials found on Public Service Commissions.

Sincerely,

MORRIS A. SCHAPIRO.

I personally am in thorough accord with the aforesaid.

WISE WORDS LOST IN PARTISANSHIP

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 19, 1970

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Walter Trohan, bureau chief emeritus of the Chicago Tribune, is recognized as a truly objective observer of the Washington scene. In his very penetrating column Wednesday, November 18, he very calmly analyzes the September 16 address by President Nixon to students at Kansas State University.

Mr. Trohan's column follows:

[From the Chicago Tribune, Nov. 18, 1970]

WISE WORDS LOST IN PARTISANSHIP

(By Walter Trohan)

WASHINGTON, November 17.—Now that the election is two weeks in the past, it is proper for Americans to ponder the wise, pertinent and understanding address made by President Nixon to the students of Kansas State University in the heat of the campaign. His words, unfortunately, had become fogged by partisanship so that much of the message was lost for many.

Political campaigns are not the best roads to truth. The outs trumpet attacks and downgrade performance. The ins point with pride to claimed advances and gloss over shortcomings.

Naturally the opposition gave no credit to Mr. Nixon for his accomplishments, especially the slowing of casualties in Viet Nam and the continuance of his program to bring the troops home. However, if the President had suffered a crushing defeat instead of standing off his foes, the so-called liberals would have blamed the war in Viet Nam.

The time has come to brush aside the opposition charges of "campaign oratory" and consider what Mr. Nixon said to students, which applies to all others as well. Here are a few excerpts worthy of consideration:

"There are those who protest that if the verdict of democracy goes against them, democracy itself is at fault, the system is at fault; who say that if they don't get their way, the answer is to burn a bus and bomb a building.

"There are those who say that this is the worst of times in which to live. What self-pitying nonsense that is.

"Those decencies, those self-restraints, those patterns of mutual respect for the

rights and feelings of one another, the willingness to listen to somebody else without trying to shout him down, those patterns of mutual respect for the rights and the feelings of one another—these are what we must preserve if freedom itself is to be preserved.

"We can maintain a free society only if we recognize that in a free society no one can win all the time, no one can have his way all the time and no one is right all the time.

"It is a time for the responsible university and college administrators, faculty and student leaders to stand up and be counted, because we must remember only they can save higher education in America. It cannot be saved by the government."

Mr. Nixon observed that our environment has been damaged by carelessness and abuse of technology, but added: "... That same technology gives us the ability to clean up that environment, to restore the clean air, the clean water, the open spaces that are our rightful heritage.

"We see that, because of our wealth, because of our freedom, because of this much maligned system of ours, that we can go on to develop those great qualities of the spirit that only decades ago were still buried by the weight of drudgery and in 75 per cent of the world today still buried by the weight of drudgery."

Mr. Nixon did not end on a note of pessimism, but promised that we "shall conduct ourselves in a way that we will be looked back on as the beginning of the brightest chapter ever in the unfolding of the American dream."

The recent campaign was partisan, as all campaigns are, but it was by no means the roughest in history or even the roughest in recent times.

One only has to recall Harry Truman's diatribes against the 80th Congress, especially the charge that "Republicans stuck a pitchfork into the back of the farmers" in order to realize this.

But once the campaign is over, there should be no time for recrimination but a period of study, and the Nixon address deserves it.

CHRISTOPHER COLUMBUS LANDED ON PUERTO RICO 478 YEARS AGO

HON. JORGE L. CORDOVA

RESIDENT COMMISSIONER FROM PUERTO RICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 19, 1970

Mr. CORDOVA. Mr. Speaker, November 19 marks an important anniversary in the history of your fellow citizens from Puerto Rico. Four hundred and seventy-eight years ago during his second voyage of discovery, Christopher Columbus landed on our beautiful verdant island, finding it to be "populated by peaceful and friendly natives who provided him with food and drink."

Nearly half a millennium later our island and its people after a continuing and successful transformation still retain the basic qualities which Columbus so happily observed. Our people are friendly, hospitable, and conscious of pleasing all visitors who come to our shores. I sincerely believe that if Columbus were to rediscover Puerto Rico today his opinion of our island and its people would not be any different.

And so Puerto Rico, the oldest community under the American flag, moves on in the decade of the 1970's looking forward to sustained progress in a common and indivisible bond with our fellow citizens on the mainland.

DEAD GI'S HERO WAS HIS DAD

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 17, 1970

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, during the past week the majority of U.S. deaths in South Vietnam were caused by enemy booby traps. One such soldier who was recently victimized by these insidious devices is Pfc. John R. Tamburri, Jr., a fellow New Yorker.

Although only 19 at his death, his short military career is an exemplary one. Unlike the many avoiding the draft through devious means, John chose to enlist in the interest of defending his country. Certainly, along with his parents, all Americans share a great debt of gratitude to this fine young American.

So that my colleagues may be able to read of young John's short life and his devotion to his country and his parents, I am including at this point in the Record a press clipping from the September 30, 1970, edition of the New York Post:

DEAD GI'S HERO WAS HIS DAD

He joined the Marine Corps when he was 17, fought in four major campaigns in the South Pacific, won the Bronze Star for evacuating wounded men while under heavy mortar and machine gun fire on Okinawa, and was discharged in January 1946 when he was 20 years old. He had already fought more and lived longer than his son ever would.

John R. Tamburri, Jr., joined the Army on March 12, 1970, shipped to Vietnam in August, and was killed by an exploding booby trap while on a night combat operation Sept. 17. He was 19 years old.

"My son joined because he was an American, a real American, not the kind who runs away," said John R. Tamburri, Sr. He spoke with emotion and had just returned to his Staten Island apartment from a visit to his son's grave in Moravian Cemetery, where John was buried last Saturday after a requiem mass in Our Lady Queen of Peace Church. "He figured he was going to go in anyway, so he might as well go now."

DAD'S WAR RECORD

At a time when many young men are trying to avoid military service because of the Vietnam war, young Tamburri enlisted, his mother said proudly, because he was so proud of his father's record in World War II. Tamburri rushed to his bedroom, when asked about that record, and returned quickly to the kitchen with a stuffed manilla satchel.

"That's what my son was proud of," he said and spread some of the contents on the table. They included his discharge framed in a leather case whose folding sides held a picture of him as a young Marine in dress uniform, and two of his medals, the Bronze Star and the Purple Heart. Individual envelopes held medals and campaign ribbons, and a file of official correspondence explained the citations. He was unable to find one letter that told about one of his medals, the Combat V—that's V for valor."

"My son was good about writing home, he wrote us a lot of letters," Tamburri said. He reached for them in another envelope near the table but then said no, he couldn't look at them now. "After he got over there he wrote he wasn't doing anything, just laying around. He didn't want to worry us. But he wrote to his friend what was really happening with him."

DEFECTIVE GUN

Young Tamburri wrote to his friend Joseph Abramson often, sometimes every day, about night patrols and day patrols and frequently both in the same day, and about how he was assigned to carry an M60 machine gun, which he apparently never got to use. When he turned the gun in at the end of one patrol, the combat soldier wrote to his friend, an ordnance officer told him the weapon was broken when he signed out for it. Tamburri said he felt lucky because the patrol had not met Viet Cong that night.

"He had an expert rating with a rifle," Tamburri said, proud that his son had shot well enough to win the highest possible marksmanship rating in training. "I taught him how to shoot. I started him shooting with a .22 when he was only seven. He was so small then he could hardly hold the rifle."

Tamburri said his son never "hung out"—when the boy wasn't caddying at the nearby Richmond County Country Club or working in a department store, he was fishing or hunting with his father. Tamburri is a Corrections Dept. officer and he said his son's ambition was to be a state trooper.

CLASSMATES MOURN

Among the few things to be turned up in frisking the life of a man who was barely more than a boy when he died are that he worked for a short time in the Post Office after graduating from New Dorp HS in June, 1969. Many of his former classmates attended his funeral and were in the 30 private automobiles that joined the procession to the cemetery. Their mass cards fill two shopping bags and so many friends asked the family for pictures of John that the family had only one left. The framed photograph is on the livingroom wall and shows the soldier wearing his uniform.

"When my son said he was going to enlist I talked him out of the Marines because too many Marines don't come back," said Tamburri, a husky man whose graying hair is trimmed as close as a trainee's. "I thought he stood a better chance with the Army."

Young Tamburri didn't join the Air Force or Navy because, his father said, "he wanted to see combat. I guess he was proud of my record. He was an all-American, all-around boy. One thing for sure, he wasn't one of Lindsay's heroes that burns his draft card."

After he returned from the cemetery yesterday Tamburri wrote a letter to his son's company commander asking for more information about his son's death, about his combat record, details that might somehow parallel his own history that was lived at a time when soldiers talked not about helicopters and fire bases but fronts and beachheads in a war that united, not divided, a nation.

"For a kid that was there just a month and a couple of days," Tamburri said, holding the sealed letter in the palm of his hand, "I guess my son was doing plenty."

MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN—
HOW LONG?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 19, 1970

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 1,500 American prisoners of war and their families.

How long?

CANADIAN DILEMMA UNDER
TRUDEAU

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 19, 1970

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, on October 16, Messrs. Trudeau of Canada, and his party in power, invoked wartime measures and suspended constitutional government, reducing Canada to the extraordinary state of martial law.

Over 30 days have now lapsed, yet the Canadian people continue to be denied liberty under a military government. The wartime measures include censorship and control of all news and reporting. Yet, the communications media of the world has proven itself most understanding, patient, and tolerant toward Messrs. Trudeau and his situation in Canada.

Imagine the reaction had such extraordinary suppression occurred under the parties in power in Greece, South Africa, Portugal, Rhodesia, Free China, or even in South Vietnam. We never would have gotten it off the front page.

The American people must start seeking answers to questions. Canada is not on the other side of the world. Why are some things newsworthy while conversely other similar incidents receive little or no coverage?

In Canada, constitutionally secured rights and privileges of the Canadian citizens are still suspended. This includes to our neighbor the Canadian, free speech, free press, and his right to know what is going on in his country, and why.

I include a story of mine which appeared in the North Baton Rouge Journal on October 29, 1970:

[From the North Baton Rouge (La.) Journal, Oct. 29, 1970]

INTERNATIONAL QUESTION MARK: CUBA TO THE
SOUTH—CANADA TO THE NORTH

(By Congressman JOHN R. RARICK)

On October 5th a Communist terrorist group, the FLQ (Quebec Liberation Front), kidnapped the British diplomat, James Cross. On October 10th, representatives of the same movement highjacked the Canadian official, Pierre Laporte, who has since been brutally murdered.

The FLQ has been frequently identified as a Chinese Communist revolutionary group determined to overthrow the Canadian government and establish a People's Republic of Canada. The kidnapped ransom demands included the release of convicted criminals and their safe passage to Cuba or Algeria—both Communist dictatorships.

On October 16th, Canadian Prime Minister Trudeau suspended the government and invoked war time measures—Martial Law because of the terrorists threat to the people of Canada.

Yet despite the recognition of the Communist threat, Trudeau and his government in power on October 13th extended diplomatic recognition to the government of Red China and has given indication of supporting the Red Chinese admission to the United Nations.

Strange behavior by the leaders of Canada when one recalls that Trudeau is the left-wing extremist who was apprehended in a

canoe enroute to visit Castro in Cuba, and his other mysterious background. Someone is playing games with the Canadian people and their attention is being diverted by a skillful maneuver in sensitivity training.

In the meantime, the silence from our interpretive news commentators is appalling. The news reports no longer identify the activist Quebec Liberation Front as a Chinese Communist movement—perhaps in fear of embarrassing Canada's new ally, Red China.

Nor does the communications media remind the public that Red China was condemned by the United Nations in 1951 as an aggressor nation for its armed intervention in Korea.

Nor that after 19 years there is no armistice or peace settlement in Korea today, but at most an uneasy cease-fire where American fighting men under the United Nations flag continue to be made casualties whenever the Korean allies of Red China desire to re-escalate a propaganda crisis.

Perhaps the reason for this blackout is that it came during the announced festivities of the 25th anniversary of that world peace organ, the United Nations Organization. No one wants to offend its image by reminding the world that the Chinese Communists are still at war with the United Nations.

Trudeau has exploited the realities of the situation magnificently. The shock troops of the FLQ are safely in jail protected from the Canadian people and Trudeau's ideological friends of Red China have been extended diplomatic recognition without any backlash.

To the contrary, Trudeau has been able to use the incident to catapult his popularity among the average Canadian as a strong advocate of law and order. Even those Canadians who don't relish the idea of having their civil liberties suspended go along under the assurances that it is a temporary measure and, after all, it has restored peace.

Trudeau has thus gained for his left of center establishment all of his international aspirations plus the endorsement of popular support from his people.

And we of the United States now have Castro and the Soviet fleet on the south—Trudeau on the north—our fighting men in South Vietnam, and our attention directed to the Middle East.

Where next? Bonn? London? Or here in the United States?

TIMOTHY BLECK: THE LOSS OF A FRIEND AND AN OUTSTANDING REPORTER

HON. WILLIAM (BILL) CLAY
OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 19, 1970

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, with great emotions, I mourn the sudden death of Timothy Bleck, a dear friend and outstanding young correspondent who had worked as a member of the Washington Press Corps for the past 2 years.

We are never prepared to believe or to accept the loss of one so young, one whose life and whose career inspired such hope. Tim Bleck had brought distinction to himself and to his profession in just 30 years. But I cannot refrain from saying that he was destined to give so much more. He had received but a mere fraction of the acclaim due him when he succumbed to illness November 14.

As great as his loss is to journalism,

CXVI—2409—Part 28

mostly I grieve the greater loss which has befallen his beautiful family, his lovely wife, Janet, and their three young children. None of us can help to absorb the force of this blow to his loved ones, but may they know that the impact of this tragedy is felt by all who knew Tim.

I speak for my own family, for my staff, and for many other mutual friends in expressing deep sadness. And we pray that his loved ones may find comfort—carrying forth the inspiration and ideals which Tim shared with all of us.

Timothy Bleck, a native of Hunterdon County, N.J., came to St. Louis in 1966 to join the staff of the St. Louis Post Dispatch. His journalistic prowess and ability were established even then. His coverage of the civil rights march from Selma to Montgomery in 1965 for the Dayton, Ohio, Journal Herald brought him recognition and the Ohio Associated Press award. In 1967 he was again noted for his coverage of the St. Louis ghetto and for his reporting of the Detroit riot.

I came to know Tim well, when I launched my campaign for Congress in 1968. He demonstrated integrity and honesty—but more than that, he sought not just facts but to understand what made them so. Tim was sensitive to the human condition, to justice, and to truth. He was driven by a commendable and rare determination to communicate that understanding to the public. He displayed the curiosity, creativity, and insight characteristic of the great journalists. And he never gave in to the cynicism which can afflict all who seek to know the truth.

Tim's move from St. Louis to the Nation's Capital coincided with my own. Our working relationship and our friendship continued as did Tim's success in his career.

We will always remember Tim Bleck—and hopefully, we will recall not just that his life and his career were tragically brief, but that both were brilliant and full.

I pay personal tribute today, not because he is gone—but because he was so very much with us when he was here. I will deeply miss him.

POPULATION, FAMILY PLANNING, AND HEALTH: INVOLVEMENT OF A MAJOR INDUSTRIAL CORPORATION

HON. GEORGE BUSH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 19, 1970

Mr. BUSH. Mr. Speaker, the overwhelming support of the Congress for the Family Planning Services and Population Research Act of 1970, S. 2108, was very gratifying to those of us who have put a great deal of effort into creating the awareness of the Congress and the public for the need of this legislation.

The Republican Task Force on Earth Resources and Population, of which I am chairman, takes a great deal of pride in developing this awareness over the past

2 years. In our two task force reports, "Federal Government Family Planning Programs—Domestic and International" and "Earth Resources and Population—Problems and Directions," we stressed the need for the involvement of both the private and commercial sectors of our society in solving the problems of delivering family planning services and developing public awareness for the need to slow our population growth rate. We realized that the Federal Government could provide leadership in this field but recognized that only with an increased interest and effort on the part of the private and commercial sectors of our society would these problems receive the attention they deserve and need.

Therefore, I was delighted to see a report by Westinghouse Learning Corp. presented at the International Conference on Population Priorities and Options for Commerce and Industry 1970-2000 at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill on October 21, 1970.

For the benefit of all my colleagues I am inserting this report in the RECORD: POPULATION, FAMILY PLANNING, AND HEALTH: INVOLVEMENT OF A MAJOR INDUSTRIAL CORPORATION

INTRODUCTION

The press of problems associated with population growth is becoming more and more apparent with every passing day. In spite of its material affluence, the United States is running out of fresh air and drinking water, not to mention parking places for its superabundance of cars. Its people need better housing, education, and health care at prices they can afford to pay. These and other problems including food production, transportation, and even employment are likely to become even more serious as our population continues to expand.

Fortunately businesses have become increasingly aware of the magnitude of many of these problems and are beginning to invest their resources and talents in a variety of approaches to their solution. A primary reason, of course, is that the business sector expects much of its growth in the years ahead to come, not only from a continuing expansion of existing markets, but from the development of new markets stemming from human needs which business has not previously served, except in a peripheral way. Building materials, construction equipment, and contracting services, for example, will be needed to rehabilitate blighted neighborhoods. New individualized learning systems like Project Plan, modular multi-media instructional materials, and comprehensive textbooks and services to the classroom teacher, as well as to school administrators, will be required for the expansion and improvement of our schools. Managerial skills and administrative expertise will have to be provided to develop and operate effective service delivery systems whether they be for transportation, communication, or health care.

This is not to suggest that the profit motive is the exclusive or even the paramount concern of businessmen. Most able executives are motivated by a strong sense of public responsibility just as much as they are by concern about an adequate return on their stockholders' investment.

Westinghouse Electric Corporation, for example, is convinced that its future depends on how well it meets the economic, social, and needs of people. To this end, Westinghouse and other companies like it have launched programs in such areas as urban planning and development, pollution control, transportation, housing, health care, education and training, and even crime pre-

vention and the administration of justice. In most cases they have proven that they can assemble the resources needed to do a job rapidly, generally without the bureaucratic inertia which hampers government agencies, and at a lower total cost to the taxpayer.

The problem of population, however, is a much thornier subject and, as Robert S. McNamara once described it, one which "it would be very much more convenient to leave alone."¹ Neither government nor the rest of the nonbusiness sector reached any kind of agreement on the nature of the problem, let alone the kinds of solutions that should be sought. In the absence of such a consensus, the lack of any significant business involvement is not surprising. Undoubtedly a great deal of public concern about the population problem is reflected in the increased interest in and support for family planning. As recently as eleven years ago, President Eisenhower was able to state categorically that family planning did not fall within the province of government. By the mid-1960's, however, the official government position had changed to one of token support for family planning programs within the United States. Now the situation is such that support for family planning is necessary and millions of tax dollars are specifically earmarked for family planning activities. Family planning has been officially designated as a high-priority domestic program; a "National Center for Family Planning" has been established as a separate office within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and some state and local health departments are moving to set up programs designed to meet the family planning needs of the communities they serve.

A recognized impetus behind these major shifts in policy, of course, has been a widespread popular recognition of the relationship between population growth and many of the other problems which beset our society. Even more significant has been the increasing concern of society for the health and well being of its members and the recognition that the unwanted and unplanned growth of families can be detrimental to maternal and child health, to the emotional health of the family, and to its stability as a social and economic unit.

Widespread popular support coupled with federal funding and a shortage of skilled and experienced personnel within government fostered involvement by the business sector. Among the first to respond was Westinghouse Learning Corporation (WLC), a wholly-owned subsidiary of Westinghouse Electric Corporation, established in 1967 to bring together the resources and expertise needed to expand an already sizable corporate effort in education and training.

This early involvement was possible since WLC found among its full-time staff skills ranging from systems engineering and physical sciences through the humanities, education, anthropology, behavioral and social psychology, economics, linguistics, and political science, as well as business administration and public health. In addition, WLC found it could employ the services of specialists in other fields from the nation's leading universities and research centers to consult, administer, and instruct as needed in specific programs and special projects.

Although the primary emphasis of most of its earlier activities had been in formalized education and training, WLC found that bringing together the best available human resources within a carefully designed and managed administrative framework could provide instructive technical assistance in family planning, a field in which both technical assistance capabilities and expertise in education and training were in short supply.

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE ACTIVITIES IN SUPPORT OF FAMILY PLANNING PROGRAMS

At the present time, WLC provides technical assistance and special services to family planning programs administered or supported by two federal agencies, the Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO) and the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD).

In OEO programs, there is frequently a need for highly competent consultants in such areas of expertise as the medical aspects of family planning, operational analysis, program development and implementation, administrative management and record retention, education and training, community organization, fiscal control and financial management. Specialists in each of these areas, most of them university-based, are made available upon request to local family planning agencies on an as-needed basis.

To insure the ready availability of consultants who can respond quickly and effectively to requests, WLC has maintained a contractual relationship with six universities: The University of Pittsburgh, Marquette School of Medicine, the University of North Carolina Population Center, the University of Nebraska, the Medical College of Georgia, and the University of Missouri.

These institutions deliver such technical assistance as may be needed in their immediate geographical areas. WLC oversees the delivery of technical assistance and provides these services directly to areas outside the geographical jurisdiction of the university resource centers.

A simplified management information and control system enables WLC's headquarters staff to keep track of operations in the field from their offices in Bladensburg, Maryland. Local requests for assistance are routed through the appropriate OEO Regional Office to the nearest specialists resource institution.

Upon receipt of such a request, it is reviewed first by the institutional coordinator and then by a family planning program analyst. As the principal link between the resource institution and a local program, the program analyst is well versed in the various aspects of program operations, has considerable knowledge of how OEO programs are organized and supported, is sensitive to the role of the consultant in the delivery of health services to the poor, is able to quickly and accurately assess and define problems related to family planning projects, and can explain and recommend matters of varying technical complexity. After studying the request, and in most cases after telephoning the local program for additional information, the program analyst delivers the necessary technical assistance personally or refers the request to a selected specialist. In situations requiring additional or special assistance, the analyst provides the necessary continuity and follow up through his report, as well as by briefing other specialists assigned to the project. Upon delivery of technical assistance, both the resource institution and the recipient prepare reports describing the nature and the efficiency of the assistance provided. In this way WLC is able to monitor the responsiveness of this nationwide system, which in ten months delivered over eleven hundred man-days of technical assistance by 135 specialists in forty-two states.

In addition to coordinating the delivery of technical assistance to local community action programs and delegate agencies, WLC headquarters staff also performs special services for OEO-supported family planning projects. These include the development of training programs for OEO project personnel in the mechanics of a new family planning patient data information system and the collection of data needed by OEO headquarters staff for nationwide project develop-

ment and program expansion. Tasks recently completed include a review of the literature dealing with the incidence and impact of abortion among poor women, a study of the extent and nature of organized opposition to subsidized family planning services, and a survey of the education and training needs of OEO-supported family planning projects. Further research related to the family planning needs of teenagers, migrants, American Indians and the rural poor is contemplated.

While continuing to provide services to ongoing family planning programs supported by OEO, WLC also will provide technical assistance to selected HUD "Model Cities" having an interest in developing family planning programs. Most Model Cities' staffs have a rather limited experience with what is required to make family planning services available to those who need them most. Because they lack the specialized knowledge to plan, organize, and deliver these services, the necessity for technical assistance is likely to be as great as with the OEO projects.

The contractual relationship with HUD calls for WLC to provide three kinds of special services; namely, direct, indirect, and ad hoc technical assistance. Direct technical assistance encompasses the provision of special expertise required for the initial planning and development of viable family planning programs. In each of the 15 to 20 cities selected to receive such assistance, WLC will help local Model Cities' staffs, involved health professionals, and other interested persons to document the existence of a need for family planning services in selected target neighborhoods and to identify potential resources that can be utilized for the delivery of such services. Once a demand for services and the available delivery resources have been established, a plan for translating processes into effective action programs will be developed.

WLC will supply the technical expertise needed to move Model Cities' family planning projects from the planning stage to development and implementation. This will entail securing the cooperation of various national, state, and local organizations and providing such assistance as may be required to develop the program during the initial stages of implementation.

In the area of indirect technical assistance, WLC is expected to generalize the best ways and means of establishing effective family planning programs on the basis of its own and other people's experience in program planning, development, and implementation. The purpose, of course, is to develop a compendium of reports and materials designed to benefit other agencies not directly involved in this particular activity.

Finally, WLC is also expected to provide ad hoc technical assistance on a short-term basis to other Model Cities, if and when the need arises. It is expected that WLC will be able to provide much of this assistance using the network of consultants that has been set up to serve OEO family planning programs.

As of this date, there are few results to report. Because the program has just recently been funded, progress has been limited to staff development and assisting in the selection of cities to receive direct technical assistance.

FAMILY PLANNING AS A STEP TOWARD BETTER HEALTH CARE

At the present stage of its development, WLC views its technical assistance activities in the family planning field as a stepping stone to greater involvement in the nation's health care. As long ago as 1968 when WLC drafted its first business development plan for the nation's health industry, family planning was recognized as having certain characteristics which led to its choice over others as a place from which to begin.

¹ Address of Robert S. McNamara to the Board of Governors, World Bank, Washington, D.C., September 30, 1968.

First of all, public awareness of family planning is a relatively new phenomenon. Most publicly supported activities have been in operation for less than five years. Its newness makes it susceptible to innovative approaches not currently possible in more traditional areas of the health care system.

Secondly, substantial amounts of money have been earmarked for family planning, especially for the poor, primarily because government has recognized that the poor tend to have more children than they can afford to support with a decent standard of living. Widespread interest plus the influx of money, coupled with the overall newness of the concept, have all contributed to the development of service programs which have proven to be singularly responsive to the needs and desires of their beneficiaries. As a relative newcomer to the public health field, and one which deals with relatively sensitive issues, family planning has also been forced to continually re-evaluate its posture in the face of skepticism, if not outright criticism, from certain factions of society.

The possibility of expanding concepts developed from family planning program activity is quite apparent. As a natural base for the entire maternal and child health structure, family planning programs have already shown strength in encouraging comprehensive health programming. Through greater emphasis on outreach, community education, closer coordination between health and human service agencies, and the recognition of the importance of consumer input into decision-making processes, family planning programs are making significant contributions to the development of a framework upon which can be built a truly comprehensive health care system. As a model, family planning is as close as any existing health program to meeting the health needs of people.

At the same time, family planning shares many of the same problems which hamper the delivery of more effective services in the whole health care field. Among the most important of these, and the ones in which WLC is most interested, are the problems of manpower development and patient education. Like most other areas of health care, family planning is in dire need of innovative approaches to education and training for its professional, technical, and auxiliary personnel, as well as patient education and information programs.

Much of the knowledge, experience, and capability needed in family planning, in the whole health care field for that matter, is close at hand. WLC, for example, recently established a Health Services Division within the Instructional Services and Training Systems Group to bring its resources and experience to bear on the related problems of health personnel development and patient education. The new division has completed a systems analysis of the education and training requirements of military hospitals and a survey of the instructional needs of general hospitals.

The military hospitals study was part of a comprehensive systems analysis leading to the design and development of a "New Generation of Military Hospitals" recently conducted for the Department of Defense by Westinghouse. The results of the WLC study included a design for a cost effective, media-based insurance system for the prototype hospital scheduled for construction in 1973. The general hospital survey provided WLC with detailed information on the basis of which multi-media training packages for hospital and nursing home personnel can be prepared.

Other developmental activities in the health field include: the design of a semi self-instructional training program for ambulance attendants, plans for a variety of instructional services and programs for extended care institution personnel ranging

from management training for administrators and supervisory personnel through skills training and job-related basic education for other staff members. WLC involvement in the design, development, production and validation of self-instructional learning materials for patients and their families in the USA and overseas is also projected.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

In conclusion, the totality of need in the field of health care is only beginning to be identified. Obviously, solutions to many problems which have only recently become apparent have yet to be developed. The role of industry has by no means been clearly established. Some successes have been noted but there have also been more than a few failures. Other private sector activities are too new to evaluate. If the success of American businesses is due primarily to their capacity to create and develop efficient organizations rapidly, to recruit, train, and employ capable people, and to use competition to get results quickly, effectively, and at a price people are willing and able to pay, a great deal can and will be accomplished. More activities like those of WLC in the family planning and health fields could signal the beginning of a new and beneficial interplay between the social concern of government, the technical expertise of universities, the managerial know-how of big business, and the practical knowledge and skills of the deliverers of health services.

THE SUPPLEMENTARY FOREIGN ASSISTANCE BILL

HON. GERALD R. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 19, 1970

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, the Nixon administration is following a policy of carefully balancing U.S. support with local initiatives. Under that policy, the United States assumes a supporting rather than a leading role, in the security of those areas with which we are intensely concerned. The policy is to shift the primary defense responsibility to the states which are threatened by aggression, and to concentrate our assistance on those nations which have shown the inclination and ability to help themselves.

Certainly Israel, Korea, and Cambodia fit this description. Israel has shown repeatedly its determination to preserve its independence, even its very existence, against considerable odds. The \$500 million in credits for Israel will help her to present an effective military deterrent, preserve a military balance which is an essential prerequisite to any Mideastern settlement.

Korea has also shown its stoutheartedness in the face of aggression. But its military must depend too heavily on obsolete equipment—some of World War II vintage—while its adversary to the North has been supplied with more modern armaments. The modernization of South Korean arms can no longer be safely delayed.

We all are familiar with Cambodia's current struggle against an invading foreign army. It has appealed for help, and has already received help, from Aus-

tralia, Japan, Korea and other countries. If Cambodia is to preserve its independence and neutrality, this aid from the United States is critical. The Cambodians have demonstrated their unity of purpose, love of independence, and willingness to fight. It is in the U.S. interest to support them.

In a rapidly changing and increasingly complex international environment, a lower American profile and greater diplomatic flexibility have become primary goals. But our commitments remain. Those foreign policy goals must be achieved without abandoning our commitments. The supplementary foreign assistance bill provides the means to do this. In place of a physical presence by Americans, this appropriation provides the wherewithal for our friends and allies to preserve the stability we have worked so long to attain. This bill is worthy of our early and favorable attention.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE MISS FRANCES BATES MCKUSICK

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 19, 1970

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues, in concert with a multitude of persons in Washington, but especially those on Capitol Hill, I received the news of the untimely passing of Miss Frances Bates McKusick with distress.

The unexpected death of a friend can indeed be distracting for some prolonged time. But with some others, Frances McKusick endorsed the line of Thomas Moore that, "memory is the only friend that grief can call its own."

I knew Miss McKusick for more than 30 years from almost daily contact during legislative months and ceremonial occasions which mark our sessions. Initially, she won my respect for the enthusiasm and competence she brought to her work. Soon after, she won my trust for her adherence to the best ethical traditions of the journalist.

Capitol Hill and Washington is thronged with outstanding personalities now and always has been. So it was something of a triumph, which she did not court, nor even realize, that Frances McKusick was among the widely known and admired Washington personalities of many years. She had all the attributes of an ace reporter, plus the genuine concern and tolerance of people which must be part of the mental equipment of a good legislator. But Miss McKusick also had that "something extra."

When the word came that Frances McKusick wanted to speak with me in the Speaker's Lobby, it had to be some tense or critical occasion that kept me in the Speaker's Chair, to delay answering her call. Usually, I hastened to the Lobby for what could be called selfish reasons. Frances McKusick had the firm conviction that tomorrow would always be better. With her cheerful outlook, her wit, her ability to nick the pompous,

pretentious, and the follies of even the wisest among us, recounted without malice or mean spirit, were a tonic to drooping spirits. There are scores of other men and women in the Congress who have said exactly that since her passing. We mourn the going of one lady with a wonderful outlook on life.

She leaves a charming, engaging memory for thousands. Mrs. McCORMACK and I extend our condolences to her mother, Mrs. Marshall McKusick of Vermillion, S. Dak.

TRADE BILL

HON. JAMES R. MANN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 19, 1970

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, the House of Representatives is on the eve of voting on the very important Mills bill on trade. The passage of H.R. 18970 is vital to the economy of South Carolina and especially to the district which I represent.

During the recent congressional recess two of the outstanding daily newspapers in my district addressed themselves to the problems faced by our domestic textile industry. I would like to commend the following editorials from the Spartanburg, S.C., Journal and the Greenville, S.C., News to all Members for their close attention:

[From the Spartanburg (S.C.) Journal,
Oct. 30, 1970]

LAW AND NEGOTIATIONS NECESSARY ON TEXTILES

The problem of textile imports, which are damaging the mills of this section, is not an easy one to solve. Any final, long-time and effective solution is probably going to involve both legislation and negotiation.

This is so because a ceiling on total imports needs to be established and then, because so many different countries are now making and shipping textiles and ready-made garments into this country, quotas will have to be set up or negotiated for each.

Most Americans think in terms of textiles and cloth equivalent garments coming into this country from Japan. But there are many other areas which are making and shipping either cloth or clothing into the United States market.

There is a parallel for the problem in other fields—sugar, oil etc. Imports in these areas have to be allocated among a number of different producing countries.

In the case of textiles, woods and synthetics there is now legislation pending in the House to set a reasonably limited ceiling on the imports that can be brought into the American market. Congressman Wilbur Mills, chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee and author of the measure, predicts that it will be passed in the first week Congress is back in session after the election recess. Senators who favor the measure feel that quick action can be secured in that body by attaching the imports measure to some other vital piece of legislation about to pass—possibly the Social Security increase.

Textile interests have never asked for a ban on foreign imports. They have only asked that a ceiling, based on a reasonable level of imports before the flood-tide of the past several years, be established and that this be increased each year on a percentage basis

of the total increase in the nation's use of textile products.

Japanese officials, after rejecting any thought of considering negotiating textile quotas last year, have recently indicated to U.S. officials that they are ready to discuss the problem. This is a reminder that once before some years back when the Congress was about to pass textile import legislation, Japan—then the chief exporter—rushed in at the last minute and negotiated a limited reduction for a limited period. One of the chief problems in earlier talks with the Japanese was that Japan wanted a one-year limit on quotas.

There probably is no lasting solution other than that applied to sugar: A positive ceiling on the amount that can be brought in—probably established by law—and then the allocation to present exporters their proportionate share of that ceiling.

President Nixon definitely promised the textile industry relief. He has worked on negotiated relief for two years without getting positive results. This is probably due to the fact that negotiations alone have been tried, not negotiations tied to and backed up by law.

[From the Greenville (S.C.) News]

MR. NIXON SHOULD BE OVERRULED

With the mid-term elections behind him, President Nixon has dropped his shrug-of-the-shoulders support of a bill to establish textile import quotas, and is again voicing optimism that a satisfactory voluntary agreement can be reached with Japan. The Japanese must find the situation very amusing.

The President's position is difficult to understand in light of the fact that very little really has changed since U.S.-Japan talks on a voluntary agreement collapsed last summer. If anything, the Japanese determination to prevent any kind of reasonable settlement appears to have hardened.

The Japanese are continuing to insist on terms that would provide virtually no relief to the stricken American textile industry. Demands by Japan that imports not be restricted to current levels and that the Japanese be allowed to switch any established quotas to different categories of goods are completely unrealistic. They also are indicative of the attitude Japan has taken during all negotiation attempts.

Mr. Nixon obviously is backing water again on his 1968 campaign promise to provide relief for this country's textile industry, plagued by the unrestrictive flow of foreign imports. But the thousands of textile workers who have lost their jobs because of the faltering industry aren't interested in the President's political nightmares.

The textile industry thought the matter was at least on the way to settlement when the Nixon administration dropped opposition to a quota bill (on textiles and shoes) by Rep. Wilbur Mills after the last talks failed. Now, however, that opposition has been revived in stronger language than ever, including broad hints of a possible presidential veto if it gets through Congress.

The responsibility now appears to be clearly on Congress. The Mills bill apparently is going to have to make the hard run to passage without any help—and, indeed, interference—from the White House. The bill is of vital importance for many reasons, some of which have nothing directly to do with textiles.

The proposed measure, as this newspaper has pointed out repeatedly, does not prevent voluntary agreements on imports, rather it would provide the potential muscle to force such agreements into being. Even if some sort of agreement is reached with Japan, the bill should be passed as plain old-fashioned insurance.

Threatened retaliation by other nations notwithstanding, the rest of the world needs

to be plainly told that the United States is going to protect its home industries from unfair competition from foreign markets. The Mills bill, basically, proposes just this—a fair trade exchange.

The bill is poised and ready for action as Congress reconvenes. It should be enacted—with or without the President's support—in the nation's best interest.

PRIDE PROGRAM AWARDS AT "BIG SHOP"

HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 19, 1970

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, during the recent recess I had the pleasure and privilege of witnessing an award ceremony which convinced me American steelworkers still retain the spirit of pride which made this Nation the greatest industrial power in the world.

The occasion took place at the "big shop," the No. 1 machine shop at Homestead Works of United States Steel Corp., which is located in Homestead, Pa., part of my 20th Congressional District. It was the presentation of awards to the outstanding "proud craftsman" and "proud foreman" employed in the shop. The winners of these awards are chosen by representatives of labor and management. The awards are given each quarter to those who best represent the shop's PRIDE program—personal responsibility in daily effort.

Candidates for the award are judged on achievement, punctuality, performance, cooperation, personal appearance, safety, ingenuity, ability, congeniality, and reliability.

The PRIDE program is the brainchild of Stephen Simko, who heads the "big shop" operation. It started in January of this year and already has won the enthusiastic support of both labor and management officials. Not only has the program boosted the morale of men employed in the "big shop" by recognizing their efforts and dedication, but it has improved significantly a safety record that had been considered good for machine shop operations. An official of the plant informed me that:

Safety always has been top priority in the mill and the PRIDE program has been a factor in helping reduce the number of accidents even further.

I had the pleasure of presenting the PRIDE award for the "Proud Craftsman" to John Reutzell of Pittsburgh, Pa., a machinist in the "big shop." Mr. Reutzell has been employed by United States Steel for 31 years and is active in civic and church work. He is a veteran of World War II, married, and the father of one son.

The "Proud Foreman" award was presented to Elwood Loreski of Smithton, Pa., by F. R. Smith, superintendent of the Homestead Works. Mr. Loreski has been an employee of United States Steel since 1941.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to congratulate Mr. Reutzell and Mr. Loreski upon their selection as PRIDE winners. But I also

would like to commend Mr. Simko for his efforts in successfully implementing a program of this type, and commend employees and officials of Homestead Works for their participation. I believe Mr. Simko best described the effect of the PRIDE program when he said:

Now a man not only comes to work to make money but he can receive something money cannot buy—respect and sincere recognition for a job well done.

Mr. Speaker, this is the kind of spirit that exemplified the American steelworker of the past. It is gratifying to know the spirit has not been lost in today's highly competitive struggle for international industrial leadership.

HONORED GUESTS IN THE GALLERY

HON. HENRY C. SCHADEBERG

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 19, 1970

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank Mr. Theodore Haaser, Associate Director, Office of Administrative Management in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for advising me of the presence of guests from the International Seminar on Health Services Research and Development at today's session.

It has been my privilege to extend guest passes into the gallery to allow the following persons to observe firsthand the activities of the U.S. House of Representatives:

Dr. J. H. F. Brotherston, Chief Medical Officer in the Scottish Home and Health Department from Edinburgh, Scotland.

Sir George Godberg, Chief Medical Officer from the Department of Health and Social Security in London, England.

Dr. Sakari Haro, Director of the Department of Planning of the National Board of Health in Helsinki, Finland.

Dr. S. Ake Lindgren, Deputy Chief Medical Officer, Head of Planning Department, the Swedish Board of Health and Welfare from Stockholm, Sweden.

Dr. Stanley Martin, Chairman and General Manager, Ontario Hospital Services Commission in Ontario, Canada.

Mr. Gordon McLachland, Secretary, Nuffield Provincial Hospitals Trust in London, England.

Dr. Leo Noro, Director General of the National Board of Health in Helsinki, Finland.

These distinguished persons are guests of the Secretary of HEW, the Honorable Elliot Richardson and the Under Secretary, the Honorable John G. Veneman and the Assistant Secretary for Health and Scientific Affairs, Dr. Rober Egeberg and other officials at the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

The International Seminar has been a 3-day affair from November 18 to 20, 1970, at the HEW building here in Washington, D.C.

The seminar has been a working seminar taking up such topics as "Methods for Distribution of Health Services," "Continuity and Quality of Services," and

"Planning and Management of Resources and Services."

It is my hope that the results of the seminar will be rewarding to mankind and make possible further evidence of the concern and cooperation by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare here in the United States and related agencies throughout the world.

COMMUNITY ACTION PROJECT IN BALTIMORE GREAT SUCCESS

HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 19, 1970

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, last month it was my privilege and pleasure to attend the opening of a Citgo Oil service station in my district. That may not sound very exciting, but, believe me, it was a most unusual occasion.

The Citgo station is located in the Cherry Hill development of Baltimore, a predominately Negro area. Mr. Thomas C. Spann, district sales manager of the Cities Service Oil Co., conceived the idea of putting to use for the benefit of the area, the Citgo station which had been closed since 1968.

A statement issued at the time of the opening, giving the details on the story, follows:

CAA'S NEW THRUST INTO ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT MEETS WITH INITIAL SUCCESS

On Thursday October 29, the Community Action Agency's Program for Economic Development was given a substantial boost by the Cities Service Oil Company. That day, the Cherry Hill Citgo Oil Service Station had its formal grand opening. This project is a joint effort of the Cherry Hill Community Council, Inc., affiliated with the Community Action Agency, and the Cities Service Oil Company.

The Citgo Service Station in Cherry Hill had been inoperative since 1968. To reactivate it, Citgo bore the cost of remodeling, provided paid training for operating personnel, and sponsored the initial promotion. Currently the station employs five young men from Cherry Hill, all of whom were formerly out of work. In addition, Citgo is leasing the property to the CHCC, Inc. for just \$1.00 a year. The Cherry Hill Community Council, through an OEO grant developed by CAA, invested in the tools and supplies needed to operate a modern service facility.

Those officiating at the formal ribbon cutting ceremony on Opening Day were: Congressman Edward A. Garmatz; W. Donald Schaefer, President of the City Council; Clarence W. Blount, Chairman of the Community Action Commission; State Senator Harry W. McGuirk; Warren D. Toburen, Regional Manager of the Cities Service Oil Company and Lenwood M. Ivey, Executive Director of the Community Action Agency.

In its ten days of operation, the station grossed \$2,897.21 in sales! More than an uplift for Cherry Hill, this successful effort can be the beginning of a major breakthrough in Community Economic Development. For, it represents the practical application of resources, limited but sufficient, to enable those without capital to go into business for themselves. Federal and Local Government Officials, Citgo Management, and the CAA Administration are in hopes that the news of this promising venture will encour-

age others to get involved in similar endeavors.

Mr. Speaker, while this was of tremendous importance only to this neighborhood, I am mentioning it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD because I hope all Members will read about it and if the opportunity presents itself, encourage similar action in their own areas.

The Cities Service Oil Co., Mr. Spann, and the Community Action Agency, deserve great credit for their initiative in this regard and I hope many groups will follow their example.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROBLEMS

HON. RICHARD D. McCARTHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 19, 1970

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, of all the environmental problems that confront us in the seventies, one that requires immediate action is the growing threat of ocean dumping. President Nixon has already addressed himself to this problem and the rest of us should follow suit.

Assistant editor, Stan Miller, of the Environmental Science and Technology magazine gives us an excellent insight into this problem and I ask unanimous consent that it be reprinted for all of us to share:

OCEAN DUMPING POSES GROWING THREAT

UNTIL U.S. MOVES TO CURB DISPOSAL OF WASTES AT SEA, IT'S LIKELY TO BECOME AN EVEN MORE POPULAR PRACTICE

The fact that 48 million tons of wastes were disposed of in the oceans around the U.S. in 1968 is as alarming as the fact that \$29 million was spent for such disposals. What is more shocking to many people is that such disposal practices have increased fourfold over the past 20 years and may increase substantially in the future. At present, the U.S. does not have an effective mechanism to curb, yet alone prevent, ocean disposal practices, and unless uniform procedures regulating ocean disposal are established, U.S.'s troubles will mount.

Oceans, like other vital resources, are limited in their capacity to survive abuse. Like commonly used solutions to other pollution problems, ocean disposal merely transfers the waste problem elsewhere. Recycling of materials is now a national goal. But until recycling becomes a reality, large urban coastal cities will continue to look to the sea for disposal of their wastes.

The extent of ocean disposal in 1968 is documented for the first time in the recent report, "An Appraisal of Oceanic Disposal of Barge-Delivered Liquid and Solid Wastes from U.S. Coastal Cities." Prepared by the Dillingham Environmental Co. (La Jolla, Calif.), under contract with the Bureau of Solid Waste Management (bswm), the report is based on questionnaire and interview data obtained from records of District Offices of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. Dillingham personnel, David D. Smith and Robert P. Brown, conducted the inventory with bswm's deputy director of research and development, Charles G. Gunnerson, as project officer. At press time, the report was being published by the Government Printing Office.

INVENTORY

The Dillingham report identifies 126 ocean disposal sites—42 in the Pacific, 51 in the

Atlantic, and 33 in the Gulf of Mexico—that 20 coastal cities used in 1968. Further, seven major categories of waste are delineated. Not surprisingly, harbor dredgings ranked first in both tonnage and cost (\$8 million tons and \$15.5 million, respectively). But industrial wastes ranked second (4.7 million tons discharged at a cost of \$8 million), and municipal sewage sludge third (4.5 million tons at a cost of \$4.4 million).

Then, in the order of decreasing tonnage, Dillingham ranks refuse and garbage, construction and demolition debris, military explosives and chemical wastes, and a miscellaneous category. However, the report does not include the amount of waste discharged that reaches all oceans through sewer and sewer sludge outfalls.

For three categories of wastes—dredge spoils, industrial wastes, and explosives—the number of disposal sites is about equal on the three coasts. Although prior to 1967, the Atomic Energy Commission disposed limited quantities of radioactive wastes in the sea, these wastes are now disposed on land. The majority of radioactive disposal sites were in the Atlantic. However, sewage sludge sites are limited to the Atlantic, and refuse (garbage) disposal in small amounts is limited to the Pacific. In general, the industrial and municipal waste disposal areas are located at distances from 15 to 100 miles offshore, the exact distance depending on the type of waste and the established regulatory procedure.

The average unit cost for disposal of the different types of wastes ranged from a low of \$0.40 per ton for dredged spoils to a high of \$24 per ton for containerized industrial wastes. But a figure to \$600 per ton was recorded for the disposal of some miscellaneous wastes off the Pacific Coast.

Industrial wastes, the second largest category with respect to both tonnage and expenditure of disposal funds, are made up as follows (in thousands of tons):

Waste acids.....	2700
Refinery wastes.....	560
Pesticide wastes.....	330
Paper mill wastes.....	140
Others	<1

Although most industrial wastes originate from coastal cities, increasing amounts are being barged from interior areas of the nation. The Dillingham report warns that such practices are likely to increase.

The severity of the disposal practice is particularly true on the East Coast. For example, exclusive of dredged spoils and explosives, the discharge of industrial wastes and sewage sludges in the Atlantic is five times greater than similar operations in the Pacific and the Gulf combined. Further, industrial wastes and sewage sludges are cited in the report as the largest factor contributing to the 27.5% increase in tonnage over two five-year periods (1959-63 compared with 1964-68). In 1968, industrial wastes totaled 4.7 million tons, nearly doubling the 1959 disposal figure. Similarly, sludge disposal in 1968 was approximately 4.5 million tons, up from 2.8 million in 1959.

EFFECTS

Little is known about the immediate effects of ocean disposal, let alone the cumulative effect of years of disposal practices. Some studies are underway to determine the short-term effects of industrial waste disposal as well as long-term effects of municipal sewage sludge disposal practices. But if we wait until adverse effects can be demonstrated, it may be too late to curb the existing disposal practices, particularly with respect to the growing segment involving industrial and sewage sludge disposal.

Two recent studies point out the need for stopping sewage sludge disposal in the New York Bight area. The studies were called

to the attention of the U.S. Senate Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution last March. Instituted by the Corps of Engineers, the first study is being conducted by the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife Laboratories at Sandy Hook (N.J.), and the second by the Marine Sciences Research Center of the State University of New York at Stony Brook. Final reports are due next year.

Sen. Harrison A. Williams (D-N.J.) told the Subcommittee that the disposal of sewage sludge was harmful to the health and welfare of New York and New Jersey residents. "It is causing a significant pollution problem. It is adversely affecting the aquatic life of the New York Bight area," Williams added.

At the hearings, Sen. Gaylord Nelson (D-Wis.) summed up the sad state of affairs with: "The Corps of Engineers confirmed that no one really knows how many people are dumping what kind of waste into the oceans. The Corps has no tally now for permits that it has issued for the first three miles of offshore ocean waters, the state's territorial sea. Further, the Corps has never rescinded a discharge permit for an offshore disposal permit, even when the polluter had clearly violated it."

REMEDIES

At present, there is neither legal provision for controlling disposal nor properly enforced methods beyond the three-mile limit. Beyond the outer limits of a coastal nation's territorial sea (12-mile limit), international law dictates that the high seas shall remain free for the use of all nations.

What is needed is specific legislation to prevent pollution of the seas from the discharge of waste beyond the three-mile limit (up to which the U.S. now exerts its authority).

Proposals that have been introduced into the legislative hopper include S. 3484, the Marine Environment and Pollution Control Act, and S. 3488, the National Marine Waters Pollution Control and Quality Enhancement Act of 1970. The purpose of these bills, amending the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, is to establish a broad new environmental management program for the long-range protection of a portion of the ocean environment under the jurisdiction of the federal government.

Introduced by Sen. Nelson, S. 3484 would ban all dumping of solid wastes into our coastal waters, including the Great Lakes, by June 30, 1975. The only type of disposal permanently exempted from the proposed 1975 ban would be liquid wastes which contain no suspended or other solid material, which are nontoxic, or which are treated to a level equivalent to that of the natural quality of the receiving waters.

S. 3488, introduced by Sen. Harrison A. Williams (D-N.J.), would permit discharges of wastes only beyond a 100-nautical mile limit. "There is, of course, nothing magic about 100 miles, except that it affords sufficient protection to shore areas for an interim period not now provided," Williams says.

At the Senate hearings, N.J.'s Governor William T. Cahill suggested incorporating sludge disposal facilities in the design of all new sewage treatment plants.

What is needed now is establishment by the federal government of uniform application and review procedures for marine waste disposal permits. Minimum standards for baseline surveys, monitoring procedures, and related data management systems are also needed and long overdue. Hopefully, these provisions and considerations will be included in further amendments of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act. But ocean dumping is not merely a national problem, it's an international one.

EXTENT OF U.S. OCEAN DUMPING IN 1968

[In percent]

	Cost	Tonnage
Dredging spoils.....	53	80
Bulk industrial wastes.....	27	10
Sewage sludge.....	15	9
Construction debris.....	1	1
Containerized industrials.....	1	1
Refuse and garbage.....	<1	<1
Explosives.....	<1	<1
Miscellaneous.....	<1	<1

ONE CARRIER TO MEET A CRISIS

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 19, 1970

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of the House the following well-reasoned editorial from the November 16 edition of the Florida Times Union:

ONE CARRIER TO MEET A CRISIS

The U.S. general public never realized it, but during the recent Jordanian crisis the once-mighty U.S. Navy was compelled, in effect, to send a boy to do a man's job.

For the Pentagon had no alternative, when the need arose for another aircraft carrier in the Mediterranean, but to halt in mid-course the shakedown cruise of the USS John F. Kennedy in the Caribbean and order it to immediate duty.

The training of new crewmen had not been completed; the ship could not be considered completely prepared for any eventuality, as any ship ordered to emergency duty should certainly be.

The Christian Science Monitor reported that several top naval officials privately admitted the ship was not ready. When pressed, the Pentagon formally went so far as to acknowledge that the situation "would have been improved" if the training cruise had been completed in the Caribbean.

What was really shocking, however, was the Pentagon having to make the decision: Send the Kennedy or send nothing. For our defense planners have been accustomed to thinking in terms of "15 carriers available"; accustomed to making decisions on the basis of "available options"—but this time finding no option.

It is true that, in theory, there were (and are) seven aircraft carriers assigned to the Atlantic Fleet. But in fact the five theoretically available (two were already in the Mediterranean) broke down this way: Two had been loaned to the also-short-handed Pacific Fleet, two were in shipyards for repairs—leaving only the Kennedy on its training cruise.

The Pentagon's shock was not without lasting effects, however. Deputy Defense Secretary David Packard (the budget axe-man in the Pentagon) had earlier maintained that the nation "probably" could "get by" with only 12 aircraft carriers (in direct conflict with the "15 needed" stand of Adm. Elmo Zumwalt, chief of naval operations).

But, after the interrupted training cruise of the Kennedy, Packard isn't so sure any more. The "12 carriers" has now become, in Pentagon discussions, at least 13 and perhaps 14. It could, of course, easily be the 15—simply by a reversal of the decision to consign the Shangri-La to mothballs.

What is to be hoped is that this new insight into reality, which has already taken place in the Pentagon, will likewise affect

Congress which controls the military's pursestrings.

It hardly can be true economy to let one's defense capacity drop so low that the democracies will once again appear the "easy pickings" that Hitler thought he saw in 1939 and the heirs of his political morality would like to see in the 1970's.

PACKAGING INDUSTRY FIGHTS DISPOSAL PROBLEM

HON. ROBERT O. TIERNAN

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 19, 1970

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Speaker, I was extremely pleased to read in this morning's paper of the effort being made by several industrial concerns to attack the serious problem of packaged refuse. A national center for solid waste disposal which is presently being organized would do research into methods of separating different types of waste from refuse.

As the original sponsor of the Resource Recovery Act here in the House, I am very concerned about the serious solid waste problem in this country. We are being threatened with drowning in our own wastes, and action is needed immediately.

Through the Resource Recovery Act, the Federal Government is attempting to deal with the problem. But the real effort must be made by the industries themselves, and that is why I am so pleased to hear about the national center for solid waste disposal.

I urge my colleagues to join me in support of this effort:

PACKAGING INDUSTRY FIGHTS DISPOSAL PROBLEM

(By William Chapman)

Prodded by public opinion and encouraged by the prospect of federal financial aid, several industrial concerns have combined to attack the problem of the refuse that their products' packages generate.

Bottle-makers, breweries, canneries and other companies whose packages create a major part of any community's solid waste disposal problem have put together a \$3 million budget to launch their joint effort next month.

To gain public acceptance, the companies also have agreed to permit independent and outspoken environmentalists to judge their efforts as members of a governing board.

The venture is to be known as the National Center for Solid Waste Disposal, Inc. It opened an office here recently and expects to have a staff operating by early December.

The center will give priority to research into methods of separating different types of waste from the tons of refuse municipal agents haul away each day. Hopefully, the bottles, cans, paper and other materials can be reclaimed and, in the industry's jargon, "recycled" for use again.

"We have failed in the past, in carrying out our business, to consider society's environmental needs," William F. May, president of the American Can Co., told an industry group recently.

The impetus for the new center came from the United States Brewers Association, an organization whose members are frequently

the targets of conservation groups concerned with litter. The association, according to its president, Henry B. King, has reports of more than 100 state legislative proposals to ban or strictly limit beer sales in cans and bottles.

The brewers put up \$250,000 as seed money to sponsor the center and have been joined by other trade associations and companies such as Monsanto Chemical, the American Can Co., Continental Can Co., Pepsico, and Coca-Cola.

They are motivated, said King, by a "combination of enlightened selfishness and a genuine concern for the environment. Industry recognizes the realities of life."

The present membership of the center's board of directors is composed entirely of industry leaders and is headed by Donald M. Kendall, president of Pepsico, Inc.

However, King said that when the center begins operations early in December approximately one-fourth of the board will be public, that is, members not affiliated with contributing corporations.

"They will be people known for their outspokenness and a record of concern for the environment," King explained. "Some of them have been quite critical of industry." He declined to name those members.

Interest has been spurred in the waste disposal issue since passage of the "Resource Recovery Act of 1970." The legislation was sponsored by Sen. Edmund F. Muskie (D-Maine). It authorizes \$467.7 million over three years for research and demonstration grants. The first year's authorization is for \$50 million. None has been appropriated yet.

King said the center would hope to make use of some of those federal funds for research activities as well as the money contributed by private industry. A federal official familiar with the new law said the new center, if genuinely nonprofit, might be eligible for grants.

The major problem, it is generally agreed, is to find economical ways of separating reclaimable wastes from the tons of useless refuse carted to dumps or landfills in American cities.

If aluminum cans, for example, could be separated out of other refuse at an economical cost, they could be used again after processing, thus reducing waste disposal costs.

The U.S. Bureau of Solid Waste Management already is sponsoring research into the separation problem. In one case, its contractors are experimenting with a compressed air column that would suspend materials of various weights at different heights.

is apropos of what is yet taking place in our own Nation and the wars in Southeast Asia.

Dr. Noe was especially distinguished as a poet of humorous characterizations; and this particular product of his pen, dealing as it does with simple and patriotic individuals, is destined to live long in the hearts and minds of our people. Its comedy—tragic portrayals—and its implications—I would like to share with Members of the Congress and the readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Our friend, Maurice H. Thatcher of Kentucky, formerly a Member of this body, found the poem in his files and passed it on to me. Under leave accorded, I now include it in the RECORD:

TIP SAMS OF KENTUCKY

(By Dr. J. T. C. Noe)

Tip Sams had twins
And a razor-back sow,
Five dogs and a mule,
And an old roan cow;
A bone-spavined filly
And a one-room house,
And a little wrinkled woman
Just as meek as a mouse.

Old Tip raised tobacco,
And he trafficked in skins,
For he had seven sons
In addition to the twins;
And every mother's son,
And the little mammy Jude
Smoked a pipe all day,
And the twins both chewed.

But Tip kept a-digging,
And he never lost heart,
For the dogs hunted rabbits,
And they caught a right smart;
And the bone-spavined filly
And the mule pulled a plow;
And they lived off the givings
Of the old roan cow,
And the acorn-fattened farrow
Of the razor-back sow;

But here the story closes—
Of my little romance,
For the seven sons are sleeping
On the battlefields of France;
But their daddy grows tobacco,
And trafficks still in skins,
And the little wrinkled mammy
Has another pair of twins.

TIP SAMS—A HUMOROUS GRASS-ROOTS POEM WITH TRAGIC UNDERTONES

HON. TIM LEE CARTER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 19, 1970

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, the subjoined poem was written years ago by Dr. J. T. C. Noe—known as "Cotton" Noe—and a Kentuckian—now deceased—and acclaimed poet laureate of Kentucky.

The lines treat in humorous fashion, but with sad and tragic features, the lives of a humble farm family—supposedly Kentuckians—whose lot more or less is typical of like families throughout the Nation. It especially deals with the period of World War I, but its story

THE "DELTA QUEEN"

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 19, 1970

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, this past week I received petitions containing over 4,000 signatures in support of legislation exempting the *Delta Queen* from the deep-draft safety statutes. These petitions were circulated by the Davenport Jaycees. Needless to say, they found ready support for the *Delta Queen* in Davenport and other areas along the Mississippi River which is the *Delta Queen's* highway. The following letter is the cover letter for the petition presented to me by the Jaycees:

DAVENPORT JAYCEES,
Davenport, Iowa, November 13, 1970.
Re Bill H.R. 17571 and the *Delta Queen*.
U.S. CONGRESS:

MEMBERS OF CONGRESS: Enclosed you will find in excess of 4,300 signatures in petition asking you consideration to exempt the *Delta Queen*, an overnight excursion boat from sudden death in conformance with Bill H.R. 17571 of The Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee.

We along with other Jaycee Chapters on the Mississippi River feel this is a part of our American Heritage. It seems that all are concerned with preservation of clean air, clean water, & anti-pollution. Now how about being concerned with something pertaining to all United States of America Citizens, a part of our American Heritage.

Wouldn't it be a shame if our flag were to be changed because the red color was determined hard on the eyes; if the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution was outlawed because parchment paper would not decay when used in a land-fill.

Well gentlemen, the river people feel it would be a shame if the last of the original overnight steam boats was to be outlawed by a bill meant for ocean going vessels. This boat is never more than a mile from shore or a town if a disasterous situation should arise.

Please, for our country's preservation of the American Heritage, consider exempting "The *Delta Queen*".

HARVEY MAYHILL,
Chairman,
Save the Queen Committee.

Mr. Speaker, I urge you and my other colleagues here in the House, to take advantage of the solution of this problem which our colleagues in the Senate have provided. I refer to H.R. 6114, a private bill to which the *Delta Queen* exemption has been added. The Senate has approved the bill and I urge prompt and favorable action on the bill here in the House.

JORDAN AND LEBANON

HON. GERALD R. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 19, 1970

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, a primary U.S. objective is to achieve a lasting Middle East settlement. Success depends to a considerable extent on the ability of moderate stable Arab governments to maintain the U.S.-initiated cease-fire and on moving the parties toward negotiations.

King Hussein is officially committed to a peaceful solution of the Arab-Israeli conflict on the basis of U.N. Resolution 242. But the September fighting in Jordan demonstrated a clear danger to King Hussein's government from radical fedayeen guerrillas and from radical Arab regimes.

The economy of Jordan had already been severely affected by the unsettled situation and fighting following the 1967 war. The additional burden of the recent fighting has taxed Jordan's economy beyond its capacity.

If Jordan is to continue to exert its moderate leadership, it urgently needs replacements for the ammunition expended and equipment destroyed in the

September fighting. Jordan must develop the kind of military force which can resist the threats to its continued existence. If Jordan is to do this as well as meet its obligations repayments for military purchases in past years, it must have the limited support which the President has requested.

While Lebanon's military requirements are not great, they are increasingly difficult to finance without some outside assistance, especially in view of the economic decline which has followed the events of 1967. Lebanon has exercised a moderate and restraining influence in the Middle East. It is very much in the U.S. interest to assist Lebanon in her efforts to continue in that role.

IT IS GOOD NEWS WEEKEND

HON. FRED B. ROONEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 19, 1970

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, love is a lot more than peace signs, emblems and messages in popular songs we hear on the radio. Every once in a while, amidst all the bad news we are conditioned to accept as part of our lives, it is indeed inspiring to see the quality of the human spirit in action, in service to his neighbor.

Douglas Sewell is a young man from my congressional district whose need for assistance sparked an amazing drive, sponsored by radio station WEEEX in Easton, Pa. Their goal, \$15,000, grew to over 4 times that amount in pledges and cash donations, to a grand total of over \$60,000. Doug would receive the kidney dialysis treatment he urgently needed, as would scores of other persons suffering from kidney ailments.

It is difficult, if not impossible, to give credit to particular persons who made this drive such an overwhelming success. As Donald Diehl, president and editor of the Easton Express newspaper put it:

The goal was \$15,000, and even this seemed terribly ambitious to some of us old fogies who believe that peoples' pocketbooks are controlled more by the sagging economy than by their hearts. I do not mean to wax poetic, but the entire weekend was one long emotional high, as hundreds of kids and their parents worked together around the clock in our studio.

Special thanks should be given, however, to Mr. Diehl; to the station manager of WEEEX, Tom Dugless; to the president of the kidney fund committee, Russell D. Parsons; to his vice president, Mrs. Jerry Hess, and to the Varsity E Mothers. They, and the many, many persons who gave their time and their money to the job of saving a young man's life should sleep well knowing that their efforts are the finest expressions of unselfish love man can give to his brother.

I would like to share this good news story with my colleagues by reprinting here articles which appeared in the Easton Express newspaper on October 26, 1970:

FANTASTIC RESPONSE RESULTS IN \$60,299
PLEGGED TO VARSITY E KIDNEY FUND

In a response termed fantastic, Easton-Phillipsburg area residents have given or pledged more than \$60,000 to the kidney fund appeal begun to meet the urgent need of Douglas Sewell.

A weekend radio marathon on station WEEEX netted \$60,299 in cash and pledges to the Varsity E Kidney Fund Committee.

The committee was formed to raise enough money—\$15,000—to guarantee the start of kidney dialysis treatments for Douglas Sewell, a former Easton Area High School athlete, of Bangor R.D. 3.

So great has been the public's response to the appeal made on WEEEX and through The Express that the Varsity E committee is planning to establish a community fund to help residents with kidney ailments.

The first \$15,000 raised will enable Sewell to begin dialysis treatments. The balance will become the foundation of the community kidney fund, the committee announced.

The many persons who telephoned their pledges to WEEEX were urged to send or deliver their gifts as soon as possible.

Checks should be made out to: Varsity E Kidney Fund, and mailed to WEEEX Radio, Easton, Pa. 18042.

Cash gifts should be delivered to the radio station atop College Hill.

Contributors created a traffic jam around the WEEEX studios last evening.

Forks Township police cooperated by directing traffic leaving and entering Route 115 and Sullivan Trail and provided security in the studios.

Sewell, 18, was forced to withdraw as a freshman at Kutztown State College two weeks ago because of chronic glomerular nephritis—a deadly disease without kidney dialysis.

Allentown General Hospital required a guarantee of \$15,000 before it would undertake preparations for the necessary treatment.

The fund appeal was born after this information was published last week.

The generous outpouring of gifts to the fund has just about overwhelmed young Sewell.

"I never expected anything like this," he remarked today as he thanked everyone who helped.

Russell D. Parsons of Palmer Township, head of the Varsity E committee, said the effort is going beyond the radio drive.

A collection at the Easton-Liberty football game in Bethlehem Saturday night produced \$1,400 from the spectators. A similar collection is planned at this week's Easton-Pennsylvania game.

Kutztown State students plan a benefit rock concert in Rockne Hall on campus next Sunday.

Lafayette College students announced plans for a benefit folk-rock concert in Agriculture Hall at Allentown.

A benefit jayvee football game between Easton and Phillipsburg high schools will add to the fund.

Synthesis Theater, near Fleetwood, will perform the play, "Summertime," at 7 and 9:30 p.m. Wednesday, with proceeds going to a KSC student group, Life Crew, which is raising \$15,000 for Sewell.

In addition, Parsons said, all service clubs, industries, union, fraternal and social clubs will be invited to contribute to the over-all fund.

The amount not used directly for Sewell will be used to help others in the area with similar kidney ailments, he said.

Parsons thanked everyone who has responded to the drive, on behalf of the Varsity E and Varsity Mothers.

He said initial treatments for young Sewell should begin in a week or so and the initial cost will be spread over perhaps a year.

The youth's father, Charles A. Sewell, issued a statement of thanks today. He said: "We want to thank everybody who has participated—the newspaper, WEEEX, Dave Marino, the Varsity E and Varsity Mothers, and especially Russ and Sally Parsons, who initiated this program, and all the workers who gave so generously of their time.

"I especially want to say that I think our young people have taught me some lessons. "There are many kindnesses which have been shown to us that will not be publicized and I want to thank those people as well."

DISPLAY OF LOVE: AN EDITORIAL

Citizens of the entire region, thousands within the signal range of radio station WEEEX, young and old, black and white, responded magnificently over the weekend to the marathon benefit appeal sponsored by the radio station and the Varsity E club of Easton for kidney disease victim Douglas Sewell. It was a performance that ought to evoke in the area community a deep sense of accomplishment.

When the campaign closed at midnight last night, more than \$60,000 in cash and pledges had been counted. Some \$22,000 in cash was brought to the WEEEX studios on Chestnut Hill in Easton, mostly by young people seeking to ensure that Doug will receive the expensive dialysis treatment he needs to keep his life.

The remarkable response will guarantee this and more. Young Sewell, a former Easton Area High School athlete, needs \$15,000 for the dialysis machine and other therapy which will take over the functions of his kidneys. He will have that, and the remainder will be used as a source fund for others in the area who have been and will be victimized by this renal system disease.

These are times of trouble and restlessness, and one frequently hears complaints about the "generation gap" that separates young people and their elders. There was no generation gap in the outpouring of love and concern shown by the people for Doug Sewell. This was a characteristic response to a human problem—it's the way young people are saying we ought to treat each other, with affection, warmth, love and concern. To everyone in the region who joined this effort, The Express and WEEEX express their gratitude and pride.

HUMBLY GRATEFUL

Douglas Sewell, whose need for \$15,000 for kidney dialysis treatment sparked an usually successful fund drive during the weekend, says he "never expected anything like this."

"I'm glad everybody wanted to help" said the 18-year-old former Easton Area High School athlete when he learned that the campaign on WEEEX radio had raised more than \$60,000.

The first \$15,000 is to get him started on treatments and the balance is to become the base of a kidney ailment fund for the community.

Doug, who had begun studies at Kutztown State College, says he hopes to resume studies and try to become a teacher when the current crisis in his life is overcome.

A SLOWDOWN ON POLLUTION CONTROL

HON. ROBERT O. TIERNAN

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 19, 1970

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Speaker, I was extremely disappointed to see in this morning's paper that the Nixon administra-

tion is once again attempting a slowdown in our efforts to provide for a virtually pollution-free car by 1976. This plea comes at a time when House and Senate conferees have agreed to stick to the 1976 deadline.

The provision under question is part of the omnibus air pollution bill. It would require cars produced after January 1, 1975, to emit 90 percent less pollutants than allowed for 1970 cars. A 1-year addition can be added if the industry shows it is impossible to meet the deadline. After January 1, 1976, however, any further extensions would have to be granted by the Congress through new legislation.

Some in the auto industry and the Government say that this provision could result in the cessation of all sales of new cars after January 1, 1976. This argument is ridiculous and is being used only as a fear tactic. Obviously Congress would extend the deadline if the auto industry had made a good-faith effort to meet the deadline but simply could not do it.

Unless the deadline is included in the bill, I fear that the auto industry will only drag its feet, especially with no pressure from the present administration. There is little doubt that this country has the technical know-how to build a pollution-free automobile. Certainly if we can build an entire space program culminating with a manned landing on the moon in 10 years, we can build a car free of pollutants within 5 years.

The Nixon administration also stated opposition to a statutory requirement that auto devices be guaranteed for 50,000 miles. In addition, the administration asked that a Senate provision requiring cars that are built for export to meet the same pollution standards applicable to cars sold here, be dropped.

It is time to stop playing politics with the health of the people of this country and of the world as a whole. I urge the Senate and House conferees to stand behind their original acceptance of the 1976 deadline and to oppose any and all administration attempts to weaken the bill.

PRESIDENT DIAZ ORDAZ OF MEXICO VISITS THE U.S.A.

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 19, 1970

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, during the recent visit of President Diaz Ordaz of Mexico, station XETV, channel 6 in San Diego, provided an outstanding community service and contribution to Mexican-American understanding. Live television coverage of the Mexican President's visit was beamed to the entire Republic of Mexico in Spanish and to the San Diego area in English. President Nixon wrote the vice president and general manager of XETV, my long-time friend, Julian Kaufman, commending XETV's leadership in improving our ties of friendship with our neighbor to the south, and I am pleased to share the

President's letter with my colleagues in the House:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, D.C., September 22, 1970.

Mr. JULIAN KAUFMAN,
Vice President and General Manager, XETV,
San Diego, Calif.

DEAR Mr. KAUFMAN: The coverage XETV gave to the recent visit of President Diaz Ordaz was a splendid example of the bonds of friendship and of interest which link the United States and Mexico. Your efforts contributed greatly to the spirit of goodwill which characterized the occasion.

Recognizing the complications these arrangements must have entailed, I wanted you to know that I thought the effort required well worthwhile, and I am sure that all your viewers, Mexican and American, appreciated your programs as much as I did.

With my best wishes,
Sincerely,

RICHARD NIXON.

PHILADELPHIA'S BAG YOUR TRASH WEEK

HON. WILLIAM A. BARRETT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 19, 1970

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, in recognition of the crisis which now grips many American cities in the field of solid waste disposal, the city of Philadelphia has taken steps to meet at least one aspect of this problem—the collection of trash from households. Philadelphia has initiated a citywide campaign requesting all citizens to "bag your trash" and "keep a neat street." The following action program was begun:

A proclamation was issued by the mayor of the city of Philadelphia proclaiming the following:

PROCLAMATION

Whereas . . . In recent years, there has been a deluge of paper products, tin cans, bottles and other materials which has scattered some 3½ billion tons of trash over the United States, with about a million tons annually in Philadelphia alone; and

This veritable trash explosion could completely clog the available machinery for refuse disposal without the cooperation of responsible householders who regularly contain and bundle their refuse for collection; and

Plastic bags have recently been developed for trash barrels and garbage buckets which can provide an estimable service in general sanitation and in reducing the threat of national pollution: Now, therefore:

I, James H. J. Tate, Mayor of the City of Philadelphia, do hereby proclaim the period of November 8-14, 1970 as BAG YOUR TRASH WEEK in Philadelphia, and urge wise citizen usage of plastic trash bags to contain all household wastes.

The press conference and luncheon at which the proclamation was read was sponsored by the Philadelphia More Beautiful Committee and the department of streets to call attention to the need for plastic trashcan liners to aid the city's pickup efforts and to assist in keeping a cleaner Philadelphia. The luncheon was hosted by Mr. David Berger, former city solicitor for Philadelphia, and chairman of the citizens committee of "Bag Your

Trash Week." Attending the luncheon were Mayor James H. J. Tate; Mr. Leo Goldstein, streets commissioner, and Mrs. Goldstein; Mrs. Walter A. Craig, chairman of the Philadelphia More Beautiful Committee and Mr. Emmanuel Galeone, executive director; Tom Woodeshick, fullback of the Philadelphia Eagles, and the "voice" for "bag your trash" special projects. Also in attendance were block captains of the Philadelphia More Beautiful Committee, sanitation department representatives, Scout leaders, special guests, and members of the press.

A statement was released to all newspapers, radio, and television in the Greater Philadelphia area which read as follows:

In an effort to seek greater public participation in environmental control, Mayor James H. J. Tate today (Thursday, November 5) proclaimed November 8-14 as Bag Your Trash Week.

In issuing the proclamation, Mayor Tate noted that "control of refuse is becoming a monumental task. Bagging of trash will enable the city to save in collection costs, while at the same time we will have more efficient service and a cleaner community."

Initially, some 50,000 plastic trash bags arrived at the Streets Department East Central Incinerator, Delaware Avenue and Spring Garden Streets. The bags then were fanned out to the 400 blocks and 50,000 neighborhood volunteers participating in cleanup activities.

Four neighborhood mini-rallies also were held Saturday (Nov. 7) to launch the Bag Your Trash Week effort, coordinated by the Philadelphia More Beautiful Committee, in close cooperation with the Streets Department.

Tom Woodeshick injured Eagles fullback, served as the "voice" of the mini-rallies. Despite crutches, Woodeshick led the caravan of the latest Streets Department clean-up equipment to the four sections of the city, visiting block party activity enroute.

At the mini-rallies, local Boy Scout Troops joined the clean-up promotion by distributing Bag Your Trash buttons and literature.

A PRETTY PICTURE OF JIM KEE'S COUNTRY

HON. JOHN M. SLACK

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 19, 1970

Mr. SLACK. Mr. Speaker, in the Saturday Review for November 21 there is a travel article by David Butwin, who has returned from the West Virginia mountain area served by esteemed colleague, Congressman JIM KEE. I think many of my colleagues will be interested in the article, and I hope you will take it as a reason to visit along with your families during this season of the year.

The article follows:

HILLBILLY HEAVEN

I don't know what Appalachia means to you, but to the mountain people of southern West Virginia it has nothing to do with strip mining, welfare rolls, or malnutrition. Down there in the hills and hollows of Summers County, just across the misty ridges from Virginia, the best of the old American values are still intact, and the animals own the woods.

For a few rare nights in mid-October, I slept on the edge of the Bluestone Gorge, where—but for the faint humming of some electrical contraption in the bathroom—all I could hear were the squawking of tree toads and crickets and other sounds not identifiable. The desk clerk said there was no way to eliminate the hum, so I learned to live with it.

Otherwise, you could hardly fault the Pipestem Resort. Built with state and federal money and opened only six months ago, Pipestem occupies more than 4,000 acres of state parkland spread across a lofty tract of Appalachia. The previous occupants were farmers, moonshiners, and small timbering interests. The rugged terrain escaped the assault of strip and shaft mining that has ravaged much of West Virginia and neighboring Kentucky.

People around Pipestem resent the sympathy of outsiders who expect to find only slag heaps and food stamp lines. "We don't even know what a mine looks like," John Faulconer, editor and publisher of the Hinton *Daily News*, told me one bright morning on the rounds of Pipestem and the surrounding country. "The closest shaft and strip mines are thirty-five miles away. Hell, I've never even been inside of a mine."

Faulconer is a robust sixty-five, a native West Virginian who wants desperately to save his town and state. Toward that end he began a push eight years ago to salvage an unspoiled chunk of Appalachia and convert it into a golfing and vacationing refuge. At the same time, he hoped to create a bundle of new jobs and stop Hinton's slide into economic ruin. Faulconer's pleas were carried to Washington by Jim Kee of Bluefield, the Congressman from West Virginia's Fifth District. Local denizens call Kee the Funding Father and Faulconer the Founding Father of Pipestem. Together they helped swing \$14-million in grants and loans from the U.S. Economic Development Administration, part of a \$48-million package Washington authorized in the early 1960's to stir tourism and recreational business in West Virginia.

What has emerged beside the Bluestone Gorge is something more substantial than even Faulconer had envisioned. Pipestem Resort employs more than 200 in the brisker summer months, and all but two of that number come from the Hinton environs. Only James Bolinger, the managing director, and his assistant represent the Branigan Organization, Inc., a Chicago real estate developer that oversees the operation. It all makes for an uncommon and fetching touristic enterprise, in which nature manages to get top billing.

The main lodge is an attractive piece of wood, stone, and glass built into the side of a hill so that its seven floors barely jut above the landscape. You enter the main lobby by a wooden ramp, board the elevator, and then learn there are five floors below, all with a rear exposure to the gorge. The lodge's 114 rooms rent for as low as \$12 single, as high as \$50 double. There are twenty-five cabins spread out overlooking a lake, and by next spring an aerial tramway will link up with the resort's Mountain Creek Lodge, a thirty-room midway at the bottom of the gorge beside the Bluestone River. Workmen who made their way into the gorge to clear away building space for the lodge came across two abandoned whisky stills. "One of them was made of stainless steel, so you know it wasn't too old," Faulconer said. His eyes glowed, "This is corn likker country. I tell you, it's good stuff when it's made right. So smooth you can drink it like water."

Pipestem may lack some of the ceremony (and certainly the prices) of the Greenbrier at White Sulphur Springs, but it can busy the visitor with horseback riding, indoor and outdoor swimming, ice skating, archery, and, of course, golf. Faulconer, who has played 175 courses and shoots in the mid-70s, took

me on a go-kart ramble over Pipestem's eighteen-hole spread, which he calls a "thinking man's course." There are no "cardiac hills" to climb, but always the fairways drop away to steep, wooded hollows, where the squirrels must be puzzling over the accumulation of golf balls. I wonder how a golfer keeps his eye on the ball with all the better things to see. To provide even clearer views of the Bluestone Gorge, the West Virginia Forestry Service has planned certain cuts through the deep woods.

Faulconer said the autumn foliage was a day or two past its peak, but I was nonetheless dazzled by the profusion of reds and oranges painting the sparkling outdoors. What I took to be falling leaves would often dart upward and show their true identity: monarch butterflies, heading south for winter. We left Pipestem (whose lodge is four and a half miles from the main road) and followed the rolling, dipping countryside to Hinton. This seat of Summers County, a railroad center in richer days, lies at the confluence of the New, Bluestone, and Greenbrier rivers, three of West Virginia's four remaining waterways still alive and jumping with fish: bass, pike, catfish, bluegills. All but two of the state's fishing records were set in these rivers. The New River claims another distinction: Along with the Nile, it is the oldest river on Earth. Who says so? The bard of Summers County, John Faulconer. And he says the Smithsonian told him so.

We stopped for a treat at a Dairy Queen across the river from Hinton. Obviously the Ritz of American frozen custard parlors, it has a terrace with tables beside the rolling waters. Its main entree is cherished throughout the county. "You've never had a hotdog here?" a woman customer asked me. She looked a mite downcast despite the brilliant day. "I hate to see it close for winter," she told her fellow Hintonite, Faulconer.

Hinton, with a population of fewer than 5,000, has twenty-two churches. And the gospel is observed. In a recent survey compiled by Faulconer's paper along with the school superintendent's office, the police, and the prosecuting attorney, not a single case of drug use or drug traffic was turned up in Hinton. If there's any pot smoke in them thar hills, it's coming from a small commune established recently in a mountainside cabin not far from Hinton. The kids, from faraway places, draw curious looks on their appearances in town—but nothing harsher.

Following a narrow road beside Big Creek, we drove back into hillbilly country until we came to a tiny frame house with two armchairs on the front porch, a pile of coal and a spent washing machine out back. Inside, Faulconer greeted six members of the Big Creek Sewing Center, who were bent over a quilt stretched out on a long wooden table. The quilting talents of West Virginia women have lately been broadcast through the land, and their midis and maxis now sell for hundreds of dollars in such distant markets as I. Magnin and Nieman-Marcus. Of course, the state's fifteen sewing circles don't realize these profits. The women are paid a maximum of \$2 an hour by the Mountain Artisans, nonprofit middlemen who are based in Charleston, backed by a federal grant, and boosted by such considerable upstate personages as Sharon Percy Rockefeller, the young and pretty wife of West Virginia's Secretary of State, John D. Rockefeller IV.

Helen Forren, her daughter, and her seventy-two-year-old mother represent three generations of quilters. Since the recent run of publicity, they've received private orders for personalized golf club head covers, puff pillows, shawls, dresses, and the colorful bedspreads that remain their specialty. Mrs. Forren's husband Bill, who is partially disabled, was away for the day squirrel hunting. She showed me some tiny cradles and chairs he had whittled, a skill for which he is known

through the surrounding hills. "He gets a little pension," said Mrs. Forren, "so we manage together. I keep four welfare children now. The welfare people won't let 'em wear hand-me-downs or patches"—which she can fashion with perfection—"so it ends up costing us a little to keep them."

Mrs. Forren's mother, Mrs. Christine Buckland, patted her gray hair in place and stood for a photograph in front of the little house. "I was married right there on that rock," she said, pointing to a stone laid near the front step. "That was in 1916."

There is nothing much to do at Pipestem after dark in the low season but listen to the sounds of night falling on the Bluestone Gorge. Or you can drop into the gift shop, browse through the mountain crafts (such as Bill Forren's whittlings), and hear the string music of Jim Coste, who minds the store for his mother. He was alternating, on a chill night last month, between banjo, guitar, fiddle, and dulcimer until he snapped a string on the dulcimer while playing a jig called "Golden Slippers." Coste, twenty-one, grew up in Hinton and loves to track the hills in search of small game and the peace the woods afford him.

He led me into the hills the next day after waiting out a thick fog that covered the Bluestone Gorge outside my window like a deep snowfall. Jim's rebuilt 1930 Model-A Ford chugged through the rising mist past the Big Bend railroad tunnel where John Henry is said to have won his steeldriving fame. Hinton is raising funds to build a sixteen-foot-high statue of the nineteenth-century strong man above the tunnel, and Johnny Cash has contributed \$500.

We followed the Greenbrier River for a spell and then tramped into the woods, Jim carrying his grandfather's twelve-gauge shotgun over his shoulder. He was after squirrels, and though we spotted three or four and Jim fired away as fast as he could reload, all he brought down were showers of yellow leaves. "Damnation!" he cursed after each miss. The racket scared up bunches of crows and a pair of pheasants, but we came out of the woods empty-handed. We tried fishing a nearby pond, but caught nothing more than nibbles, while barking squirrels taunted us from the sanctuary of the woods. Jim apologized repeatedly for the futile morning, but I assured him it was nothing of the kind. If one could only make a lifetime of such wasted mornings.

IT IS TIME TO RETURN TO THE FUNDAMENTALS

HON. THOMAS N. DOWNING

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 19, 1970

Mr. DOWNING. Mr. Speaker, Gen. Bruce C. Clarke, U.S. Army, retired, recently delivered a fine address to the National Triennial Convention of the Knights Templar which was held in Denver. His speech entitled, "It's Time To Return to the Fundamentals," contains a number of sentiments which I feel are of prime interest to all the Members and I am happy to include it in the RECORD:

IT'S TIME TO RETURN TO THE FUNDAMENTALS
(By Bruce C. Clarke)

Today we find our country disturbed, apprehensive, suspicious, and lacking in high morale.

How can we help to overcome this situation? Painting a home filled with termites is not a very permanent solution.

Before daylight on 16 December 1944, Hitler struck through the Ardennes Forest in Belgium in great force. The American Army was surprised. Units were cut off. Headquarters ceased to function. Communications were cut. Rumors were abundant. There was an air of impending disaster in the combat area.

The American reaction was to place Field Marshal Montgomery in command on the north side of the Bulge and to rush in reinforcements. In ten days the breakthrough of the Germans ground to a halt. It was then that Marshal Montgomery is reputed to have said:

"There comes a time in every battle when you should tidy up the battlefield."

This he did and then we counterattacked. In a short time, the German Army was driven back into Germany and within a few months the war was over.

It is time to again tidy up the battlefield. How do we do that? There is only one way. That is to return to the basic fundamentals in many fields in America.

At last year's Army-Navy football game, the Navy was reputed to have come to Philadelphia with some trick plays, unusual items of dress, etc. The pregame reporters played these up. Just before the kick off, a T.V. interviewer asked the Army coach what "gimmicks" he had brought to the game to spring on the Navy. He said:

"The only gimmicks we know are how to block, tackle, run, pass and kick."

The score, as I recall, was about 25 to 0. I am sure you can guess who won.

When Field Marshal Foch was asked, after World War I, what was the great strategy he used as Supreme Allied Commander to win the war on the western front, he said:

"There is no grand strategy in warfare. It is the application of practical solutions to military problems."

When I took my graduate work in Civil Engineering, the first two courses I studied were on "Foundations." I cannot recall the details of the courses, but I have always remembered the philosophy of the professor who taught the courses. He pointed out that the first thing needed in a structure was an adequate foundation. It was generally all underground where it did not show. No one took pictures of it for the press. No one wrote articles about it. Its cost was a large part of the cost of the structure. There were many opportunities to slight the work and bury out of sight defective parts of the job. It was not until the structure failed, would these malpractices come to light. He pointed out that an Engineer displayed his character as a man by how he built the foundation for a structure.

In the story, an old Irish grandmother said as she sank back into a chair exhausted from feeding, undressing, bathing, listening to prayers and getting several grandsons into bed and asleep:

"Oh were there aught else to build men out of besides boys."

But there isn't any other way to produce our replacements in life. The answers to the problems facing us are known. They spring clearly from the teachings of Jesus, the Ten Commandments, the Constitution and the English common law. Our problem is to relate these great teachings to the problems of building sound foundations in our people and in our country.

I have been privileged to have helped to train many million soldiers. I learned early to approach my job with this philosophy:

"My soldiers want to do what I want done; they do not do it, it is because I've not properly instructed and motivated them."

Many of our troubles come from our people not being properly instructed and motivated. The Vietnamese War is a classic example. We must do better in instructing and motivating our people. We must start with teaching the

fundamentals of life to our youths. I do not recognize that there is a "generation gap" between us and the great bulk of American youths. Nor do I recognize that their generation is smarter than ours. They know about more things that we did at their age, but what we did know about, we understood in greater depth instead of superficially as is often the case with today's youth.

On a plaque in the athletic stadium at West Point is this statement:

"On these fields of friendly strife are sown the seeds that on other fields, on other days will bear the fruits of victory."—Douglas MacArthur

We have people who think it is wrong to win. Mostly they are incompetents who want to change the rules to insure that they can come out on top.

There is nothing wrong in winning if the rules are fair for all and we play by them.

The ability to win, even against great odds, has made America great.

We have produced a generation of "doers"—a generation of builders. Our people were interested in and capable of getting things done. We are overwhelmed today with rhetoric, arguments, and illusionary goals. But we are not overpopulated with those who can take the basic fundamental facts and objectives and create and carry through a sound workable plan to produce what we need.

Let's not say that we are getting beyond the active solutions to the problems of our times because of our years. Helping to solve them will keep us young. Our teachings, experience, and maturity are greatly needed today. They are a great asset to America.

If the basic concepts that we know so well from our teachings were still practiced in our families, churches, communities, schools, colleges, and industry by those charged with making men out of boys, we would be a long way towards solving our problems.

What should we do to help cause a return to those basic fundamentals which have made our country great?

We can set the example in law and order, in civic duties, in voting, in ethics, in observation and in support of our schools, and in taking a part in community affairs. We can bring our help and influence to bear. We can become activists in what is needed and good for the community, state and Nation. We must help to instruct properly and motivate our people—especially our youth. It is not too late or too early to start in all these fields.

When I used to make out efficiency reports on officers I felt one of the best things I could say was:

"He does his best all the time."

If, through our work and service, we help our people to return to the basic fundamentals that have made our country great, we will have helped to preserve our heritage. We can proudly say that we are then good citizens. We need more good and active citizens today. Let's be such Americans.

Our country at this time needs us to do our best all the time.

1970-71 SESSION OF CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE HELD IN BROOKLYN

HON. BERTRAM L. PODELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 19, 1970

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, on the 19th of October, the opening meeting of the 1970-1971 session of my Citizens Advisory Committee took place in Brooklyn. Hundreds of concerned citizens met to

express their ideas and feelings on the important issues of the day and to select one of the eight standing subcommittees on which they would serve.

The keynote address was delivered by the president of Brooklyn College, Dr. John Kneller, who I am proud to say is the chairman of the Advisory Committee.

Dr. Kneller became president of Brooklyn College in 1969 after serving for 4 years as provost of Oberlin College. His distinguished career as an educator, author, and administrator as well as his keen interest in the welfare of our community, State, and Nation are qualities we welcome in a chairman.

His remarks on the role of the individual in meeting the problems of a community can serve as an inspiration for constructive action on the part of all citizens.

The address follows:

SPEECH BY DR. JOHN W. KNELLER

All of you have come to this meeting with your own ideas concerning your roles as citizens of the borough, the city, the state and the Nation. I have come with mine and I'd like to share them with you.

Nearly everything about Brooklyn is changing. And, like most kinds of change, the ones we are experiencing are painful and sometimes perilous. As a relative newcomer, I keep reminding myself that the borough has a larger population than half of the States of the Union. What we do and say here cannot fail to have a serious impact in the Nation as a whole.

Brooklyn has had a rude awakening to its own nature and the nature of the world around it. It is obvious that we have a gigantic amount of thinking and work ahead of us, and I believe all of us are uncomfortable and apprehensive. Uncomfortable because it is difficult to reevaluate everything within one's frame of reference, individually or collectively. Apprehensive because true progress always means setting off into new territory without knowing all the answers ahead of time—and, inevitably, risk and challenge are present in equal quantities. It is much simpler, and much more tempting, not to set out at all, to assume that we've done as well as could have been expected. Like everyone else, we have face we'd like to save.

But, as the French writer Stendhal once said: "The risks that a man takes are a measure of his worth." I take it that we are willing to take some risks. That is why we are here. The challenges we face and hope to survive are unprecedented in two dimensions: the extent to which the turmoil and the controversy touch the life and conscience of nearly every citizen, and the fact that the ordeal is global. Never before, not even during the Civil War, have Americans been unable to escape moral involvement, whatever the national crisis. And never before, not even during the Great Depression and the World Wars, was this country's fate so closely linked with the global, human predicament.

There was a time when Americans were able to believe that people in many other countries were somehow not quite human. So it didn't matter if they were hungry, sick, poor, without resources . . . It didn't even matter if we took what scant resources they had, and underpaid—if we paid at all. We never had to face the consequences of what we had done. There were no televised wars, no pictures of children with starvation-bloated bellies. Now we can see some of what we have done—and not done. And just as we now know that nuclear weapons will undo those who use them, along with those they are used against, we know that to ignore the

needs of others is to nurture sickness in ourselves.

Others have described the challenges in terms ranging from the technical to the apocalyptic. On this much, however, I think we could all reach agreement. A central part of the problem is the scope and pace of technological and social change, throughout the world, and the obvious inadequacy of existing institutions to deal effectively with change and its human consequences. The mediocre measures of history repeat themselves over and over again and evolution seems to have slowed to nearly a stop, because of man's want of competent control over his own actions.

The source of some of our difficulties, at least, is not lack of insight. No one is really unaware of the utter futility of war as an instrument of national policy, let alone the consequences to the planet and its inhabitants of a thermo-nuclear war. Nor can anyone be blind any longer to the cancerous effects of racism in any society, anywhere. We have all the insight we need into the consequences of the population explosion and the horrendous dangers of continuing environmental pollution.

No, the source of the difficulty is that organized society—civilization, if we can call it that—has not yet taken any of these problems seriously enough to do much about them. This is not somebody else's fault; it is my fault, your fault—our individual and collective fault. A number of political philosophers have suggested imaginative alternatives to war, but the major powers have yet to take any significant steps in that direction—and the inertia of the vast majority of us means that our governments continue dragging their feet. Racism continues to plague American society and is a growing factor in world politics—and the major outcry against it still comes largely from those who are discriminated against. Population control is technically feasible but except in a few countries it still has low political priority—and citizens do not use their political leverage to demand action. Pollution abatement is also technically feasible, but the big debate in this country appears to be, "Who will pay for it?"

No wonder, then, that humanity—especially young humanity—is experiencing a crisis of confidence. The haste with which civilization is plunging toward a host of visible disasters is, to any thoughtful observer, the height of irresponsibility.

There is a very reasonable skepticism concerning the wisdom and sincerity of "those in charge." Traditional institutions are properly suspect, and old values are questioned—as they should be.

We seem to have an incredible need to maintain images of ourselves that please us, whether they accurately reflect our stature or not. But everyone who has discovered that fire burns and ice chills knows the fruitfulness of error. If we choose not to learn anything new, because we are afraid of the pain that often accompanies growth, we cannot hope to be part of the solution of our nation's problems.

Our politics are increasingly polarized by antagonisms, and those in the center have begun to choose sides. As Senator Margaret Chase Smith put it a few months ago, "Extremism bent on polarization . . . is increasingly forcing upon the American people the narrow choice between anarchy and repression. And make no mistake about it, if that narrow choice has to be made, the American people, even if with reluctance and misgiving, will choose repression."

In short, if we are not first overwhelmed by the great problems we have so far ignored or failed to solve, we may simply destroy ourselves by acts of political self-evisceration. We may suffocate in our own garbage, annihilate ourselves with our mighty

new weapons, or simply destroy ourselves with hate.

It puzzles me, for example, that so many people of my generation are so hostile to the aspirations of the Blacks and Puerto Ricans. It puzzles me because we grew up during the depression, and I sometimes think it takes a depression mentality to understand the passionate self-interest of Americans who know they are at last on the way up. We more than anyone else should understand the deadening, bone-crushing defeats of poverty, the dullness and pain. We should understand what it means to be unable to provide any future for our children that seems fit for human beings. We should be able to imagine how it is to be caught in that horrible non-life—and how it is to see, in such a vista of endless grey, a light, a way that might lead out into the world that other people seem to inhabit so effortlessly.

We who grew up in the depression, we should understand the fierce determination to rise. It may be harder, but we should also understand the lack of determination to rise. Even the depression was not endless. There was a time before it, and if we could not remember it, our parents could. It is a different thing when one has lived in a grey world forever. Eventually the light goes out, or it chokes back any hope of escape; it leads to no-world beyond because it is only a mirage. There are people who have lived in despair too long.

From the poor with great hopes and the poor with little hope, Brooklyn will draw many of its future leaders. It is a difficult time for Brooklyn but one that could really lead to a remarkable set of relationships. If we can find bridges, very diverse groups of people may find ways to reach each other. This should be one of our most important goals. If we succeed, we may help to produce a new breed of leadership in the community. This suggests that the upcoming generation of urban leaders could well be closer than we have ever come before to the ideal of James Madison; pluralistic, competitive, interest-oriented and highly motivated.

Clearly, the shape of the future will be very different from the past. Let us hope that we will be different and that our institutions, which are the reflections of ourselves, will adjust and adapt to keep up.

I wouldn't attempt to blueprint all the changes that should take shape in the future. But as an educator, I do know that educational institutions will have to turn out men and women capable of understanding and managing broad, intricate problems, within a framework of political and social responsibility. The specialists will still have their roles to play, but the men in charge will surely be broadly educated generalists. They will be people who are capable of growth and change, who will take delight in discovery—people who are secure enough in themselves so that they do not need to be seen as perfect. They will acknowledge their mistakes and use them to build on; this will accelerate their growth—and the rate at which they contribute.

I am not offering a prescription for the inhabitants of Utopia, nor for some snobbish and possibly even effete elite of the future. I am talking about the desperate need for knowledge-based, system-oriented, solution-directed professionals who are equipped to deal with tough problems, not just complain about the incompetence of others. These qualities are essential and perhaps even minimum requirements for the emerging world for which we—all of us—are responsible. We sorely need such people now, in government and industry, in education and communications, in international relations and in local public affairs. The accumulated, ignored, mismanaged problems on mankind's agenda call

for initiative, not inertia; for constructive action, not just carping criticism; for a hard work follow-up, once the debating point has been made.

Some of the qualities I have called for are, indeed, well within your competence and mine—if we apply what we have learned to the jobs before us. We need, above all, to accept personal responsibility for the present and future state of the world we live in. We can no longer afford to assign blame to faceless conspiracies. It is not an anonymous "they," but an identifiable, flesh-and-blood "we," who are the instruments of historical change. There is no longer any room for a silent majority, because apathy is also a position—an irresponsible position. The true enemy of political justice is not the conspiring of a few, but the apathy of the many. The enemy is not "they" who would destroy but "we" who do not create.

We can still turn back from fatal polarization and there is glimmering evidence we may be doing so. Student participation in the recent primary campaigns and the coming fall elections is one good sign. In our young people we have the raw material of need, interest and commitment. We must stop the antagonism toward them and help them to fulfill their extraordinary promise. It is the most precious gift of all, and at the moment it seems singularly unappreciated.

The nation that is now trying to remake itself, at great pain and cost, is startlingly close to the democratic political equations on which it was founded—think about it. There are only minorities in a truly pluralistic society; the proper functions of leadership are not to deny differences or to impose orthodoxy, but to draw from all groups the best they have to offer, not for the benefit of some privileged few, but for everyone.

Now is the time when we can begin to rebuild our community in a fresh and imaginative way. Urban blight is one term that is used for communities that grow haphazardly, and then suffer from their randomness. We can help make Brooklyn a totally new kind of place; a place that has unity and thought behind the structures that make of it a worthy place for all its people to live. Please, let us get together and begin.

THE NIXON-ECHEVERRIA MEETING

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 19, 1970

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, last week my district was to have been the site of the important meeting between Mexico's President-elect Luis Echeverria and President Nixon. As we all know, the time and place of that meeting had to be changed in deference to Mr. Nixon's attendance at memorial services for Charles de Gaulle in Paris.

However, the significance of this conference between two leaders of the Western Hemisphere is neither temporal nor geographic, but rather, it lies in the spirit of mutual respect which characterizes the current relationship between the two countries, as exemplified by the cordial meeting.

Mexico's emerging strength and fierce independence make her the best kind of hemispheric ally. The Mexican-American relationship represents a model, and, hopefully, a preview for inter-American relations in the years to come. The era

of U.S. superdominance in the Western Hemisphere must give way to the partnership of equals. We may not always speak with one voice, but we can be bound by a mutual commitment to freedom and independence.

Such is the spirit of our close ties to Mexico. This spirit was recognized by the influential *Diario Las Americas*, a leading and authoritative Spanish daily published in the United States. In a perceptive editorial on November 13, *Diario Las Americas* pointed out the great significance of the meeting of the two leaders for inter-American relations, noting the great number of matters pending which require much good will on both sides to be resolved satisfactorily. It also calls attention to the great achievements of President-elect Echeverria and his potential for influence on Mexican history.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the attention of our colleagues to the full text of this timely editorial:

THE NIXON-ECHEVERRIA MEETING

As it is known, the meeting that should have been held at Key Biscayne, in Miami, on Thursday the 12th, between the President of the United States, Richard M. Nixon, and Mexico's President Elect, Lic. Luis Echeverria, was postponed for this Friday in Washington, D.C., as President Nixon had to go to Paris for the funeral of the great French leader Charles de Gaulle. As soon as the news of the death of the former French President was known, the Mexican President Elect, Lic. Echeverria, notwithstanding his numerous commitments inherent to the supreme responsibilities that he will assume on December 1st, cooperated with the White House so that the interview could be held in Washington, upon Mr. Nixon's return from Paris. The future Mexican President, with humane understanding, accepted the powerful and sorrowful reasons that compelled the American President to accompany the French in these sad moments.

The meeting that will be held this Friday at the White House is of great importance for the United States of America and for Mexico. And in certain aspects it is also of high significance for inter-American relations in general.

There are always a great number of matters pending between the United States and Mexico that require high echelon negotiations so that the special friendship joining these two countries for the last decades not only be maintained but also strengthened in reciprocal benefit, within an atmosphere of decorous conveniences. The fact that there are over three thousand miles of frontier between the two countries, undoubtedly implies many situations, sometimes conflictive, that require much study and much good will on both sides to be solved satisfactorily. That is why the personal contact of the American and Mexican Presidents is very important, and positively contributes to facilitate the negotiations of the respective chancelleries.

In the case of this Friday's meeting, it is timely to point out that the American President will be talking with a Mexican figure which has already emerged as one of great significance in his country's politics. Judging from the achievements of Lic. Echeverria and by the extraordinary impulse of his electoral campaign, there are powerful reasons to believe that this influence on Mexico's life will not only be during his mandate of six years, but also that it will project beyond into the field of civic activities that exert political power in his country. The disappearance of the legendary figures, so to say, of the Mexican revolution, gives to Lic. Echeverria and to the new leaders of the nation,

special responsibilities in the guidance of its future.

It is to be hoped that the conversations between Messrs. Nixon and Echeverria, therefore, be beneficial for the United States and Mexico. And also that regarding economic matters, possibly in what concerns the protectionist measures in the United States, they favor the Latin American countries in general.

LADY BIRD JOHNSON AWARDS

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 19, 1970

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, the highway beautification program inspired by Lady Bird Johnson is now an ongoing concern with its own momentum. The results of this effort we all now enjoy.

Keeping our highways beautiful is a never-ending task, however, and Mrs. Johnson still lends her talents and efforts to help the cause.

In early October she initiated an award which gives recognition to our first line of defense in this effort—an award in recognition of the Texas Highway Department maintenance foreman who has done the most to preserve and enhance the unique beauty and environment of roadsides in Texas. An engraved plaque and a check for \$1,500 were a part of the award.

Recipient of this the first of these awards was Joe H. Derrick of Stephenville at an award ceremony in the amphitheater of the Lyndon B. Johnson State Park in which I was privileged to participate.

Mr. Speaker, this is recognition given where recognition is due. To paraphrase a statement about one of the five finalists for this award—what these men and their crews do is always on show, even if the men are not.

It is part of a commitment expressed by our former First Lady to the American Road Builders Association in February 1966:

We are the road-buildingest nation on earth. The highway program is 35 times as large as the Panama Canal, Grand Coulee Dam, and the St. Lawrence Seaway combined. Your creations, your works are public property, open to all and for the service of all, and inevitably, they affect the lives of the people for better or for worse. Therein lies both the glory and the burden of roadbuilding. Whether we will one day stand in pride and be able to say "well done" depends very much on the skill and imagination and sheer determination we put forth in the next few years. In disturbing the turf of this beautiful country, we have a special obligation—not only in terms of land use, but also in an esthetic sense. We are obliged to leave it looking as good if not better than the way we found it.

These words are not an expression alone of a nice sentiment, they are the expression of a duty and a commitment we all should honor.

Mr. Speaker, one of the more colorful local papers of the area, the *Fredericksburg Standard*, did a superb job of expressing the views many of us hold toward Lady Bird Johnson's efforts to

beautify our land. I would like to reprint its article in the RECORD:

EDITORIALS: A MORE BEAUTIFUL
AMERICA . . .

"In disturbing the turf of this beautiful country, we have a special obligation—not only in terms of land use, but also in an aesthetic sense. We are obliged to leave it looking as good, if not better than the way we found it." These were part of the remarks made on Feb. 23, 1966, by Lady Bird Johnson to the American Road Builders Association.

Over four years later, in the state park named for her husband, she did something tangible to back up the determination she expressed then. She gave the Lady Bird Johnson Award she established this year to recognize the Texas Highway Department maintenance foreman who had done the most to preserve and enhance the beauty of Texas roadsides.

Mrs. Johnson is always so warm and generous in her praise and expression of appreciation of what others have done to preserve, conserve, beautify and enhance buildings, places and things.

What we here in the Texas Hill Country, especially in Gillespie County, want her to know—as others no doubt also feel all over the nation where her influence has been felt and made known—is that her interest and concern have been a special inspiration to people from all walks of life and in many trades, professions and livelihoods.

Long before the hue and cry all over this land was "Save our Environment" and before preaching ecology was the "in" thing to do, she was concerned with "Beautify America." Her words were followed up with deeds and actions, the latest of which was this generous gift and beautiful plaque she awarded Friday to "one of the troops" who help to keep our roadsides beautiful along with the maintenance of the highways themselves.

This gracious lady, who will always remain a "First Lady" by her deeds and demeanor, is due a share of the applause and honor she is always showing to others. Her optimistic outlook in seeing the possibilities in preserving the finer things of life is a bright light amidst the words of gloom and doom she referred to Friday as being heard too often throughout our land. Her reward, already well in evidence in her own immediate area and in many sections of America, is one that all of us share—a more beautiful America.

EULOGY FOR CARDINAL CUSHING

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 19, 1970

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the following is the text of the sermon given November 7 by Cardinal John Wright, prefect of the Vatican congregation for the clergy, at the funeral of Cardinal Richard Cushing of Boston. Cardinal Wright started his priesthood in Boston under the leadership of Cardinal Cushing. Cardinal Wright was formerly the outstanding bishop of the diocese of Pittsburgh, and bishop of the diocese of Worcester, Mass.

The text of the sermon follows:

"And God will wipe away every tear from their eyes. And death shall be no more; neither shall there be mourning, nor crying, nor pain any more, for the former things

have passed away. And he who was sitting on the throne said, 'Behold, I make all things new!' " (Apocalypse, Chap. 21 V. 4-5).

The lamented cardinal archbishop of Boston was a man of many contradictions—some within minutes of one another. He was a man of not a few controversial words and actions—some bitter, some bewildering, some almost amusing to himself and to us who loved him. But one single, over-riding, constant purpose integrated his entire life and to that abiding constancy he was totally committed unto death.

That one constant purpose was his determination, stubborn and untiring, to serve, with whatever genius or frailty, the one, holy, universal, apostolic Church, in communion with Rome, and to do everything else in his power, at all times, in all places, on every level, to advance that kingdom of God of which he knew the visible, organized Church to be the beginning and the principal agent on earth.

To this unchanging motivation, he was faithful all the days of his life and through all the mysteries—joyful, sorrowful and glorious—of that life otherwise shot through with superficial contradictions and occasional controversy.

I am grateful to Archbishop Medeiros and to the bishops and priests of this truly holy Church of Boston for the privilege of speaking, in behalf of all present and millions not able to be present, some words of affectionate remembrance of Richard Cardinal Cushing.

The text which I read a moment ago was one I heard on his lips on many occasions, some of them occasions so bound up with his goodness to me that they came instinctively to mind when, by a curious providence, I arrived the other night in the New York airport to be handed a scribbled note that Archbishop Medeiros and Bishop Minihan had phoned that our cardinal was dead.

When Archbishop Cushing was installed in this cathedral over a quarter century ago, he thought of choosing the last part of today's text—"Behold, I make all things new!"—as the theme of his first sermon. A last minute decision, expressed by him with a characteristic comic touch, prompted him to choose another text, but he returned to this theme time and again in those early years of his pontificate as he went about the diocese where he was welcomed and loved so passionately.

When he preached at the Mass establishing the new diocese of Worcester 20 years ago, he used the last words of this text, as he did nine years later when, with paternal solicitude he installed me as bishop of Pittsburgh. This is a purely personal reason why I am grateful to be able to repeat those words as he is laid to rest, since in all of my life as a brother bishop, as in the lives of thousands of bishops, priests and lay collaborators, these words, the aspiration of his own life, became our dynamic ideal: "Behold, I make all things new!"

These words coming from him were no heady, empty boast concerning any charismatic gifts or special talents Richard Cardinal Cushing possessed, or wished the rest of us, all of us, to share. It is an echo of words which Scripture places on the lips of that Christ, the Alpha and Omega of all things, who could alone possibly pronounce such powerful words, that Christ of whom every believer in one way, every priest in a most especial way, every bishop in a preeminent way is called to be the agent.

And so, from the day of his ordination as a priest, indeed before, and unmistakably from the springtime of his archbishopric in the exciting years of the 1940s, Richard Cushing, fired by the energies of Christ and inspired by the word of the Lord of all, sought to "make all things new." For years this aspiration had identified him with the work of the missionary Church as few in history and none in our times, have given them-

selves to the spread of the kingdom to the ends of the earth. Seeking to build on the firm foundations of solid faith and holy pride left by Cardinal O'Connell and his predecessors in the local Church of Boston, Archbishop Cushing aspired to bring fresh vitality—to "make all things new" again—in the diocese committed to his care. Those were the days—the latter 1940s and the early 1950s—of the joyous mysteries in the life of our beloved leader. He stood so tall, so confident, so radiant, so energetic, so indefatigable, and, if one may dare to say it, so debonair, as America's youngest archbishop and one of the Church's most articulate, open-handed and prophetic witnesses to God's truth.

In those days of the joyful mysteries of his high priesthood, Archbishop Cushing was everywhere. He preached everywhere. He was at work building everywhere. He sought to encourage everywhere, at home and abroad. It was war time when he began this omnipresent apostolic action. He combined with the all-out service of his own flock an amazing apostolate to soldiers and sailors, to men and women in the service, not only here on local ships and bases but wherever in the land he was asked to confirm, to offer the Mass, to comfort or to say the word of encouragement for those caught up in the war.

The moment the war ended he began, again with all-out effort and in worldwide fashion, to labor for the things which make for peace. He was among the first, together with the late Cardinal Dougherty of Philadelphia, to take a clear stand against future compulsory peacetime military service. But at the same time, he braved the wrath of the more equivocal, if not disloyal, at home and abroad by pinpointing in his public addresses those whom he saw as enemies of faith, freedom and the prospects of abiding peace, no matter how much some of them may have, at the time, presented themselves as allies of freedom, lovers of peace, and, on at least one occasion, spokesmen for religious faith.

Much more positively and unforgettably, before rebuilding from the devastation of war had even begun in Europe, he projected and personally led a series of pilgrimages to European nations, shrines, and peoples from whom we had been estranged during the years of the war. This was among the greatest of the joyful mysteries of this man's life and how it rejoiced us all to see him leading a thousand of his people to Canada, before any political personality even dreamed of doing anything, to walk through the streets, to preach and to pray in witness to the unity of spirit which must bind neighboring nations. How proud we were a year later to see him standing, erect and confident, in the pulpit of crowded Notre Dame of Paris, before the altar of Lourdes, surrounded by 500 of his Boston flock and thousands of the French eager to hear him speak of the indestructible ties between our countries. As in France, he spoke of new hope, so later in Spain he pleaded for new ways, in Ireland for new courage, in Germany for new understanding. Never were the joyful mysteries of his life so symbolized than when we priests and people of Boston went with him to Rome to present to Pope Pius XII our petition for the canonization of Pius X, whose motto had been, "Restore all things in Christ," as Richard Cushing's inspiration had been, "Behold, I make all things new!"

That was the springtime, the season of joyful mysteries as the Rosary, which he delighted to recite on trains abroad, over the radio at home, at religious gatherings everywhere, would call them. That was the season that saw him consecrating new bishops, especially missionary bishops, not only here in Boston but in the chapels of the motherhouses of great missionary orders all over the land and beyond. His theme was always the same: New worlds to conquer for Christ, new hope to bring to men, new energy and open-

ness in the profession of the faith, "all things made new."

It was in this period of the joyful mysteries that he began to dream of concentrating his energy and his vision especially on Latin America, toward which as a neighbor continent he felt that we had special obligation in affection, generosity and faith.

Before anyone, known to me, was using the words "Third World," the indomitable Cushing in the years of his joyful mysteries was launching, with the aid of the priests and people who shared his vision, Latin American programs all his own, typified by but not limited to the Society of St. James—the name of which had dawned on him as he stood at the shrine of St. James, one of his patron saints, at Compostella in Spain. "The Spaniards," he said, "were chief among those who brought the faith to South America. They did a wonderful work. The job of bringing back the faith, 'of making all things new' must now be ours!"

Yet none of his worldwide activities distracted him, during that springtime of the joyful mysteries, from his duties here at home. He multiplied, in plain fact he pioneered locally, new educational work for handicapped children; there are those who say that it was he who coined the tender phrase "exceptional children" to describe those born with all the odds against them. He made his own an especial apostolate to old folks, and, in a mixture of pathos and comedy, he planned festive visits not only to institutional homes for the poor, but to public restaurants, even night clubs, to which he invited those who had no one else to entertain them on national family feasts, like Thanksgiving. He was the host and he was the entertainment. He built institutions for the aged and the poor, the sick and the abandoned, but, what was more important, he identified himself personally with his brethren, whether they were in the institutions of the Church or those of the state, whether they were in whatever we now call poor houses or were in prisons.

In was in this period, again the springtime of his joyous mysteries, that he revealed his highly publicized flair for hats of varied and marvelous design, as well as his disarming, not to say sometimes disconcerting, delight in uttering the unexpected phrase, the unstuffy remark, or a frequently astonishing bit of self-deprecating humor.

And thus, in the midst of laughter, intense activity and resilient indifference to either flattery or adverse criticism, he lived out the joyful mysteries of his springtime as a prelate, reproducing in deeds, something, at least, of what only Christ could promise: "Behold, I make all things new!"

Then came the season of his sorrowful mysteries. It is a little difficult to place a date; it doesn't make much difference. It is even more difficult to assign clear causes, particularly for the contradiction, confusion and sometimes personal attack that left his spirit sorrowful, even broken, more than ravaging diseases made painful his flesh. Suddenly the seemingly carefree, contagiously enthusiastic young archbishop of the early days, began, manifestly, to share the priesthood of the Man of Sorrows, as once, not less manifestly, he had exemplified the priesthood of the Son of the Cause of our Joy.

He became like to no one so much as to Job. His telephone calls, his letters to friends, his private conversations sometimes, when affliction of spirit and pain of the flesh were especially acute, and his unguarded public remarks began to echo the very vocabulary of Job. He spoke, as many of the bishops who are our fathers in Christ, have been obliged to speak, of abandonment, repudiation, unconcealed contempt for what he loved and what he tried, at least, to do.

Words from the lips of Job, words of ulcers and tumors, of desolation of spirit and utter heartbreak, began to be heard from his lips.

Once, apologizing half jokingly, half ruefully for his shrunken physical condition and his inability to eat anything but clear soup and a little ice cream, he quoted in a letter a line from Job: "My flesh is consumed, my bone has cleaved to my skin, and nothing but lips are left above my teeth!" The years of the sorrowful mysteries had unmistakably descended upon him.

Unlike Job, his personal possessions had never been of a financial kind. He had never held on to money and so he couldn't lose that. He owned no camp, no villa, no hideaway from the pressures of life; any place he stayed, perhaps for a day or two, he stayed as a guest, usually a paying guest, but in any case, a grateful guest. As his secretary, I wrote the draft of his first will after he became archbishop. His instructions were very simple. He said, "So far as my job is concerned, include everything that canon law requires. So far as my personal effects are concerned, find some legal, high-faluting way to say that I haven't got a dime. I came into the world poor and I shall go out the same way!"

Neither did he suffer, as did Job, from neglect or indifference by his family. Since they are present and we understand one another in this hour of grief, I must acknowledge, as did the late cardinal, that it sometimes seemed quite the other way round. His people loved him deeply, but he apparently felt that by giving his own family even a day of his time he might neglect the work for all God's children. His parents had taught him to love Christ and His Church above all else. His kin understood this perfectly and so they were content, but not surprised, that only in the year before he died he at last took time to visit home on the family feasts of Thanksgiving and Christmas. His nephew followed in his footsteps as a priest and a missionary and the cardinal was very proud of that fact, but he never told him. On the one occasion that he invited his family to rejoice with him in Rome, the news of a death in the family, the death of one who had remained at home, disrupted the Roman reunion at its height. He was already sick, wracked with pain, in no small degree frustrated—but his comment at the hotel in Rome that day might have been a line out of Job.

In the season of his sorrowful mysteries, it became common for him to faint with pain at public events or to show utter exhaustion in ceremonies or at meetings. But then the rumor began that he had cancer, together with asthma and other afflictions. A loose-lipped woman started the cancer rumor. Her phone lines sizzled with the grisly news. Finally he heard the rumor himself, as all evil reports finally reach whom they are intended to disturb. His doctor had been discreet, but a writer whom the cardinal had helped, when no one else would, helped spread the rumor that he was taking means to kill pain and showing symptoms of metastasis and sclerosis.

This was indeed the season of sorrowful mysteries, but he never stopped going. He never stopped preaching. He never stopped wiping away tears, though they were invariably the tears of others.

It was then that the pilgrimages for peace (the politicians had begun to come to life on that level) gave way to pilgrimages of prayer for the physical healing of others. He chartered airplanes to bring crippled and handicapped boys and girls—"his exceptional children"—close to some of whom he will be buried this afternoon—to Lourdes and to Ireland. All that was most beloved about him is summed up, not in the funny stories in his popular biographies, but in a poignant piece of sheer poetry that was uttered at 2 o'clock in the morning 40,000 feet above the Atlantic, in the darkness of a plane filled with afflicted children, their afflicted father in Christ and the Sisters and doctors who

took care of both. In the mist of the midnight silence a small boy called out, "Cardinal!" An exhausted Prince of the Holy Roman Church, to give him one of his exact titles, sleepily but promptly murmured: "What do you want, Bobby?" The small boy answered, with a demand that Christ gave the poor and afflicted the right to make of all Christians, princes and peasants alike: "Cardinal," the small boy said, "I can't sleep. Come hold me!"

Let any of the captious describe the Cardinal's prompt response that night as sentimental or untypical, let me quote from an article by the librarian of the Boston Atheneum, to which, by the way, the first bishop of Boston, a Frenchman, left his library. The quote again involves an airplane and Cardinal Cushing at the height of the season of his sorrowful mysteries, but still hard at work making all things new. Here is what Walter Muir Whitehill tells us in an article about Massachusetts entitled, "Who Rules Us?"

"Never underestimate the role played by that remarkable prelate, Cardinal Cushing, in breaking down fences in Boston. . . . Few cardinals have been as simple or as indefatigable. . . . Undeterred by illnesses that would have defeated an ordinary man, he carries on tirelessly. One stormy winter night in 1968 I went to LaGuardia Airport to take a shuttle to Boston. The plane was at the gate, receiving passengers, but both the time and the likelihood of its departure were uncertain. A moment after I had taken my seat, I was relieved to see Cardinal Cushing come aboard, for his presence inspired confidence that Eastern Airlines would get us safely to Boston. They did, and on time, at that. But throughout the flight the cardinal—at the end of a long day—was chatting and joking with everyone, trying on pilots' caps and stewardess' hats, as if he had not a care in the world. Once on the ground at Logan, he had a friendly word, a joke, or a blessing for half the people he passed until he strode out of view into the snowy night."

What sustained this paradoxical man as he disappeared into the dark after his antics, some might say, his apostolate you and I will say, on the airplane where Walter Whitehill watched him with such sympathy and admiration? It was, of course, the conquering joy of those words of Christ: "Behold, I make all things new!" But joy and confidence are not always the wellsprings of energy, nor certainly of holy entertainment in the midst of the sorrowful mysteries of one who is wracked with pain and exhausted by contestation and picketing demands for instant solutions of evils one had fought all his life—and such had become the humiliating destiny of our cardinal. Now only faith, indomitable faith, is adequate to keep alive the joy and to spark the laughter of the sick at heart. There is no one in this church who does not know the nature of that faith as it kept strong in spirit this man of broken flesh, now that the sorrowful mysteries of his beloved Rosary overwhelmed him.

Oddly enough, a classic affirmation of that faith is in the very chapter of the Book of Job that I have already recalled him as once quoting. What Job said of old, Richard Cushing said now, without, perhaps, speaking the words but by the way he carried on in the midst of infirmity and desolation: "I know that my Redeemer liveth, and on the last day I shall rise out of the earth. And I shall be clothed again with my skin; and in flesh I shall see my God. Whom I myself shall see, and my own eyes shall behold, and not another. This is the hope that is hid in my bosom!" (Job 19, 25-27).

It was my privilege to come to Brighton with His Excellency the Apostolic Delegate, when the personal representative of our Holy Father in the United States brought to Car-

dinal Cushing the letter from Pope Paul accepting the cardinal's resignation and sending him warm and loving greetings on his birthday. I wanted to be with him when the news that the work we all had seen begin was at length ended and I wanted to have lunch with him on his birthday. He read the letter from the Holy Father; he read it out loud in his bedroom as a young boy might read an affectionate letter from his father writing from a distant place. It was a beautiful letter; you all saw it reproduced in the Pilot.

Cardinal Cushing used to say, in the midst of his years of sorrow, that he thought Good Pope John was the only Pope who understood him. But this was not true. Pope Paul understood him well and with exquisite sensitivity he obviously delayed as long as he dared the acceptance of the resignation on which, in fact, the exhausted warrior insisted. He deliberately waited until the birthday which would make the resignation not only the more gracious in the eyes of the public but the more welcome to the suffering cardinal.

The luncheon prepared by the devoted Sisters of St. Joan of Arc for the apostolic delegate, for Monsignor McGuire, who served him so loyally, and for me was a steak and a bit of birthday cake. But the cardinal could eat only ice cream, and not much of that, so far advanced were the lesions, the tumors and the pain. After lunch and a little bit of laughter recalling the joyful mysteries and some invisible tears at the thought of the sorrowful mysteries, the apostolic delegate withdrew to phone his office concerning his travel plans. I was left alone with the cardinal. It was a terrible minute but, characteristically, it was he who broke its melancholy. He said: "John, I am through now and I am glad. But when I am gone, if anyone asks if anything I ever said or did may somehow have hurt the Church, what do you think the answer will be?"

I said, and no one here present would have said different: "Archbishop, everyone will say that if you ever even seemed to hurt the Church, even a little, it was in your loving desire to serve it—to make it stronger and more beloved, to build it up as a more powerful means to the kingdom of God!"

He thought for a moment and then he said: "I hope so. Now we have to pray for the man who is coming, to pick up some of the broken pieces, maybe, but above all to build higher and better!"

Then he smiled painfully with a face that showed signs of the beginning of the glorious mysteries, the glorious mysteries in the life, the death and the victory of everyone who loves God and his neighbor as did Cardinal Cushing. He obviously was thinking back to things as they had been 30 years before and he said: "The new man will make it all new again, won't he?"

This was less than three months ago and it was the beginning of the end, but not quite the end. For the promise of Christ and the faith of Job enabled him a few weeks later to walk, head high, out of this cathedral after he had thrilled to the glorious mystery of seeing his successor installed, firmly and unchallenged, in the sanctuary from which the now dead cardinal's voice rang out so often, as priest and later as prelate, the promises of Jesus and the faith of the Fathers.

On that wonderful day, so recent and so proud, your applause of the dying man helped him to persevere, joyful and glorious, to the end, all sorrow being left behind. Your applause of his successor was heard around the world. It told our new archbishop to fear not, that the way will be made straight, the wilderness will be broken open with new paths and new directions, and that God was with our fathers, so will He be with us. God now wipes away all tears from the eyes of

Richard Cushing, since death for him shall be no more, nor pain nor evil any more, for the former things have passed away—and by that same power God gives to Humberto Medeiros the full share of divine power needed to make all things new again!

This is the point of the Church; there is no other. That is the point of the apostolic succession; there is no other. This is the point of the priesthood; there is no other. This is the point of the Christian fact and of all the people who share it or whose lives it touches; there is no other that matters enough to mention. This is why all mysteries—joyful, sorrowful and glorious—blend in the exultant cry: "I know that my Redeemer liveth, and in the last day I shall rise out of the earth . . . and in my flesh I shall see my God!"

In the last I shall rise out of the earth . . . and in my flesh I shall see my God!"

Confirmed in this faith, we commend this valiant newsmaker to history, this holy man, zealous priest, uncommon prelate to the God who gave joy to his youth, the Christ who consoled his age, the angels and saints with whom he will share eternal life, undying love!

PUERTO RICO DISCOVERY DAY

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 19, 1970

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, on this day a great celebration will be held in the Plaza de Colon in San Juan, Puerto Rico. Those American citizens will be celebrating the discovery of their fascinating Caribbean isle by the great Italian explorer, Christopher Columbus, in 1493.

I would like to take this opportunity to offer a word of congratulations to the millions of Puerto Rican Americans living on the island and on the mainland. I would also like to congratulate my dear colleague, the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico (Mr. Córdova) for his fine work in representing his constituency and the good Governor of Puerto Rico, the Honorable Louis Ferre.

Puerto Rican Americans have made an excellent contribution to this country's pluralistic society. They have brought into our culture the rich heritage and traditions of the Spanish-speaking peoples. They are well known for their industry and resourcefulness.

I take particular pride in the fact that one of my daughters, who married a native of the island, is now making Puerto Rico her new home. I am always pleased to see my fine young grandson equally versed in the English and Spanish languages.

Oftentimes some Americans tend to forget the close relationship Puerto Rico has with the United States. Its citizens, like other American citizens, share in the rights and benefits of this great Nation.

Moreover, there are some who forget this land was populated by many and diverse groups of people, immigrating from all parts of the world. For this we should be thankful. There is no doubt in my mind that this rich cultural heritage is what keeps America strong. Certainly, Puerto Rico and its inhabitants are one of the key pillars of this great Nation.

STOP TAX-PAID MILITARY TRIPS FOR PUBLIC RELATIONS PURPOSES

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 19, 1970

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, as a long time member of the House Armed Services Committee, I know of the dire needs of our military to protect our citizens and preserve world peace. The needs are great. For example the Navy needs new and modern ships; the Air Force must have a new bomber; and the Army requires an up-to-date tank.

All of this requires funding, but the Defense budget is stripped to the bare bones. At the same time, millions of dollars are being spent by the Department of Defense for public relations purposes. Military airplanes and ships and other vehicles are being used ostensibly to woo private citizens to the military's various causes. And this does not include the manpower and other emoluments used to entertain civic leaders, and the like, so that they will have a favorable impression of our defense might.

To me, this is an unconscionable waste, especially since I know from my position on the Armed Services Committee that we are dangerously skimming on vital projects necessary for survival.

Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill to prohibit this unnecessary and improper expenditure of Government and taxpayers funds to carry out these trips by the military, which has rightly been criticized by the news media and others.

My bill would prohibit the use of military facilities for public relations purposes, but would not ban the use of facilities for proper news media transportation approved by the Secretary of Defense. I am sure America's taxpayers believe this to be a good position. The bill reads as follows:

A bill to prohibit use of military facilities for public relations purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the movement of civilians on military aircraft, ships, or land vehicles, or at the expense of the United States Government, for the purpose of public relations is hereafter prohibited, *Provided however,* That exception may be made by the Secretary of Defense for the news media and accompanying Federal employees in specific instances.

I insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article in the Wall Street Journal of November 3, 1970, which draws attention to this problem:

WAR OF WORDS: PENTAGON PROMOTION OF OWN ACTIVITIES UPSETS CRITICS

(By Dennis Farney)

WASHINGTON.—Its twin engines roaring, the Air Force T29 lifted off from Middletown, Pa., banked and headed west. Despite the aircraft's unlikely cargo—about a dozen civil leaders from eastern Pennsylvania—a hazardous military mission was under way.

The mission: Enhancing in the face of heavy flak, the public image of the Pentagon.

For five days last March, the T29 shuttled its civilians across the continent: From Middletown to El Paso, from El Paso to Colorado

Springs and back to Middletown again. It took them to lunch with a general, to military briefings, to missile firings and on a tour of the nation's air defense nerve center in Colorado. At the end, each participant got a scroll, signed by a lieutenant general, commissioning him an "Ambassador of Air Defense Artillery."

The flight was another sortie in "Operation Understanding," an exercise in "enhancing community relations and fostering better public understanding" of the Army Air Defense Command. "Operation Understanding," in turn, is one small part of a multimillion-dollar Pentagon operation that's coming under increasing criticism: A complex of public relations programs to explain, interpret and—critics say—promote the military.

WHAT DOES IT ALL COST?

Spread over five separate offices—one each for the Army, Navy, Air Force and Marines and one for the Department of Defense itself—the Pentagon's public relations apparatus is both vigorous and versatile. It turns out press releases, photographs and films. It sponsors traveling exhibits. It advises freelance writers, moviemakers and television producers. For a newsmen or an influential citizen, it can—and often does—arrange a flight in a military jet, a cruise on an aircraft carrier or a tour of a military base.

No one, not even the Pentagon, can say for sure how much this all costs. One critic, Rep. Jonathan B. Bingham (D., N.Y.), asserts that if all the Pentagon's public relations activities actually were classified that way and not under other budget headings, the cost might exceed \$70 million a year. The Pentagon estimates it spent about \$44 million in fiscal 1970 and asks, but may not get, \$37.7 million for fiscal 1971.

Of course, \$40 million is small potatoes in a defense budget that totaled about \$77 billion in fiscal 1970. But in a time of growing criticism of cost overruns and defense spending in general, Pentagon public relations activities are coming in for special attention. To critics, these activities are inherently wasteful; worse they help pave the way for wasteful new weapons programs, the critics contend.

OUR MISSION: PUSH OUR PRODUCT

Each year, each service spends "millions of tax dollars . . . to persuade the public that its particular brand of weaponry is the finger in the dike holding back the enemy hordes," Sen. J. William Fulbright (D., Ark.) once declared. Sen. Fulbright buttressed this argument by citing a letter from an ex-Air Force information officer. Few people realize, the former officer wrote, that "the U.S. military maintains an active, professional advertising department ('information' office) on every one of its thousands of installations around the world." There he described his own duties:

"Our mission was identical to that of any commercial advertising agency: To 'push' our product . . . as hard as we could—to capitalize on its successes, and to conceal its blunders. . . . We were not concerned primarily with truth or accuracy (except in spelling the names of officers), and we were not adverse to releasing false information when advantageous to the Air Force."

Nonsense, replies the Pentagon.

"We don't conduct a selling campaign. We just don't," says Jerry W. Friedheim, a civilian and the Pentagon's second-ranking spokesman. "We do put out a lot of information, because one thing Secretary (Melvin) Laird wanted to do was to make more information available." He explains that when Mr. Laird took office "The credibility of the Defense Department wasn't high."

THE BAD AS WELL AS THE GOOD

So these days, Mr. Friedheim says, "the bad news goes out"—like, the time some

metal skin peeled off the tail during a flight of the costly, controversy-plagued F-111 fighter. "Nobody on God's green earth would have known about that but the Air Force," he says. "But they volunteered it anyway. They volunteered it because it's the thing to do, because Congress is entitled to that information." He adds: "We bend over backward to cooperate with members of Congress."

Some Congressmen might be surprised to hear that. "The basic way the military sells its program to Congress is by coming in consistently with low estimates and concealing, to the maximum extent possible, everything that isn't absolutely required by law to be known to the public," asserts an investigator for a Congressional committee. In fact, some lawmakers gripe, they can't get straight talk from the Pentagon about a relatively simple matter, the true size of its public relations budget.

According to Sen. Fulbright, the Pentagon estimated in 1968 that its fiscal 1969 public affairs budget would total less than \$28 million. But as the House Appropriations Committee remembers it, the estimate was for \$9.1 million. In any event, the Pentagon exceeded both estimates and spent \$44 million. Last month the committee took pointed note of that—"an increase of \$34,954,000 over the original estimate"—and slashed \$7.1 million from the fiscal 1971 request of \$37.7 million. The House sustained the cut, and the measure now is before the Senate.

Providing ammunition for critics is last summer's report by Mr. Laird's "blue ribbon" panel on Pentagon reorganization. "Some of the department's 'credibility gap' with the Congress and the public must be attributed to the fragmented and often confused" departmental organization for legislative and public affairs, the panel concluded.

SOME PROPOSALS

Sen. Fulbright and Rep. Bingham, among others, have proposed clamping a \$10 million lid on annual Pentagon public relations activities, a proposal that was soundly defeated last year. Other critics maintain that the Pentagon would easily evade such a restriction, and they advocate a more drastic solution, a cut of \$10 billion or \$20 billion from the entire Pentagon budget.

One such critic is A. Ernest Fitzgerald, former Air Force Deputy Assistant Secretary who was fired after confirming Congressional charges of huge cost overruns in the C5A jet transport program. Now a consultant to the Joint Congressional Economic Committee, Mr. Fitzgerald reasons: "If it comes to choosing between hiring more flacks or buying more arms, they (Pentagon officials) would choose more arms, I would hope. So far they haven't had to make that choice."

Congress seems quite unlikely to follow Mr. Fitzgerald's advice. In 1969 it did bar the use of defense appropriations for "propaganda" purposes. But Rep. Henry Reuss (D., Wis.), who sponsored that move, says his action has had almost no effect. "Propaganda, hucksterism and flackery at public expense" have continued almost unabated, he said recently.

Mr. Reuss's conclusion was based on a three-month survey of Pentagon publicity operations by the General Accounting Office. The survey turned up a maze of activities that, the Congressman contends, go well beyond simply responding to unsolicited requests for information. Mr. Reuss has asked the Comptroller General to rule whether the following activities violate the propaganda ban:

The Joint Civilian Orientation Conference, eight-day cross-country tours of military installations for prominent citizens nominated by the President, the Pentagon and Congressmen. Each participant pays for his rooms, meals and official receptions, but the Pentagon picks up the rest of the bill; it

put the cost of a recent conference at about \$12,000.

The Air Force Distinguished Visitor Program, a variety of trips for civic leaders to acquaint them with the Air Force "mission and capabilities." Example: The airlifting of 20 community leaders of Lowndes County, Ga., from Moody Air Force Base in that county to Colorado Springs, then to two air bases in California and one in Texas and back to Moody again.

The Secretary of the Navy Guest Cruise Program, a variety of cruises for civilians. Example: An "at-sea orientation cruise" aboard the aircraft carrier *John F. Kennedy* for staff members of Edgar D. Whitcomb Republican gubernatorial Indiana.

THE BIG PICTURE

And, what Rep. Reuss called "innumerable examples" of films, radio and television programs and speakers programs.

Each military branch has its own speakers bureau, and some speeches that result are hardly nonpolitical. In October 1969, for example, Gen. Leonard F. Chapman Jr., Marine Corps commandant, told a Washington, D.C., audience that antiwar "doves" are "good people, good Americans who abhor war." But, he added, "they seek peace at any price." And last December Gen. Lewis W. Walt, assistant Marine Corps commandant, ended a Portland, Ore., speech by declaring: "It is time for the 'silent majority' to stand up and be counted. It is time for all of us to take an active part in the cause of 'peace with freedom.'"

Another of Rep. Reuss's targets is the Army film series, "The Big Picture." The series, which cost nearly \$900,000 to produce and distribute in fiscal 1970, reaches—and presumably influences—the public through about 300 television stations. Nevertheless, an Army spokesman argues, it is still "primarily an internal information tool."

To the spokesman, at least, the TV showings aren't intended to propagandize the public; they merely supplement internal showings at Army posts, enabling the Army to "hit a part of the audience we don't otherwise get." He explains: "Our audience isn't just Army personnel. It includes their wives, their children, retired personnel. . . . Anybody outside these categories who happens to tune in, in other words, is just incidental."

Similarly, Pentagon spokesmen insist that other parts of their information program really aren't intended to plug for military appropriations and new weapon systems. However, the Pentagon now admits that in at least one case the Army was preparing to go too far. This was its ill-fated "Sentinel Public Affairs Plan," a campaign to sell the public on the antiballistic missile (ABM) system.

The plan envisioned a "country-wide" campaign, complete with speakers, information kits, press releases, film clips, slides and traveling exhibits. But the ambitious campaign never got beyond the planning stage. The Washington Post exposed it, and Mr. Laird killed it in early 1969.

Actually, Mr. Friedheim explains, the idea "never formally became a plan. . . . (It was) an Army draft of a proposal whereby they were going to go out and talk to some groups around the country . . . and, in the view of Secretary Laird, do a little selling." But then, he says, "everybody found out about it. It doesn't break our backs that everybody found out."

WE ARE THE WHITE-HATERS

But Mr. Friedheim and other spokesmen do seem at least mildly disturbed by all the criticism and talk of budget cuts. "We think we're the white-hatters in respect to what they (critics) say," declares Col. A. M. Jones, assistant director of information for the Air Force. Mr. Friedheim maintains that a \$10

million ceiling would be unworkable and "unrealistic." That's also the position of the Army's chief of information, Maj. Gen. Winant Sidle.

"My position is: Do you want to scale down our ability to inform the American people?" the general says. "I think the American press would rebel . . . pretty shortly, when they found they couldn't get their questions answered, or they were standing in line before the one guy who's left."

Gen. Sidle had nothing to do with the short-lived "Sentinel" plan; he was in Vietnam at the time. "I don't know enough about it to comment, I'm happy to say," he says with a grin. But he defends "Operation Understanding," a program that began in 1956, when the Army found it necessary to convince cities that the air defense missiles it was installing around them were safe.

As the military sees it, programs like "Operation Understanding" cost the taxpayers little or nothing: The civilian participants pay their food and lodging costs, the Air Force plane is charged off as "part of authorized allocations for normal air crew proficiency flying time"; the missile firings are practice shots that would be occurring anyway. But critics wonder how many military man-hours are expended in briefing the civilians and showing them around.

The whole object, of course, is to convince local leaders the Army is doing a good job; then they'll spread the word around, it is hoped. But it didn't work out quite that well with at least one of the participants in that "Operation Understanding" flight last March: J. Carl Emple, a county commissioner of Chester County, Pa.

Mr. Emple did indeed find the program an "invaluable educational experience" and one that left him "very favorably disposed" toward the nation's ABM system and generally "in favor of expanding" it around more of the nation's offensive missiles. On the other hand, Mr. Emple says, "There is one thing I learned to my sorrow." That was the general attitude he observed among the military men he saw. It seemed "the work they were doing was just something to put up with until they could get to the Officers' Club."

SURPLUS SCHOOLS, SURPLUS FEDERAL FUNDS—BUT NO EDUCATION

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 19, 1970

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, as Congress is repeatedly asked to appropriate more and more taxpayers' dollars to fund so-called education projects, it behooves us from time to time to take an accounting of just what is being done with this educational money. Is it being wisely and usefully spent? Is it being used to upgrade education? Is it benefiting our society, culture, and civilization? Just what is education today?

In my district alone, there are numerous usable school buildings, playgrounds, and properties which have been abandoned to comply with HEW guidelines and directives and by Federal court orders. School facilities, for which millions of dollars of taxpayers' money have been invested by elected school boards, in the interest of quality education, now stand idle and vacant, grown up with weeds and exposed to the ravages of vandalism and nature. This is progress in

education. The use of taxpayers' moneys to deny taxpayers the use of their investments?

Last night's local paper carried a report of \$532,709 in Federal grants for the school system in one Maryland county. The grants included such educational facilities as assistants to guidance counselors, a full-time psychologist, professional parent helpers, Afro-American studies, sensitivity training for teachers and students, and even \$50,000 to expand the volunteer and aide program with a coordinator.

Education once was the opportunity for a child to improve his mind by discipline and exposure to reading, writing, and arithmetic. It now appears that our children have suffered a setback rather than having benefited by the misdirected and wasted money from the Federal Government. Today's education is too involved in business and profit to provide the basic fundamentals of learning. Certainly the parents and taxpayers in the school district would not consider raising their taxes to pay this superfluous free-loading bureaucracy nor to abandon already constructed school facilities.

It is little wonder that concerned parents who have already paid for one school system are now fleeing from the threats of federalized academies in search of quality education for their children through independent private schools whose goals are education and not seeking of Federal funds.

I include a newspaper clipping as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Nov. 18, 1970]

COUNTY SCHOOLS GET INTEGRATION GRANTS

The Prince Georges County school system has received \$532,709 in federal grants to aid in desegregation and attendance boundary changes at 20 secondary schools.

Barry Anderson, school board human relations officer who is in charge of the desegregation project, said yesterday the county now has the largest federal program in the state for easing desegregation difficulties.

The funds were granted by the Department of Health, Education and Welfare in two parcels of \$365,135 and \$167,574. Most of the money will be used to hire additional professional and para-professional personnel for the 20 schools.

The money will be used as follows:

\$21,000 to hire para-professional assistants to relieve the clerical duties of guidance counselors and to establish a full-time psychologist for Fairmont Heights Senior and Mary-Bethune Junior High Schools. Evening walk-in centers for parents also will be financed with this money.

\$21,000 to hire para-professional parent helpers to assist in 10 of the 20 schools with the highest potential for problems.

\$28,000 for the development of a minority studies course which will be integrated into the American history curriculum.

\$130,000 for creation of in-service workshops, seminars and institutes. Part of these funds have been allocated for weekend workshop retreats to familiarize and train staff personnel in race relations and problems.

\$12,000 for the creation of a special student-to-student program and human relations clubs.

\$19,500 for a planning and logistical report.

\$68,000 for training 15 to 20 people in human relations to establish group training programs in the schools.

\$10,275 to hire a full-time drug specialist

and a drug coordinator to identify drug addicts and pushers at Fairmont Heights, Central and Bladensburg Senior High Schools. \$17,500 to establish resource libraries for the staff in human relations and minority studies.

\$10,250 to hire a specialist to resolve the problem of obtaining reliable information on educational needs of minority children.

\$50,000 to expand the volunteer and aide program by 12 aides and a coordinator.

RACISM IN REVERSE

HON. JOHN G. SCHMITZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 19, 1970

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, "equal employment opportunity" has been one of the great and almost universally approved American crusades for the past decade, arising out of a well-justified concern and anger that American citizens were in some situations systematically denied jobs for which they were well qualified, simply because of their racial and ethnic background, or the religion they professed.

While good men have differed, and continue to differ, on how best to give minority group members access to jobs to which they are suited, nearly all agree that this ought to be done.

But in the past 10 years we have moved, with scarcely a pause for breath, from deliberate minority group exclusion to deliberate minority group preference in hiring and promotion, especially by Government agencies and by companies doing a large part of their business with the Government. The goal which nearly everyone affirmed in the beginning, manifested in the very term "equal opportunity"—the goal of making it possible for all men to obtain jobs for which they are qualified, regardless of race or any other irrelevant factor—has been quietly abandoned. Many minority groups have become pressure groups to which Government yields at the expense of employees who are not part of any readily identifiable minority.

Few dare call attention to this fact for fear of being accused of racism. Yet minority group preference is racism in reverse, and if continued will have all the evil effects of the original racism.

On January 30 of this year, the Secretary of Labor directed major defense contractors, which are among the largest private employers in southern California, to pursue an affirmative action program "to increase the hiring and promotion of minority members, and great pressure is being put on those employers to comply. Yet at the same time, sweeping reductions in Federal defense and aerospace expenditures have required large-scale layoffs by these same employers. The result is that qualified, experienced employees of long standing are forced out, often without any prospect for other employment. In several cases brought to my attention, such men have actually had to go on welfare. But at the same time, less qualified personnel of little or no experience are

being hired, retained, and promoted under the affirmative action program.

As several of my constituents, who may soon be victims of this Government-imposed hiring and promotion policy, have eloquently written me:

We are seeing hundreds and thousands of regular employees laid off from aerospace work in your own Orange County area, while at the same time blacks and Mexican Americans are being brought in as fast as they can be found. This is stirring up more racial hatred than a casual observer could ever see on the surface.

The original idea was to "color blind" and non-discriminatory. Now the government has done a complete about-face and is forcing contractors to hire unqualified persons and to lay off employees who have been with the companies for years and years. Supervisors who do not load their departments with enough minorities are told they will "no longer be supervisors." This is grossly unfair. People who had devoted their lives to a company, planning to retire there, are being put out on the street. They are told it is "morally right."

Everyone is afraid to complain. Speaking of government control of industry—this comes near to Fascism itself.

They ask me to speak out for them, and I intend to do so—not only in this newsletter, but subsequently at any opportunity which might be favorable to their cause. Even those who believe minority group preference to be justified in hiring for new jobs would be hard put to defend the firing of present, competent employees and replacing them with less experienced and less competent minority group members. I doubt that this policy can stand exposure, given the inherent sense of fairness in the American people.

PRESIDENT'S EFFORTS TO FEED THE POOR ARE SUCCESSFUL

HON. GERALD R. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 19, 1970

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I am always amazed at how easy it is for politicians ambitious for higher office to find and become indignant over issues they have ignored for years.

Take the issue of hunger. All of a sudden there is a flurry of baseless charges aimed at the President of the United States by pseudo-experts in the field. Some have even written books critical of the President and his aides. I say "books" lightly; they are really political tracts, aimed not at helping the hungry but only at advancing those hungry for power.

Fortunately, their irresponsible claims are refuted by the real experts.

For instance, those who claim that the President has failed to help the hungry have only to listen to Jean Mayer, the Harvard nutrition professor who heads the White House Conference on Food, Nutrition, and Health. He has said publicly that "one of the most spectacular successes of the Nixon administration has been its efforts to feed the poor."

Of course, it is not politic for ambitious Democrats to admit that a Republican President has been a spectacular success at anything. But it would be a lot more honest.

SENATE—Friday, November 20, 1970

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by Hon. MIKE GRAVEL, a Senator from the State of Alaska.

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

O God our Father without whom we can do nothing great or good, but with whom all things are possible, may the miracle of Thy grace be sufficient for all our need. To Thee we commit ourselves and our Nation. We lay before Thee the moral chaos, the spiritual fatigue, the blurred idealism, the personal and corporate degeneration, the dark forebodings and the rebellious yet wistful spirit of our age. Cover our sins with Thy forgiveness. Overrule our mistakes by Thy higher wisdom. Work in us and in all peoples the cleansing and renewing grace that shall redeem and transform our broken world. Grant us strength of will to keep Thy commandments and to walk in Thy ways.

We pray in the name of Him who took the way of the cross and made it redemptive. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

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

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,

Washington, D.C., November 20, 1970.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. MIKE GRAVEL, a Senator from the State of Alaska, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
President pro tempore.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Berry, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 10634) to amend the Interstate Commerce Act and the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 in order to exempt certain wages and salaries of employees from withholding for income tax purposes under the laws of States or subdivisions thereof other than the State or subdivision of the employee's residence; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. STAGGERS, Mr. FRIEDEL, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. DEVINE, and Mr. KUYKENDALL were appointed managers on the part of the House of the conference.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 17923) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. WHITTEN, Mr. NATCHER, Mr. HULL, Mr. SHIPLEY, Mr. EVANS of Colorado, Mr. MAHON, Mr. LANGEN, Mr. MICHEL, Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota, and Mr. Bow were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House had passed a bill (H.R. 18970) to amend the tariff and trade laws of the United States, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H.R. 18970) to amend the tariff and trade laws of the United

States, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Finance.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, November 19, 1970, be dispensed with.

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

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to limit statements to 3 minutes during the period for the transaction of routine morning business today.

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

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate go into executive session to consider nominations on the Executive Calendar.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The nominations on the Executive Calendar will be stated.

AMBASSADOR

The assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Melvin L. Manfull, of Utah, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Central African Republic.