

Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. DENNEY, Mr. DEVINE, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania, Mr. FULTON of Tennessee, Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. MAYNE, Mr. MICHEL, Mr. MYERS, Mr. PRICE of Texas, Mr. ROTH, Mr. ROUSSELOT, Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia, Mr. WYMAN, and Mr. ZION):

H. Res. 1284. A resolution; support for efforts to rescue American prisoners of war incarcerated in North Vietnam; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. FINDLEY (for himself, Mr. RHODES, Mr. SMITH of New York, and Mr. CLEVELAND):

H. Res. 1285. A resolution; support for efforts to rescue American prisoners of war incarcerated in North Vietnam; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. FINDLEY (for himself, Mr. GROVER, Mr. HORTON, and Mr. WILLIAMS):

H. Res. 1286, a resolution; support for efforts to rescue American prisoners of war incarcerated in North Vietnam; to the Committee on Armed Services.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia:

H.R. 19875. A bill for the relief of Giuseppa Alessandrini (nee Belacchi); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOSS:

H.R. 19876. A bill for the relief of Maria Regina Montenegro-Quintero; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

### COL. WALDRON E. LEONARD, THE VETERAN'S VETERAN

### HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, November 25, 1970

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the veterans of this country lost a great and true friend Friday, November 20, when Col. Waldron E. Leonard died.

Colonel Leonard served with millions of American servicemen and then served for them in many important positions with veterans organizations and groups. Knowing first hand the problems of the young man leaving service, Colonel Leonard worked to make the transition from military service to civilian life easier for all who left active duty.

As a veteran, I had a great appreciation for what Colonel Leonard did for all veterans. As a member of the Senate Veterans' Affairs Subcommittee for the past 13 years, and having served 7 of those years as chairman of that subcommittee, I knew firsthand the commitment and the dedication of Colonel Leonard in serving all veterans.

Through the years of working with Colonel Leonard, I got to know him personally. We became friends and close associates, working together to help our veterans.

Mr. President, I had the great honor and sad duty of delivering the eulogy at the Veteran's Memorial Service for Colonel Leonard here in Washington, Sunday, November 23. I ask unanimous consent that this eulogy be printed in the extension of remarks today along with the article "Much-Honored Head of Washington Bureau: W. E. Leonard, Crusader for Veterans" from the Washington Post of Saturday, November 21, and the article "Waldron Leonard Dies; 'Fightingest Veteran,'" published in the Washington Evening Star of Saturday, November 21, 1970.

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

EULOGY OF COLONEL WALDRON E. LEONARD, DECEASED, BY SENATOR RALPH W. YARBOROUGH  
Buddies, comrades, brothers, fellow veterans. The Veterans' Veteran has left us.

Colonel Waldron E. Leonard, 73 years of age, passed away Friday, November 20, 1970, in Alexandria, Virginia. He is survived by his widow, Mrs. Helen T. Leonard, his daughters, Miss Laura Leonard, Mrs. Robert Millan, Mrs. Douglas Gates, a son, W. E.

Leonard, of Tyler, Texas, a sister, Miss Helen R. Leonard, of Buffalo, New York, and seven grandchildren.

He lived out the Biblical three score years and ten—with an added three years—but what a life! What a great life for his fellow man. He lived virtually three lives in that one lifetime.

Colonel Leonard was born at Monongah, West Virginia, September 9, 1897. He attended Virginia State Normal School and enlisted in the U.S. Army in March 1917. This enlistment action was typical of his vision, his ability to look ahead and foretell the course of events. Woodrow Wilson called for a Declaration of War on April 6, 1917. Less than a month earlier, Waldron Leonard, not yet 20 years of age, and with no draft law in the land, saw the shape of history to come, and cast his lot with the four million to be inducted later in that War.

When his service ended in March, 1919, he was a Sergeant, First Class. Like so many other veterans of World War I, World War II, and other wars, when his service terminated, he went west—in his case, southwest to Texas.

He went into business in Texas, but with the coming of the Great Depression, acting with that concern for his fellow man that is the hallmark of his life—the hallmark of a great life—he turned to public service in the form of aiding his fellow man. In the early 1930's he became active in Texas with the problem of unemployment, especially unemployment of veterans. You will recall that there was no unemployment insurance at that time, no old age pensions, no Social Security, very little of anything to blunt the heavy blows of unemployment in the early years of the Depression.

Because of that service with unemployed veterans, Waldron Leonard was appointed director of Veterans Affairs for Texas, at Austin, and served for two years.

During these Texas years he was active in the Texas National Guard, winning promotions up to and through the rank of Colonel.

In 1935, he branched out to a broader field of service, coming to Washington with the Department of Agriculture, then moving to the Interior Department as Legislative Director.

In 1945 he left the Interior Department to take a post with the Veterans Center in Washington to aid the 16,000,000 service men and women of World War II in their readjustment after demobilization—an experience he had gone through in 1919, when there was no GI Bill. His own experience aided him greatly in helping hundreds of thousands of other veterans.

For 21 years, he directed the District of Columbia's Department of Veteran's Affairs. He devoted his life to fighting for a fair break for hundreds of thousands of U.S. Servicemen, returning from the battlefields of World War I, World War II, of Korea and of Vietnam. When Colonel Leonard retired from the Directorship of the Veterans Center of the District of Columbia in December in 1965 he was appointed as a consultant

to the U.S. Office of Emergency Planning for a year, but all the while, never slackening in his service to the Veterans of the country.

For the past 13 years, it has been my privilege to be a member of the Veterans Subcommittee of the Senate and for seven years of that time, I have served as Chairman. In that 13 years, I saw Colonel Leonard often. He was the most consistent battler for Veterans rights whom I knew in Washington. Commanders of the great national veterans organizations (and I belong to the American Legion, the VFW, and numerous other veterans organizations) come and go. And administrators of the Veterans Administration come and go, but Colonel Leonard keeps on and on and during my years in Washington I observed that he had accomplished more for Veterans than any veteran administrator or any commander of a national veterans organization within my experience. He accomplished much more than many senators, many other people of high rank. I have seen monuments erected to people who accomplished less for their fellow man than Waldron E. Leonard. His life was dedicated to serving his fellow man.

But let another veteran friend who has worked with Colonel Leonard all of his years, all of Colonel Leonard's years since 1945, describe him. Mr. Samuel E. Stavisky describes him as follows:

"Over his lifetime, Colonel Leonard was honored by six Presidents, and more than a score of governors, and he was bestowed with some 200 citations and awards for distinguished service to the veterans. Nonetheless, Colonel Leonard was perhaps proudest of an informal tribute paid him by an ex-GI who dubbed him 'the fightingest veteran for the vets.'"

For the veteran, Colonel Leonard fought apathy, red-tape, and bureaucracy; he fought discrimination at every level. He fought to give the returning GIs a fair break in medical treatment and rehabilitation, in making up for time lost in education and training, in acquiring decent housing and jobs with opportunity. He battled hardest for the disabled veterans and for those veterans who faced the most difficult road back to civilian life because they came from deprived sectors of the U.S.A.

Soon after he was appointed Director of the District Veterans Center in 1945, Colonel Leonard expanded services to handle 400 to 500 veterans daily. He ran the Center not only to serve the veterans of greater Washington, but also for GIs from around the country seeking assistance unavailable elsewhere. It was Colonel Leonard's belief that since Washington is the Nation's Capital, its veterans center there should be available to all ex-GIs, regardless of legal residence.

Much of the legislation for veterans that followed World War II bears the imprint of Colonel Leonard's fair-break philosophy. He persistently lobbied committees and members of Congress for legislation he believed the ex-GIs needed. He fought unyieldingly for years to replace the ramshackle Mt. Alto Veterans Hospital with the ultra-modern

veterans medical facility finally erected at the Washington Hospital Center.

And Colonel Leonard took a lead role in searching out the Congressional Medal of Honor winners of all wars by helping them form a permanent organization, and in making them guests of honor at the official inauguration ceremonies for Presidents Eisenhower, Kennedy, Johnson, and Nixon.

I knew Colonel Leonard best in his fight for hospitalization and education for the veterans, in his fight for pensions for the veterans of World War I. In my eight year fight for a Cold War GI Bill, Colonel Waldron Leonard was a constant and consistent supporter. At the same time he aided me with the Cold War GI Bill, he was fighting for modern veterans hospitalization, adequate care of the veterans, decent pensions, and decent treatment.

He was a man of vision. His fight was not just for the veterans alone, but for the entire country. He was a patriotic man and the country is stronger by caring for its veterans. He knew that if veterans were starved out and forced to come into the cities for some kind of break, then the country was weaker. Although the disability payments were small, if a disabled veteran was able to stay in a smaller town, he could live more extensively and more fully have a better life. Knowing all of this, Colonel Leonard fought for decent payments for the disabled veteran so that they could live out their lives in their home communities, a better life, a richer life, and one that strengthened the community.

As we worked together for the Cold War GI bill, stepped on toes, he was not a timid man, he was not a subservient man, he did not go cringing and crawling and begging for veterans rights, he stood boldly upright demanding them. He faced Presidents, Congressional Committees, anybody who stood in the way anyone who was slow or timid in granting what he thought was the veteran's just dues. He stepped on toes, and he rubbed high brass the wrong way when they didn't vote for right treatment for the veterans.

Colonel Leonard was bold and vigilant. Once in addition to helping the veterans of the Vietnam War get an even break with the veterans of the other three large overseas wars, he was fighting for justice for the veterans of World War I whose numbers were rapidly declining, but whose pension treatment was far poorer than that of the veterans of the Spanish American War. The treatment of veterans of World War I is still poor. I see Colonel Leonard now as he comes to my office, erect straight as an arrow at the age of 72 or 73, immaculately dressed, neat in appearance, trim and straight and firm and erect.

With his gold headed cane, his stickpin in his tie, his pride in his appearance, he came with a sense of right and justice that was the heritage of many generations that sought justice. A soldier's soldier, a veteran's veteran, a patriot and a fighter for justice. On occasions I have seen him, where strangers came to see a Senator, look around at Senators and Colonel Leonard, and walk up to Colonel Leonard and call him Senator. He looked the part of a Senator, a general, a colonel, a leader of men, but the man he fought for was a private in ranks, the man who needed a friend, a man who needed a bold and courageous spokesman.

After his retirement from official positions, he devoted more time to the plight of the veterans of World War I. After having devoted his life to a single objective, "a fair break for the GI home from the war," he turned increasingly for a fair break for the veterans of World War I.

During his last battle, he underwent a serious operation. Less than a week later, he quit the hospital, flew from Washington to Salt Lake City, and on October 15 was elected by acclamation National Commander of the

Veterans of World War I of the U.S.A. It was his hope and dream, as he told me not so many weeks ago, to see that the veteran of World War I got justice.

I believe that justice is coming for the veterans of World War I. I feel that the spirit of Colonel Leonard so infuses this place, and so affects all here that the fire of his spirit will spread like waves on a pond until its influence is felt in so many quarters that justice for these World War I veterans will come.

There was a strong bond of friendship between us. I miss him now greatly. These veterans organizations wanted him buried in a veterans cemetery. The veterans of Texas all want him brought home—we consider him a Texan, and the veterans organizations in Texas desired that he be buried there. But his interment will be in Alexandria, near where his loving family lives, and where they can visit the grave and with loving hands leave evidence of that love and those dear memories on his grave.

Colonel Leonard was a doer. He was an executive. He was a driver. But his drive was for the man who needed help. It was the drive of a great heart seeking justice, but he found time among other duties to be a President of the Metropolitan Council of Veterans Organizations, and was Chairman of the Veterans groups that participated in 4 different Presidential inaugurations. While aiding through his center oftentimes hundreds of veterans a day, he also served in civic affairs in Virginia, and from 1959 to 1962 he was a member of the Fairfax County, Virginia, School Board and served as its Chairman.

As was stated a few minutes ago, he really packed 3 lifetimes into this one. Yes, monuments have been erected to men who did far less for their fellow man. He lived such a life that he can fit the poet's dream of what a man's life should be like:

"So live that when thy summons comes to join

The innumerable caravan that moves to that mysterious realm . . .

Thou go not, like the quarry slave at night . . .

But sustained and soothed by an unfaltering trust approach thy grave . . .

Like one who wraps to draperies of a couch about him and lies down to pleasant dreams."

Goodbye, Brave Comrade.

MUCH-HONORED HEAD OF WASHINGTON BUREAU: W. E. LEONARD, CRUSADER FOR VETERANS

Col. Waldron E. Leonard, 73, Washington veterans affairs director for 20 years and a longtime crusader for improved veterans benefits and services, died yesterday at Circle Terrace Hospital in Alexandria.

Col. Leonard had been elected national commander of the Veterans of World War I just five weeks ago, shortly after undergoing a brain tumor operation. His death was ascribed to post-operation complications.

Once termed "the fightingest veteran for the vets" by an ex-GI, Col. Leonard directed the District's veterans affairs department from 1945 until his retirement in 1965.

Honored with about 200 citations and awards for services to veterans, Col. Leonard enlisted in the Army and rose to sergeant first class in World War I. He won his colonel's rank in the Texas National Guard in the early 1930s.

Director of the Texas veterans affairs department in 1932 and 1933, Col. Leonard came to Washington in 1935. He was an Agriculture Department personnel specialist and Interior Department legislative representative before being named chief of the old Veterans Information Center in 1945.

With the surge of veterans returning home from World War II, Col. Leonard expanded the center to serve 400 to 500 men a day seek-

ing help with jobs, training, housing, education and medical treatment.

When he retired, he told newsmen that his proudest achievements were his role in the fight for a new veterans hospital here to replace the old Mt. Alto Hospital, and the designation of certain city jobs for disabled veterans.

A former president of the Metropolitan Council of Veterans Organizations, Col. Leonard was chairman of veterans groups that participated in four presidential inaugurations.

Also active in civic affairs, he was a member of the Fairfax County school board from 1959 to 1962.

Col. Leonard is survived by his wife, Helen T., of the home, 2612 Fairview Dr., Alexandria; three daughters, Laura, of the home, Mrs. Robert Millan and Mrs. Douglas Gates, both of Alexandria; a son, W. E. Leonard, of Tyler, Tex.; a sister, Helen R., of Buffalo, N.Y., and seven grandchildren.

#### WALDRON LEONARD DIES; "FIGHTINGEST VETERAN"

Waldron E. Leonard, 73, who retired five years ago after 20 years as director of the District Department of Veterans Affairs, died yesterday in Circle Terrace Hospital in Alexandria. He lived at 2612 Fairview Drive, Alexandria.

Mr. Leonard, a fighter for rights for veterans since 1919, was called "the fightingest veteran for the vets." Last month, less than a week after surgery for a brain tumor, he flew to Salt Lake City, where he was elected national commander of the Veterans of World War I of the U.S.A., Inc., an organization of more than 200,000 former soldiers.

Mr. Leonard remembered them, fighting apathy, bureaucracy . . . and discrimination on behalf of between wars.

He was honored by six Presidents, as well as governors, and had received about 200 citations and awards for his service to veterans—improving their medical service, rehabilitation, education and training, housing and employment opportunity.

Mr. Leonard was born in Monongah, W. Va. He attended a state normal school and a business college. He served in the Army in World War I and was discharged as a sergeant in 1919.

After the war, he moved to Texas, where he continued to champion veteran causes while operating his own businesses. At one time he was director of the Texas Department of Veterans Affairs two years, and also was promoted to colonel in the Texas National Guard.

Mr. Leonard served on many veterans committees and conferences, his name becoming a byword with such groups.

He was active in lobbying for veterans legislation after World War II and had worked for replacing the old Mount Alto Veterans Hospital with the modern facility now near Washington Hospital Center.

He also helped winners of the Congressional Medal of Honor form a permanent organization.

Mr. Leonard had lived in the Washington area since 1938, when he was a legislative liaison for the Interior Department. He left Interior in 1945 to take the post with the Department of Veterans Affairs, a District welfare agency that provides services ranging from notary public to employment and determination of eligibility for veterans benefits. DVA also helped save people from evictions, obtain pensions and medical care and review dishonorable discharges. It was estimated that the department saved the District government an estimated \$1 million a year in welfare funds.

Mr. Leonard also was active in Alexandria and Fairfax County civic affairs and in the 1950s was a member and chairman of the Fairfax County School Board.

After he retired, he was a consultant to the Office of Emergency Planning.

He leaves his wife, the former Helen Thornton; three daughters, Laura, Mrs. Robert Millan and Mrs. Douglas Gates, all of Alexandria; a son, W. E. of Tyler, Tex., a sister and seven grandchildren.

**SENATOR EDMUND MUSKIE URGES  
MORE IMAGINATIVE APPROACH  
TO HEALTH CARE PROBLEMS**

**HON. PETER N. KYROS**

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 25, 1970

Mr. KYROS. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Public Health and Welfare Subcommittee of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, I have been continually made aware of the need to provide adequate health care for all Americans. While we can be very proud of the quality of medical science in our Nation, it is increasingly more obvious that the delivery of health care to our citizens is less than satisfactory. Speaking before the National Kidney Foundation Convention in Washington, D.C., this past Saturday night, November 14, Maine's Senator Ed MUSKIE expressed important ideas about steps which should be considered in improving our medical delivery systems. Senator MUSKIE has long been concerned about the availability of proper health care in Maine and throughout the Nation, and I would like to bring his ideas to the attention of my colleagues.

His remarks follow:

REMARKS BY SENATOR EDMUND S. MUSKIE (D-M), BEFORE THE NATIONAL KIDNEY FOUNDATION, SHOREHAM HOTEL, WASHINGTON, D.C., SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 21, 1970

Thank you for permitting me to join you this evening . . . to honor those who have promoted the cause—not only of health—but of life itself.

Some of these men are good and close friends.

They are men whose judgment I have come to respect . . . whose profound human decency I have come to admire.

And I am proud to share this evening with them—with Abe Abel—with Arnold Picker.

I think it is appropriate—on an occasion such as this . . . with a gathering such as this . . . at a time in our nation's history such as this—to ask the question: How can we better secure the right to life?

After all, the goal of a more healthy society is not new. It is as old as the Republic itself.

Almost 200 years ago, the Declaration of Independence declared life to be—not a privilege—not a commodity—but an unalienable right.

It is now we who must protect and enhance that right . . . for every American.

The right to life requires health care of quality—health care that is accessible . . . that is comprehensive . . . that is available on fair and equitable terms.

We have not yet satisfied those requirements—the requirements of a healthy society.

Of course, we have passed legislation.

We have appropriated funds.

We have made enormous strides in medical knowledge and medical capability.

Yet, as the Carnegie Commission on Higher

Education recently stated, "Better health care is clearly a high national priority."

Indeed, we seem confronted today by a serious crisis in our health care system—in terms of availability . . . in terms of cost . . . in terms of excellence.

It is a crisis that threatens not only our well-being as individuals . . . but also our vitality as a nation.

To our shame, this crisis has been apparent to poor Americans for many years.

To our surprise, this crisis has fast become apparent to Americans of all incomes.

You know how disturbing the figures are in only one area of concern, 4,000 children . . . between the ages of one and six . . . stricken annually with nephrosis; 8 million Americans of all ages . . . afflicted by some form of kidney ailment; from 50 to 100,000 of whom . . . die each year.

These people can be helped to live—by surgery . . . by drug treatment . . . by mechanical devices.

Yet the fact of the matter . . . is that not nearly enough men and women have been trained . . . to help them live.

The Public Health Service estimates a current shortage of, almost 50,000 physicians; 150,000 nurses and more than 250,000 allied health personnel.

These shortages affect not only the delivery of health care . . . but also its price.

Last year alone, doctor's fees rose 7.3 percent.

That rate of increase was not much different from what it was in 1968 . . . in 1967 . . . or in 1966.

Part of the reason, of course, has been inflation in general.

But another important part has been the added demand for medical services with no comparable growth in the supply of medical personnel. This manpower shortage is also costly in human terms. In many of our clinics—both public and private—medical records are all too often misplaced . . . service is frustratingly slow . . . and no one really seems to be concerned with patients as individual and essentially fragile human beings.

No one has the time to try to get to know them.

That kind of health care can in fact do more to diminish the quality of life, than to enhance it.

What, then, can we do?

Clearly, we can help medical schools grow . . . as well as survive.

We can insist that government be intelligent enough not to force these schools to resort to their endowment funds in order to meet their operational budgets.

We can insist that government aid those men and women who seek entry to our health profession . . . and not—as has happened in the last two years—reduce the number of student loans by 60 percent.

However, we must realize that even expanding our M.D. degree programs will not—by itself—cure all the deficiencies in our manpower supply.

It has been estimated that a doubling of medical school enrollment—under present conditions of training—would result in only about 8,000 more doctors . . . by 1978.

One alternative to more doctors . . . that has been suggested . . . is more productivity from the doctors we already have.

Yet many of them are—even now—working to the limits of their physical endurance.

Of course, we should encourage them to improve their efficiency and their effectiveness—by organizing together . . . wherever practicable; by emphasizing the prevention of illness as well as its treatment, by recognizing the potential of the general practitioner as more than a conduit to the specialist.

But we cannot rely on even these approaches alone.

We must also—at this point in time—make a commitment to increase substantially the number of our paramedical personnel.

And that commitment must be accepted—without reluctance—by the entire medical profession.

Men and women can and must be trained to reform many of the tasks which do not really require a medical diploma.

They must be offered opportunities for advancement in these indispensable careers.

And they must be treated with respect by the medical profession . . . so that they can gain the confidence of their patients.

Physicians' assistants, like physicians themselves, cannot succeed without that confidence.

One area of improvement immediately comes to mind—that of the medical corpsman.

In light of the fact that nearly 30,000 of them are discharged from the Armed Forces every year . . . including veterans from Vietnam . . . isn't it time we offer them the full opportunity to pursue their work in civilian life?

At least 6,000 of them have delivered primary medical care on a regular basis.

In some cases, they can take over as much as 70 percent of a physician's workload.

Each of them represents an investment of roughly \$25,000 in medical skills.

Yet currently, only several hundred of them are licensed as medical assistants in civilian life.

They are capable of making a substantial contribution toward the goal of a more healthy society . . . if we give them the chance to do so.

Clearly, our health care crisis is not impossible to overcome.

We must, however, exercise imagination with respect to how we can better organize ourselves to respond to that crisis.

We must begin asking ourselves some fundamental questions . . . in the area of medical manpower.

We must examine the medical school curriculum and—if reasonable—reduce the time it takes to enter the practice of medicine.

We must explore whether solo practice on a fee-for-service basis is the most sensible avenue to success and—if it is not—develop more rewarding ways of organizing a physician's time and talent.

We must review the professional licensing statutes in our States and—where they are no longer up-to-date—change them to reflect the reality of new kinds of medical personnel.

We need to consider these proposals thoughtfully, and promptly.

And don't forget that we must—at the same time—address ourselves to the problems—of designing a program of comprehensive health insurance; of developing incentives and management techniques to reduce medical costs and paperwork; of establishing new kinds of health care facilities for people who do not really require hospital beds.

Responding to our health care crisis will obviously require us to apply the resources and the compassion which Americans are capable of applying.

It will require a new spirit of cooperation between the Federal Government . . . institutions of medical learning . . . and members of the medical and paramedical professions.

And it will require the support . . . the dedication . . . and the continued persistence of organizations such as yours . . . and of those persons and organizations you have chosen to honor tonight.

It was once written by Hippocrates that, "Healing is a matter of time . . . but it is sometimes also a matter of opportunity."

That opportunity is ours to seize.

WEST VIRGINIA HONORS PEARL S. BUCK—CAMPAIGN UNDERWAY TO MAKE HER BIRTHPLACE A LIVING MEMORIAL

**HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH**

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES  
Wednesday, November 25, 1970

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, there is perhaps no American woman of letters whose achievements have been so widely recognized as Pearl S. Buck.

As a writer of renown, as the only American woman to win the Nobel Prize for literature, as a devoted humanitarian, Pearl S. Buck has truly left her mark on our civilization.

We citizens of West Virginia are gratified that Miss Buck is a native of our State and shares our good heritage. To demonstrate the esteem in which we hold her, efforts have been underway for the past 5 years to obtain and restore her birthplace, a farm house in the lovely countryside of Pocahontas County.

The Pearl S. Buck Birthplace Foundation, a nonprofit organization formed with the encouragement and help of the West Virginia Federation of Women's Clubs, has purchased the home and is now engaged in a campaign to raise funds to complete the restoration and make the birthplace an active institution.

As part of her personal contribution to this effort, Miss Buck recently spent more than 2 weeks traveling about her native State, meeting the people and discussing with them the many and varied experiences of her active life.

Her outlook on life is, I believe, well summarized by a remark she made in my native town of Salem, which was reported in the Salem Herald. "If you don't want to get involved, you don't want to live," she said. There can, I am convinced, be no more realistic maxim to guide an active and productive life.

Between November 6 and 20, Miss Buck made 39 appearances in more than 20 West Virginia communities and spoke before audiences which totaled an estimated 18,300 persons. The tour was personally supervised by Robert Jacobson, an attorney in Miss Buck's native county, who is acting as director of the foundation. It was appropriately climaxed by a banquet at Charleston honoring foundation supporters on November 19 and a visit the following day to Pocahontas County High School.

In 1966 the West Virginia Society of the District of Columbia designated Miss Buck as its distinguished Daughter of the Year and so honored her at its annual dinner. At that time, I had the privilege of introducing her.

This privilege was repeated at the Charleston banquet last week, as I was once again asked to introduce Miss Buck. Urgent Senate business required that I cancel plans to be there in person, but I was able to speak to the banquet by a long-distance telephone arrangement.

Mr. President, West Virginians are proud of Pearl S. Buck. So that others may know of our affection for her, I ask unanimous consent that an article pub-

lished in the Charleston Daily Mail and the text of my remarks to the banquet be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Charleston (W. Va.) Daily Mail, Nov. 20, 1970]

PEARL S. BUCK BIRTHPLACE FOUNDATION SUPPORTERS SPECIAL GUESTS AT DINNER

Pearl S. Buck's West Virginia tour was made to give her a chance to know her fellow West Virginians and for her people to know her and to enlist personal support for the Pearl S. Buck Birthplace Foundation Inc.

The foundation has as its aim the restoration of Miss Buck's birthplace in Hillsboro and making of it a living memorial to the West Virginia woman who has won both the Nobel and the Pulitzer prizes and every other major literary award for her work as a writer of both novels and children's books.

Robert Jacobson, a Lewisburg lawyer, who is (volunteer) acting executive director for the foundation, told this part of the story, at the dinner which also honored those people who have donated \$1,000 and become lifetime members of the foundation.

Fourteen of the donors were honored. Ten more preferred not to be named. Among those life members were Mr. and Mrs. Otto Hall, Mr. and Mrs. George Hoylman, Bank of Marlinton, Ronceverte National Bank, Paul Hawkins of Martinsburg, Miss Pauline Johnson of Alderson, Mrs. Ruth Woods Dayton of Lewisburg, Mrs. Alice Van Landingham of Morgantown; John D. Rockefeller IV of Charleston; Nolan B. Hamrick of Gassaway; Miss Julia Price of Charleston and Marlinton; Mrs. Delmas Miller of Morgantown, the West Virginia Branch, American Association of University Women, and Mrs. Marie Leist, Ronceverte.

He explained that donations ranging from \$5 up will be accepted. The West Virginia Federation of Women's Clubs has donated \$50,000 which they hope will be matched by the federal government. Efforts are being made to raise another \$50,000—the half-way mark has been reached—which the government tentatively has promised to match. This would give the foundation \$150,000 to restore the birthplace and take care of the grounds.

Miss Buck has given all of her manuscripts, all of her many awards, everything connected with her literary career, and her personal research library to the foundation to be placed in the completed home.

"Feeling her home state did not want her, she signed over her assets, including royalties and all she had earned as an author to the Pearl S. Buck Foundation to be used in caring for thousands of Amer-Asian children whom she will never see. She was a multimillionaire but she no longer is. She can no longer afford to do this for West Virginia," Jacobson said.

"I feel this is a real opportunity for West Virginia to join in honoring this gifted daughter . . . a chance to help build a living memorial that will make an impact throughout the world."

Officers of the Birthplace Foundation are Mrs. Marie Leist, Ronceverte, president; Mrs. George T. Hoylman, Gassaway, vice president; Mrs. Fred Hurt, Beckley, secretary; Mrs. Paul K. Yates, Ronceverte, treasurer; Robert S. Jacobson, Lewisburg, acting executive director. Tour directors for Miss Buck's trip through West Virginia were Mrs. Holyman and Mrs. Hurt.

REMARKS BY SENATOR JENNINGS RANDOLPH

Some 10 years ago the Saturday Evening Post published an article about West Virginia that received considerable attention.

There are those who believe that this ar-

ticle, in a major magazine, was the first widespread attention given to West Virginia as a so-called pocket of poverty and the forerunner of subsequent publicity.

The Post article pictured West Virginia, in many instances unfairly, as a backward land populated by semi-literate hillbillies and outside the main stream of American life.

I asked the editor if he would consider an article on "What's Right With West Virginia." He replied that they were not interested. The Charleston Gazette, however, published a series of articles that I prepared on the subject.

West Virginia was then a focal point of national interest in poverty and the rallying cry for those who believed it was time something was done about poverty. West Virginia and other affected parts of the United States have, we know benefitted from action programs on many fronts.

I regret, however, the image of West Virginia as a poor, backward area persists in part to this day. Our problems have been alleviated in degree, but we must understand them in the context of a total knowledge of our great state and its sturdy people.

You who have gathered tonight know of the fallacy of this impression. We are aware of the rich mountain heritage we share and how this accumulation of experience continues to contribute to the life we West Virginians live.

The spirit which infused the early settlers with the will to succeed still persists.

Ours is a unique and diversified culture, tempered by the hardships of life on the frontier, strengthened by the building of a state, and refined by our place in the modern world.

Those of us who have our roots in these mountains share in this heritage. It has contributed to making us what we are, and we in turn contribute to the total character of our state.

This is true of all of us, and it is especially true of our honored guest, Pearl S. Buck is a product and a part of our mountain culture. I am not being presumptuous in saying that Miss Buck's West Virginia background has influenced her life and her work more than just incidentally.

Miss Buck has traveled far from these hills during her lifetime. She has lived in many parts of the world, and she has contributed considerably of herself, both as a writer of incomparable talent and as a compassionate humanitarian.

Now Pearl Buck has returned home. For the past two weeks she has visited some 20 cities and towns, talking with West Virginians and receiving the accolades she so fully deserves.

In West Virginia Miss Buck has spoken on the theme of her autobiography, "My Several Worlds." Her worlds indeed have been several, and I am confident that at this special time West Virginia is prominent among them. I know too that Miss Buck draws new strength and new inspiration from this return to her homeland.

It is no accident that Miss Buck has chosen this particular time to accept some of the many invitations she has to return to West Virginia. Citizens of our State, who have long recognized her many contributions to mankind, are now engaged in creating a living memorial to this most distinguished native daughter.

Many persons have contributed significantly to this effort by becoming life members of the organization that is developing the Pearl S. Buck Birthplace at Hillsboro. Your generosity shows that you need no convincing of the merit of this undertaking.

Working in the Congress in Washington, D.C., for more than a quarter of a century, I have become accustomed to the memorials we have erected to our national heroes. These magnificent structures are monuments

to men and women who have so profoundly influenced their country.

But, in a sense, I feel that memorials such as that being created at Hillsboro are a more human tribute. For what finer honor can a woman have than to see the place of her birth cherished by her neighbors? Indeed, the Pearl S. Buck Birthplace is a monument on the scale people can comprehend and one that can relate to every individual. And this, too, is fitting for a leader who has devoted her life and her energies to people.

Nor will the Pearl S. Buck Birthplace be a static monument. It will be a living institution, contributing to the fuller understanding of mankind just as Miss Buck herself has done so much to ennoble the human spirit.

The Federal Government has recognized the significance of the Pearl S. Buck Birthplace by listing it on the National Register for historic places. I am hopeful that the Government will also participate financially in its development.

The main responsibility for this effort, however, properly must be borne by West Virginians, and I know our people will not be stinting in their support.

The accomplishments of Pearl S. Buck are well known. The magnitude of these achievements has had an impact throughout the world. She has indeed inhabited several worlds, but I believe in none of her roles has Pearl Buck excelled to the extent she has as a warm, compassionate human being.

As such, it is with unusual personal pleasure that I present to you this gifted daughter of West Virginia.

#### TRADE ACT OF 1970

### HON. JOHN M. ZWACH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 25, 1970

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, on November 19, the House passed the Trade Act of 1970 by a vote of 215 to 165. After weighing the advantages against the disadvantages of the bill as reported out of committee, I voted against the trade bill. While I voted against the bill, I do not want this to be interpreted as an expression of satisfaction with our present trade situation.

I do believe that we need new trade agreements on specific imports. In my Sixth District of Minnesota, our mink, meat, and dairy producers are feeling the effects of rapidly increasing numbers of imports of these products. If quotas or agreements could be accomplished through negotiations, there would be less likelihood of retaliation on our agricultural exports, especially for soybeans, which are also produced in my district.

The United States provides one of the freest markets to the rest of the world and other countries have taken advantage of our country by keeping variable levies and tariffs and expecting us not to reciprocate. What we need in the form of legislation is to renew the President's authority to negotiate trade agreements rather than mandatory restrictions. I want Japan and the European economic community to know that trade is a two-way street. I feel strongly that they are taking advantage of us. I expect improvement in this situation and unless there is improvement, I will support restrictive legislation in the future.

#### AMERICAN RAID SHOWS HANOI'S WEAKNESS

### HON. EARL F. LANDGREBE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 25, 1970

Mr. LANDGREBE. Mr. Speaker, the recent raid by a small band of valiant men in an effort to rescue American prisoners-of-war has touched off waves of weeping and wailing by those elements in this country who will be satisfied with nothing less than surrender by our country.

The voices of fear have been heard once more, telling us what a reckless move this was by the President and asking us to quake with fear about the dire consequences that will result from this action.

And yet, I would ask, what was the reaction by Hanoi? Our raiding party went in by helicopter, 20 nautical miles from Hanoi itself, surrounded by hostile territory and miles from any reinforcement. Were they met and crushed by an invincible force of crack North Vietnamese troops?

On the contrary, the raid was conducted without a single casualty. The only loss was that of a helicopter, and this was due not to enemy action, but to a mechanical malfunction. If such an operation can be conducted twenty miles from the capital city of North Vietnam without reprisal, reaction or resistance, why do the architects of surrender continue to tell us that we must act timidly in Vietnam? Why do they cling to the myth that we cannot win this war? Why are they so sorely afraid of this tiny flyspeck on the globe?

Unfortunately, the raid did not accomplish its objective. Whether this was due to faulty intelligence or a security leak no one knows at this time. But I find a great deal of encouragement in the fact that the raid met with absolutely no resistance. I believe it clearly indicates the impotence of North Vietnam and sharply illumines the folly of our no-win policy.

Like the Cambodian incursion before it, the raid at Sontay shows that we are capable of any positive military action in Southeast Asia and that there is very little risk in taking that action. On my recent visit to Indochina, I talked with many high-ranking military officers, the true experts in military matters. To a man, they told me that we can end this war quickly and decisively by military victory.

This would be a faster and in my opinion a much more satisfactory solution than Vietnamization—even Vietnamization with a timetable. Its effect would be more sure and decisive in accomplishing the goals so many Americans have died for—freedom of choice in South Vietnam. It would probably result in the smallest loss of American lives and the smallest expenditure of American tax dollars.

At present, the peace talks drag on at Paris, with no indication that the Communists have ever seriously considered peaceful settlement. Our American POW's continue to languish in squalid

concentration camps, while Hanoi callously ignores our pleading, our cajoling and our concessions on their behalf.

It is unmistakably clear that, unlike the United States, North Vietnam has never deviated from its intention of unconditional military conquest of all Indochina and will be satisfied with nothing less. Negotiations under such circumstances are an exercise in futility. The only way out is by victory for America or surrender by Hanoi; a middle ground, or "political solution" as some choose to call it, is impossible when our enemy has absolutely no motivation to settle for such a solution.

A surrender would be a betrayal of freedom in all Asia; a military victory would preserve freedom and show the Communists all over the world that we will not allow aggression and oppression to be rewarded. Additionally, the positive use of our military power, with its purpose of victory as unmistakable as that of Hanoi, could conceivably get the Paris talks at last off dead center. Such action would at last give Hanoi some motivation to negotiate and achieve that political solution that all of us want, but which, in my opinion, will not be forthcoming until we get Hanoi's attention and then let them know that our patience is very nearly exhausted.

In conclusion, I congratulate those great heroes, those brave men who volunteered to go to North Vietnam in search of their comrades who are being held by the Communists.

#### REMARKS OF LT. COL. JOSEPH SLEGER, JR., AT VETERANS DAY CELEBRATION IN LAFAYETTE, LA.

### HON. SPEEDY O. LONG

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 25, 1970

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I was privileged to attend a Veterans Day celebration at Lafayette, La., this November 11, sponsored by American Legion Post No. 69 of Lafayette, La. Lt. Col. Joseph Sleger, Jr., assistant director of personnel procurement, 8th Marine Corps District, New Orleans, La., delivered a most inspiring and informative address at this observance. I thought his remarks were quite appropriate in this day and time, and I felt that I should share with my colleagues the very important thoughts Colonel Sleger expressed that day. His words follow:

It is indeed a pleasure and an honor to be able to address you here at the Lafayette Veterans Day celebration.

Since receiving the invitation to speak at this celebration, I have given considerable thought to the subject of my talk. In fact, I asked myself several times—what should I talk about—what would be a suitable subject on such a patriotic day as this? First I thought since we in the military service hear so much of the civilian opinion of the military that I could at least, for a beginning, reverse the situation and tell you what we think of you—the civilian populace. Of course, I can speak from a Marine's point of view and then more specifically, from a personnel procurement insight. The 8th Marine

Corps District, which has its headquarters in New Orleans, is comprised of the five states of Louisiana, Arkansas, Oklahoma, Texas and New Mexico. The 8th Marine Corps District leads the nation in Marine recruiting—both for officers and enlisted men. Certainly this must have some implication—and it does. It means simply this—that in this modern day and age when it is supposedly popular to object to and defy authority that the overwhelming majority of the population within the various states which comprise the 8th Marine Corps District—and you are included in that majority—recognize their responsibilities as Americans. In our reports to Headquarters Marine Corps, we have stated repeatedly that the area which comprises the 8th (Marine Corps) District is the stronghold of good old-fashioned American patriotism. I spoke just now of recognizing responsibilities and this brings me to a second point—that of individual responsibility.

We all recognize that large scale changes have taken place during this century . . . changes which can and have affected previous strong home patterns, strong patriotic feelings, and strong beliefs in traditional religion. Our responsibility therefore, is one of concern, a concern to ensure that the family, patriotism and traditional beliefs are maintained where they are strong and reinforced and strengthened where they may have faltered. This concern implies caring enough to become involved in discharging our individual and collective responsibilities as Americans.

There is also a responsibility to tradition—the act of passing these traditions from one generation to the next, and then moving ahead to achieve even higher goals. It should not come as a surprise to realize that one of the strongest ties between generations is the knowledge that the results we want, most are the same general aims and results which the previous generation or generations started out to achieve. In our constant struggle to achieve higher goals we are going to encounter problems. Unfortunately, somewhere along the line, something has been forgotten by many of our people. There is no quick, easy, and absolute solution to many of the world's problems. Remember, we live in a real world, not a dream world. We must distinguish between the world of our dreams and the tough, cruel, demanding world of reality where advantage, gain, and privilege are accompanied by and correlated to work, sweat, tears and accountability for our actions.

In our work and effort to enjoy the achievements of a free society, and in making our freedom more secure, we have learned that if freedom is to endure, it must be shared. We have been faced with the stark reality that when any nation's freedom is denied, ours is threatened. Freedom is not free—it comes with a high price tag which includes supporting those who struggle to gain it. Free men throughout the world must work and fight together for what they believe, or soon they will have no cause for which to work, fight—or believe.

Working and fighting together with free men of the world includes the type assistance we are currently providing in Vietnam. The Vietnam war is, without a doubt, the most controversial issue facing our nation today. While our purpose in the Republic of Vietnam is very simple—to ensure the right of self-determination of the Vietnam people, the nature of the war and our role in Vietnam are extremely complex. However, the complexity of this issue in one way reduces the obligation each of us has, to be thoroughly informed and to take a stand on Vietnam.

Permit me to pass along some basic information in regard to that conflict. First, the Vietnam war has often been erroneously termed a civil war, while in fact it is externally initiated and controlled. Externally

initiated and controlled by adjacent and more distant Communist countries. In addition to our military successes on the battlefields of Vietnam, exceptional progress has also been made in assisting in the education of the Vietnamese children, progress in providing medical treatment and rebuilding roads, churches, and market places destroyed by the Communists.

One outstanding example of this progress is the 3rd Marine Division Children's Hospital in Quang Tri City. Last year, this hospital treated over 12,000 children. This hospital was built and maintained by Marine contributions. I had the personal privilege of being present at the cornerstone laying ceremony for that hospital.

Also, the Armed Forces of the Republic of Vietnam continue to improve. When first formed in 1954, they faced insurmountable obstacles. I had the opportunity to observe this, first hand, while in Halphong in August and September of 1954. Poor equipment, minimum training, marginal leadership, and the continued pressure of the communist forces made progress slow. However, that small but determined country persevered . . . they have been fighting almost continuously since that time. Since 1961, they have lost over 106,000 officers and enlisted men in battle. That's a tremendous loss for a little country of seventeen million people. If we were to equate that figure to our own population, it would mean that we would have lost over one million, three hundred thousand men killed in action. This means, in turn, that on a percentage of population basis, the total military war dead suffered so far by Vietnam is: more than 13 times our combat dead in World War I, over three times our combat dead in World War II, and about 33 times our combat dead in the entire Korean conflict.

With our help, the Vietnamese Army continues to improve. With new equipment, increased confidence, they have gone out into the countryside. They have fought side-by-side with us in every major battle.

But the true measure of their success is the skill and professionalism which they have exhibited during those operations associated with destroying the power of the communist in the rural communities throughout the country. More and more the fighting has been pushed out beyond the populated area and the enemy has had to relinquish control of the people and retreat into his jungle and mountain sanctuaries. What effect has all this had on the enemy? He has had no victories, no progress to show for his losses. Much to-do is made of the few American military men who seek an escape from their responsibilities by gaining entry to Sweden or Canada—but how much have you heard about the 47,000 Viet Cong and North Vietnamese who defected to our side during 1969 alone? Morale has truly become a problem for the enemy! His hopes for a popular uprising among the people of South Vietnam are fading as the government and military of the South grow stronger and more stable each day.

We can point to the progress achieved in the field of education as another measure of strength of the Republic of Vietnam. In 1954 there were approximately 250,000 children in school. Today, there are 3 million young people in school. In the past five years the Vietnamese with our help have built 18,000 schools. In 1965, there were just 2,000 students attending ONE university in the Republic of Vietnam. Today, there are over 41,000 enrolled in five universities throughout the country. In the I Corps area during 1967, 140,000 tons of rice were grown. New strains of rice and improved farming methods have increased output so that in 1969, a half million tons were produced. These are the indications of progress. These are the things which portray accurately the growing strength of the Republic of Vietnam. Considerable gains have been made since our

arrival in Vietnam. Now, more than ever before, we must consolidate our gains and continue to assist the Vietnamese government in their efforts to assume a great share of the fighting. As the Vietnamese continue to progress, we will be able to continue troop redeployments. However, our successes in Vietnam will be meaningful only if the enemy's propaganda efforts to undermine American public opinion are ineffective. As early as 1966, the announced main effort of the North Vietnamese was to win the war on the political and psychological battlefield in the United States as they had done against the French in 1954.

Our President has outlined his program for bringing an end to the fighting in Vietnam. His program provides for an honorable peace which will ensure the freedom of the Vietnamese people. I have no doubt that the vast majority of the American people support that cause of freedom.

We have labored for over five years in Vietnam at a great cost in life and treasure. We must be sure that the Americans who have given their lives have not died in vain. We must be sure that our men who are prisoners of war and missing in action are not abandoned. We will not turn our backs on the families of these men who keep the lonely vigil hoping the enemy will provide some word about their loved ones. We must remain faithful to the ideals for which so much has been sacrificed.

Hundreds of thousands of dedicated young men have fought and are continuing the fight in Vietnam. Their courage and determination should serve as an example for all of us. That same courage and determination which has been displayed in Vietnam is needed here at home to safeguard the true strength of America. It is time for all of us to take an active part in the cause of peace with freedom. This is a great responsibility, and a personal obligation we dare not ignore.

It is only just to say that the majority of the American people recognize their country's responsibilities and obligations to assist free men in their struggle against communism overseas. In acknowledging this recognition of our country's responsibilities and obligations the populace gives recognition to responsibilities and obligations on the personal and individual level. With this premise in mind we must consider that our attentions should be focused on two fronts: our overseas commitments which I have just partially reviewed and our national interests here at home.

In looking at the home front, permit me to reflect on the following statement:

"Your republic will be fearfully plundered and laid waste by barbarians in the 20th century as the Roman Empire was in the 5th, with this difference—that the Huns and vandals will have been engendered within your own institutions." That statement was made by Lord MacAulay, the famous English historian to an American friend of his, approximately 100 years ago.

Closely associated with Lord MacAulay's statement is a copy of some of the so-called "Communist Rules of Revolution," which the Allied Forces obtained in a conflict of the current century. These rules read in part as follows:

Corrupt the younger; get them away from religion. Make them superficial; destroy their ruggedness.

Get the people's minds off their government by focusing their attention on trivialities.

Divide the people into hostile groups.

Destroy the people's faith in their natural leaders by holding the latter up to contempt, ridicule and disgrace.

Encourage extravagance, produce fear of inflation with rising prices and general discontent.

Incite unnecessary strikes in vital industries, encourage civil disorders and foster a

lenient and soft attitude on the part of government toward such disorders.

Cause the breakdown of the old moral virtues of honesty, sobriety, self restraint and faith in the pledged word.

Cause the registration of all firearms on some pretext, ultimately confiscate those firearms and leave the population helpless.

The foregoing "Communist Rules for Revolution" were obtained by the Allied Forces in May 1919 at Dusseldorf, Germany. Over 50 years have passed since the uncovering of these "rules" . . . and in a careful review of each of these rules we can see that the goals of communism have not changed and there is presently an active confrontation with the internal proponents of these communistic oriented rules of revolution!

We do not have to look very far or hard to see the very first of these rules applied on the home front. Corrupt the younger; get them away from religion—make them superficial. Ladies and gentlemen, you need only look at the so-called peace symbol to see this first rule applied. Many young people are familiar with the peace symbol and wear it as jewelry and even paint it on their cars—some even go so far as to overprint it on the flag of our country. They wear it as a fad gadget, not necessarily realizing they are supporting the emblem of those opposed to Christianity—the broken cross turned upside down; the emblem of the anti-Christ; and communism. True Americans will actively oppose this symbol under any and all conditions of use; in the home, business, school or play. As good Americans we cannot be indifferent.

Regardless of how we may try to divert, we always return to the heart of responsibility by asking ourselves the simple question; "What am I for?" We hear a great deal today about what people are against, but only a few ever stand up and tell us what they are for. After you can name and justify to yourself the things you stand for, the next thing is to consider what you must do to support and foster those things. In short, we must decide what we are for and then be for it. And be alert—alert to oppose the relatively small factions that want to see the whole American system come tumbling down in flames, so they can build an entirely new civilization (which they have never described and are not capable of describing) on the rubble. They blame what they call the capitalist system for everything that is wrong.

These factions are regarded by many as being "way out" . . . so "way out" that they do not deserve serious consideration. As a result, we brush them off, and that's the greatest error we could ever make. Though they represent a small segment of our population they have managed to gain the attention and interest of a sincere media and have caused considerable disruption throughout the country. These factions are not aimless or impatient students—they are violent destroyers. Within these factions there is small core that will take risks, that will break the law to force an issue to the point of violence. That is exactly what they seek. When legally charged they immediately demand due process, and amnesty. They try to make a cause to which the more moderate or innocent can be rallied. These factions possess a determination to develop skills and attitudes of violence. Their final effort is to attack the morals of the young. They operate on the theory that "if the moral standards are destroyed the productive energies of the society will disappear."

This may appear to be a bleak and melancholy story, but it must certainly generate one question in your mind . . . what is there for decent Americans to do—people such as you who believe that freedom is for everybody and not just for those who aim to destroy our country and our society? To help, we must get involved . . . involved personally, emotionally, and enthusiastically. In other words, take a stand. Take a stand as indi-

viduals and as groups. Seek out, support and encourage the decent organization; support the various youth organizations that foster patriotism, obedience, loyalty and decency and others which are founded on the basic Christian ethic and the basic patriotic philosophy that has made our country what it is today. Check on the school administrators. Ask them to tell you and show you what they are doing about patriotic education, about education in the roots and traditions of our country. The good ones will be proud to tell you; the others may learn a lesson.

Most of all be attentive to the home. I would venture to say, that no one here can picture a youngster who had a strong home environment burning down a college library. Likewise we cannot picture a youngster brought up to understand the strength of our country, and the durability and brilliance of the American heritage, trampling on our flag or shouting "tear it down."

Ladies and gentlemen, it is said that we have a great country. This is not an entirely accurate statement. What we have is a great country with great people; people who in successive generations have produced a crop of youth who went on to secure and to strengthen our freedom and to bring it to the great condition which it enjoys today.

What else can we do? We have a choice! We can approach the future with hands idle in our pockets, or we can busy ourselves by rolling up our sleeves. We can stand on the sidelines and criticize, or we can become involved and constructive. The person who turns away from responsibility will have much company—and those in such company deserve each other. But a person who cares enough to become involved picks his company from among the finest.

Unlike many things we may aspire to, no one has to wait long for responsibility. Responsibility begins wherever we find it and we'll find it whenever we begin to look for it.

These are challenging times—and I challenge you all to recognize your individual and collective responsibility that the greatness of our country and the greatness of its people is duly passed on to the next generation—ensuring that those who have fought and died for the freedoms we enjoy—those who we honor on this Veteran's Day—will never ask whether they fought and died in vain.

Thank you.

#### COMMUNITY CLUB AWARDS DAY IN MOBILE, ALA.

### HON. JACK EDWARDS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 25, 1970

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, in response to the outstanding work being accomplished by the more than 40,000 housewife members of Community Clubs throughout Mobile, and the efforts of radio station WABB in sponsoring these worthwhile endeavors, I wish to include in the RECORD at this point a proclamation by the mayor of Mobile, the Honorable Joe Bailey, designating October 27, 1970 as Community Clubs Day in Mobile. The proclamation follows:

#### PROCLAMATION

Whereas, all fraternal, religious, civic, social and charitable organizations of the City of Mobile are constantly striving through private means to further the cultural, civic and charitable aims of our great City; and

Whereas, the furtherance of these aims require long and dedicated work, and money to finance worthwhile projects; and

Whereas, WABB Radio Station, as a public service, has recognized this need and assists organizations eligible through Community Clubs Awards; and

Whereas, the 1971 campaign marks ten consecutive campaigns providing over \$52,000.00 in cash Community Club Awards given to the various clubs in the Mobile area for the purpose of assisting in the promotion of their worthy projects.

Now therefore, I Joe A. Bailey, Mayor of the City of Mobile, do hereby designate Thursday, October 29, 1970, as Community Club Awards Day and urge our citizens to join in the observance by taking an active interest in the Community Club Awards program.

Attest.

RICHARD L. SMITH,  
City Clerk.

Done at the City of Mobile, Ala., this 27th day of October, 1970.

JOE A. BAILEY,  
Mayor.

#### ECSTASY IN ROCKFORD

### HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 25, 1970

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the current issue of Newsweek magazine, in an article entitled "Ecstasy in Rockford," describes the success of the "scattered site" housing scheme for the poor in my hometown of Rockford, Ill., the largest city in my 16th Congressional District, and the second largest in the State.

Under this plan, the poor are assisted in purchasing homes in middle-class areas at monthly rates not to exceed what they were previously paying in rent. After 3 years, the city has built enough homes to move 226 poor families out of their former neighborhoods and into middle-class neighborhoods. The article goes on to tell why this scheme is working where sprawling public housing projects and high-rise ghettos have failed.

Mr. Speaker, I am naturally proud that Rockford is in the forefront of efforts to ease rigid socioeconomic neighborhood patterns and give the poor an opportunity to own their own homes. And I am equally proud to have had a part in the implementation of this program in 1967. As Newsweek points out, Rockford's scattered site program, "may be the most successful public-housing experiment in the country." At this point in the RECORD I include the article from the November 30 issue of Newsweek, and commend it to the reading of my colleagues.

The article follows:

#### ECSTASY IN ROCKFORD

Looming out of the rolling cornfields 90 miles northwest of Chicago, the rich industrial city of Rockford, Ill., hardly suggests itself as the ideal testing ground for new programs to help the poor. Its two newspapers—both owned by the Gannett chain—are well to the right of The Chicago Tribune. The political conservatism of most of its 145,000 residents provides the John Birch Society with plentiful supplies of recruits; and in their zeal to insulate the city from "social tinkering" by Washington, the town fathers finally accepted limited Federal aid only after lengthy debate. It comes as no small surprise, therefore, to find in Rockford

what may be the most successful public-housing experiment in the country.

The program is a "scattered site" scheme, in which the poor are helped to purchase new houses of their own in middle-class areas for no more than they used to pay in rent; it was begun haltingly in 1967 as an alternative to sprawling public-housing projects. Now, three years later, the city has not only built enough houses to move some 226 families—30 per cent of them black—out of poor neighborhoods, but in the process has also helped suggest that settling the poor in stable communities does not automatically open the door to crime and doom the area to decay. What's more, as the only hopeful alternative to the current trend toward impersonal high-rise monsters, the project is being picked up as a model by other cities across the country. "If it can work in Rockford," says William F. Lewis, acting director of the city's housing authority, "it can work anywhere."

#### CHOICE

The way Rockford's new program works, families selected to buy are given the choice of six brick-and-clapboard models with bank loans guaranteed by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. Prices run from \$16,000 to \$19,000 with no down payment; instead, the owners agree to pay 22 per cent of their monthly incomes for 25 years. And unlike their counterparts in traditional public housing, tenants are not kicked out when their incomes rise above a certain level.

To dampen the political static created when the plan was announced (local newspapers were barraged with hot letters predicting disaster), tenants are carefully screened and required to attend classes on how to keep their houses up to middle-class snuff. "Untended lawns, stripped automobiles and broken windows would have killed the program," says Lewis. Regulations also called for eviction for antisocial conduct and inspections to make sure the houses weren't becoming eyesores.

As it turned out, most of these fears proved groundless. Housing inspectors found little to criticize on their rounds—here, an overstuffed chair had to be removed from a front stoop, there, an owner was told to keep his motorcycle out of sight. Indeed, the poor behaved so well by community standards that they were criticized by some for not seeming poor enough. When the first family, a white couple with two children, was moved into the first house in 1968, a local reporter noted in his story that a color television sat in their living room. As a result, more angry letters poured into the newspapers, and some neighbors actually came to see the color TV. The houses have from two to six bedrooms, two baths and a full basement, but no garage. Some of them fit esthetically alongside private dwellings costing as much as \$35,000. "In fact," says Lewis, "most of the hollering came from people whose homes weren't half as nice as ours."

As for Rockford's new host of landed poor, the reaction comes close to ecstasy. "I never did know anything to do with a rent receipt but burn it 'up,'" says Gerald Sparks, a black factory worker who a year ago moved his wife and four children out of a crowded public-housing project to a new Colonial on the integrated northwest side of town. His payments are \$112 a month. "Everything I pay helps me buy this place," he says. "It's the first time I ever had a real home."

#### WHOSE INTELLIGENCE IS FAILING?

### HON. JOHN G. SCHMITZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 25, 1970

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, there has been quite a bit of talk centered around a

possible intelligence leak which supposedly compromised the recent gallant attempt to free some of our men being held by the North Vietnamese Communists. These doubts have arisen both from men who are interested in ascertaining the facts of the matter and others who seem only to be interested in sensationalist television coverage for themselves.

If we use some of the information which the Secretary of Defense supplied about the operation and our own intelligence, I think we can safely assume that the mission was not compromised by an intelligence leak.

Secretary Laird, in the hearings before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee yesterday said that:

This particular camp was chosen as a target for the operation because this was the only camp which there were areas surrounding the camp that made it possible for us to make a landing outside the camp for our ground forces—for our special mission ground forces. It also gave us the opportunity to make a landing with the initial assault force inside the camp itself.

So we see that this was the only camp that could be the target of the particular type of operation for which our men had been training. This being the case, if the North Vietnamese Communists knew that the operation was coming, if the operation was compromised; why did they not set up for this operation and destroy it?

No one can have any doubts about the North Vietnamese capability to wipe out a small operation of this sort if they knew that it was coming. The North Vietnamese surely have the capability to do this. So we can safely assume that if the North Vietnamese had known that this operation was planned, and moved the prisoners accordingly, they would undoubtedly have set up an ambush that would, quite handily, have wiped out our force.

The fact that they did not do this leads me to believe that the mission was not compromised.

Some might say that even if the North Vietnamese had known of the operation they would not have set up an ambush. This is a bit far-fetched but since war is a combination of material capability and will we must examine this argument and refute it in advance.

The operation itself, while not accomplishing its mission, was functionally a success. We showed that we can land men within 20 or so miles of the enemy capital, have them on the ground for a time, and then successfully extract them. This is really quite an accomplishment which must cause the Communists no end of consternation. Imagine our feelings if the Soviet Union was to run a successful airborne commando mission within 20 miles of Washington.

The North Vietnamese will be forced to increase their defenses to ward off this type of operation in the future. This means that just that much less war material and soldiers will be going south. There was an incident just recently where a Cuban Mig flew unobserved into a Florida air base. We had to reestablish the reconnaissance operations which had been cut down for reasons of economy.

These two facts lead me to believe that

if the North Vietnamese had known of the mission it would have been decidedly to their advantage to destroy it. This mission was a tremendous psychological victory no matter what the carping defeatists may say.

If we take all these facts into account: First. There was only one enemy prison camp which this particular type of mission could have had as a target—and even if there had been several camps where this type of mission could have been run the Communists still have enough ordnance and soldiers to set up successful ambushes at several sites; Second. The enemy has the capability to destroy this type of mission if forewarned; Third. That because this mission was a functional success the enemy must now divert men and materials from his war effort in the south and west; Fourth. The functional success of this mission makes it more likely that future attempts will be made to rescue our men; then I think that we can safely assume that there was no intelligence leak.

The Secretary of Defense should be congratulated; not interrogated.

#### THREE FLAGS TO ACCOMPANY VOLUNTEER TO ANTARCTICA TO BE RAISED OVER THE SOUTH POLE

### HON. JAMES A. BYRNE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 25, 1970

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, one of my young constituents, Sk2. Matthew F. Lewandowski, volunteered for Operation Deep Freeze, which is a year's assignment with the Navy in Antarctica. Out of many volunteers, Matt was one of 15 men selected by the Navy for this important project, and I am proud that he is from my congressional district in Philadelphia. Matt was the only member of the team chosen from Pennsylvania.

Several months ago Matt approached me with the suggestion that he take with him a U.S. flag, a Pennsylvania flag, and a City of Brotherly Love flag to be raised over the South Pole.

I was privileged to present Matt with the U.S. flag, which was flown over the U.S. Capitol on August 15, a holy day of obligation, the Feast of the Assumption. It is with great pleasure that I bring to the attention of my colleagues the transcript of the presentation ceremony held on September 12 in Mayor Tate's reception room in Philadelphia.

PRESENTATION OF FLAGS OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, STATE OF PENNSYLVANIA, AND THE CITY OF PHILADELPHIA TO MATTHEW F. LEWANDOWSKI, JR.

Before: Honorable Francis X. McClanaghan.  
Present: Congressman James A. Byrne, Member of the House of Representatives of the United States, State Representative Stephen R. Wodjak, State of Pennsylvania, Francis J. Lederer, Member of the Veterans' Advisory Committee, on behalf of the City of Philadelphia, Henry J. Wyszynski, President of the Polish Congress, State of Pennsylvania.  
Judge McCLANAGHAN. Ladies and gentlemen, this is rather a unique occasion for

which we have gathered here, in that one of our young citizens volunteered for a year's service in Operation Deep Freeze in Antarctica for the United States Navy. Imbued with a love of country, state and city, he conceived the idea of taking with him to the Antarctica the flag of the United States that has flown over the White House, the flag of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, and the flag of the City of Philadelphia.

In these days when patriotism is regarded as something from the dark ages, it is real refreshing to see such devotion and a sense of pride in this young man who has such a regard for his country.

I will now present to you the Honorable James A. Byrne, who will present to Matthew Lewandowski, Jr., of the United States Navy, the flag of the United States.

Congressman Byrne. (Applause)

Congressman BYRNE. Thank you, Judge McClanaghan.

Specialist Lewandowski, Representative Wojdak, relatives and friends of Matt Lewandowski, and ladies and gentlemen: It is a great pleasure for me today to be here to present this flag to Matthew Lewandowski because not only was it his own idea but his devoted sense of patriotism which has driven him forward to attain this goal. He was down to see me at the Customs House about a month ago with the idea and I told him at the time that I thought it was a fine idea. He said, "The astronauts put a flag on the moon and I want the people to know that I would like to put a flag on the South Pole, accompanied with the State of Pennsylvania flag and the City of Brotherly Love's flag." I thought it was a grand idea. And so on behalf of Matthew Lewandowski and all Americans, and all the boys in the service, at a time like this when a man like Matt steps forward as a member of the Navy and stands out as an American who is proud of the flag and not one of those individuals who burn the flag, he deserves a lot of credit. He volunteered to go to the South Pole on this expedition, I might say, and I know what he is going to go through, because as a member of the Armed Services Committee, we are briefed about once a month on what is going on throughout the world.

Matthew, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania and all Polish people throughout America congratulate you, and it is my personal privilege in this City Hall, the City of Brotherly Love, to present you with the flag of the United States that was flown over the United States Capitol on August the 15th, which was a holy day of obligation, the Feast of the Assumption, and it is my honor to present this flag to you and wish you health and wealth.

To the Polish people who are great Americans, let me say this to them, niech zije Polska. (Let Poland live.)

Judge McCLANAGHAN. Thank you, Congressman Byrne.

It is now my privilege to present to you the Honorable Stephen R. Wojdak, the State Representative who will present the flag to the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania to our young man, Matthew Lewandowski, Jr.

Representative Wojdak. Judge McClanaghan, Congressman Byrne, Mr. Lederer, Matt Lewandowski, Jr., parents of Matt Lewandowski, Jr., and friends and neighbors of Matt: It is a particular honor for me to be here today and to know that Matt came to me and selected me as the person he would like to have present him with the flag of this Commonwealth. I think the man is to be congratulated, and I wish to extend a personal note of congratulations on behalf of myself and all of my constituents in the District, many of whom are neighbors and friends of Matt's.

On behalf of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, I extend this note of congratulations to Matthew Lewandowski for having

been one of fifteen men selected to take part in Operation Deep Freeze. He is going to be spending a year in the Antarctica as part of this Navy team to do certain developments in the ice regions of the Antarctica, and I think it is a particular honor to all of us in the City of Philadelphia and the State of Pennsylvania to know that Matt is the only young man who was selected from the City of Philadelphia, and, for that matter, from the State of Pennsylvania.

Matt, I congratulate you on that and I congratulate the parents of Matt Lewandowski, and I wish you all luck. (Applause)

Judge McCLANAGHAN. At this time it is my opportunity to present an old friend and a distinguished young man who served ably as chief of county detectives in the City of Philadelphia, who has been very active in veterans' affairs, who will now present the flag of the City of Philadelphia to our young Navy man, Matt Lewandowski.

FRANCIS J. LEDERER. Thank you, Judge McClanaghan.

Congressman Byrne, Representative Wojdak, friends of our very young man and inspiring Matt Lewandowski. It is my pleasure to come here this afternoon on behalf of the Veterans' Advisory Commission of the City of Philadelphia and his Honor Mayor Tate, who cannot be here today.

From time to time I have either been involved or overheard through different people in our city government of young men who have gone away and have requested flags of our City of Philadelphia, but this is the first occasion where I can recall that a young man sought to obtain a flag of his city, the City of Philadelphia, prior to going overseas, and it is inspiring to me and I congratulate Matthew.

Within the Veterans' Advisory Commission and the United States Veterans Council in Philadelphia, I don't think anyone can challenge the fact that within our organization there is no more patriotic group of men than the Polish American war veterans. I think you will find as you go along in life that the Polish community is synonymous with patriotism and Americanism. So, on behalf of the veterans in Philadelphia and our city government, it is my privilege to present the flag of the City of Philadelphia to young Matthew and wish him well. (Applause)

The COURT. I think it is a good time now that we give Matt a chance to talk to some of his friends here, because after he travels pretty near twelve thousand miles it is going to be rather difficult for him to talk at all. Here is a man of whom we are all proud, Matt Lewandowski.

MATTHEW F. LEWANDOWSKI, JR. Thank you, Judge McClanaghan, Congressman Byrne, State Representative Stephen Wojdak, Mr. Lederer, friends and relatives.

The Antarctic world is an exciting, unique and adventurous world of man against nature in a most inhospitable environment. There are no palm trees, no sandy beaches, no golf courses, and the swimming is a bit cold. Temperature variation of up to 100 degrees within a period of only a few weeks have been known to occur. Freezing weather accompanied by high wind will freeze inactive human flesh in one minute.

Far more important than the environmental state is the governmental state of affairs which exists. Although the name "Antarctic" is well known to all, perhaps we do not appreciate the fullness of the continent. Antarctica is governed under an eight and one-half year old treaty signed by sixteen nations vowing to peacefully develop and explore the icy wilderness. This is a treaty which says, "It is in the interest of all mankind that Antarctica shall continue forever to be used exclusively for peaceful purposes." It is the one continent in the world where all treaties established have worked, where

no blood has ever been shed in war, and where no shot has ever been fired in anger.

Antarctica is in the interest of all mankind a humanitarian challenge. It is a challenge to scientists of the National Science Foundation and to service personnel like myself. A challenge, no matter how small, is accepted and attacked with full vigor, accepted with real patriotism, holding the idea of justice and dignity for all mankind, for human good, working to achieve worthy greatness and not empty prestige or power.

Although I do not fully realize the extensive effects of Operation Deep Freeze on mankind, I have faith in its intentions and success. I have been taught to believe in man until proven otherwise. I am the clearest mirror of my parents' performance, the truest measure of whether I live up to their ideas. By my participation in this human exercise, I hope to do my share to help mankind, loving America and working to make it worthy of love and respect.

As I stand here today, I am proud to receive the flags of our country, our city, the City of Brotherly Love, and our state. I am also proud to be able to fly over Antarctica, the land of tranquility, this symbol in hope of man to live in peaceful coexistence.

Thank you. (Applause)

Judge McCLANAGHAN. You heard him, ladies and gentlemen, and now you know why we are so proud of him. We are privileged to have with us today other members of our city government, Councilman Campbell in the back here, Deputy Sheriff Gallagher, the head of the Veterans' Advisory Committee, and other members of our court assembly.

As you know, Matt is employed in the data processing part of the court administrator's office, and he is on leave at the present time while he is fulfilling his service hitch.

I am now going to call upon somebody that Matt knows slightly. I know him, too, after having been my court officer and the father of our young man, Matt Lewandowski, Senior.

MATTHEW F. LEWANDOWSKI, SR. Thank you, Judge McClanaghan.

Congressman Byrne, Senator Wojdak, Deputy Sheriff Lederer, family and friends: It is a great honor for me today to stand up here and express my thanks to all of you for coming here to show respect for my son. I am real proud of him. I wish to thank Mr. Henry J. Wyszynski, who has taken time out from his duties to be here, also Councilman Campbell, Deputy Sheriff Gallagher, and all the personnel from around City Hall who are present here today. Thank you very much.

Judge McCLANAGHAN. How about the president of the Polish Congress coming up here and checking up on that Polish expression used by Congressman Byrne.

HENRY J. WYSZYNSKI. Thank you, Judge McClanaghan.

Congressman Byrne, Representative Wojdak, Mr. Lederer: It is very proud the Polish people are today for the respects that are being paid to one of our sons, the chosen young man who had a great idea and brought it to our State Congressman and to the attention to the mayor of our city. We are all very proud of him, not only in the community, but those in the service who have made such a shining and outstanding record such as Matt Lewandowski, Jr., who has shown us by his thoughts and by his service in the United States Navy what true devotion to duty really means.

I want to thank you, Judge McClanaghan, for asking me to express myself, and I would like on behalf of the entire Polish community to wish Matt God speed.

Congressman Byrne always tells me when we meet, "Jeszcze Polska nie zginieła do puki my żyjemy." (Poland is not lost yet as long as we are alive.)

Judge McCLANAGHAN. I wish to say that it is very fitting that these ceremonies be

conducted in the City of Philadelphia because this has always been recognized as a Navy town. I was a little upset about a week ago when I happened to see one of the letters in the Philadelphia Bulletin and the response there which indicated that there is no one known as the Father of the American Navy. Well, you can all tell your shipmates, Matt, that in Philadelphia we know there is a Father of the American Navy and he was a Philadelphian, too, by adoption, Commodore John Barry. He wasn't Polish, he came from County Wexford.

We are just as proud of you and your taking up the cudgels on behalf of the people of Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, and the nation the same way that Commodore Barry did, and it is in the spirit of brotherly love that you are going to the Antarctica. It is a cold spot down there that is going to be filled with warm hearts, I know, Matt, and we wish you God speed and we look forward to your safe return.

Thank you very much for coming. (Applause).

#### UTILIZING THE CAPABILITIES OF NASA AND THE AEROSPACE INDUSTRY IN THE ENVIRONMENTAL FIELD

**HON. THOMAS N. DOWNING**

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 25, 1970

Mr. DOWNING. Mr. Speaker, some of us have expressed a great deal of concern for our Government's oversight in failing to fully utilize the great capabilities of NASA and the aerospace industry in the environmental field.

My friend and colleague, Representative BOB CASEY of Texas, testified to this great undeveloped potential when he appeared before the Government Operations Subcommittee on Conservation and Natural Resources. His is an excellent statement, which I believe should be brought to the attention of our colleagues in both Houses, and to the American people.

My colleague, whose district includes NASA's Manned Spacecraft Center near Houston, is fully familiar with the aerospace industry and its contributions to our space effort, for I had the great privilege to serve with him for several years on our Science and Astronautics Committee. I not only commend him for his statement, but also my distinguished friend, Representative HENRY REUSS, chairman of the subcommittee for holding these important hearings on the role of the aerospace and defense firms in solving problems of environmental control. The statement follows:

STATEMENT OF REPRESENTATIVE BOB CASEY

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Subcommittee:

I am grateful for the opportunity of appearing before you as a witness in these very important—and very timely—hearings. I can think of no greater problem, no more irritating national itch, than the one you are looking into here: the roll our great new technologies can play in relieving some of the pollution crises that dominate so much of our thinking today.

I have come to speak, not as an expert in ecology or on the interaction of man with his environment, but as a concerned citizen with some experience in aerospace industry's

capabilities. I have watched with awe, as I am sure you all have, the technological triumphs of the space age: the conception and creation and operation of the great space ships that explore the whole environment of man, the depths of the solar system within which our world floats, alone, blue, beautiful, teeming with life—and beset by many difficulties of our own making.

I shared with you and with a quarter of a billion others that great victory over the unknown—the first steps of man upon the moon. That triumph was not one of technology alone; it was one of national will as well. We have proven, to ourselves and to the world, that we can select and surmount incredible challenges, that we have the brain power and the courage to do the very difficult—and to do it very well. We know how to harness the best talents in government, in our schools and universities, in industry and business to get a job done. We understand teamwork, teamwork on the scale of Apollo which organized and managed nearly 400,000 people at its peak and which met its specifications in time, money, and performance. It was a massive pulling together of human energies, both physical and intellectual. The world has not seen its like before.

The question you are addressing here, it seems to me, is: "Will the world see its like again—but this time aimed at cleaning up our garbage dumps, sweetening our waters, purifying our air, and making green again our hillsides, forests, fields, and shores?"

I believe we will, but only if we go about it right.

As I see it, we have got to make some fundamental distinctions. We must understand the difference, for example, between a cosmetic and a real solution. A fence of pine trees in front of a junk yard does wonders for the sensibilities of the citizens that drive, walk, or ride before it; but does hiding the mess cure it? Or, worse yet, does hiding the mess contribute to its continued existence? There is something about the stark, visible honesty of filth and garbage that leads to personal action—local social, political, action—to have it changed. A cosmetic cover, while most agreeable, does little to unleash those forces of human will, indignation, and pride which we all know to be so effective—if marshalled, when and if aroused.

Real solutions are even more difficult. Take the simple problem of energy. We are today, I am told, facing a real crisis in energy sources. Over the next few years, we will have to triple our electric power generation capability in order to keep up with demand. That demand, by the way, is not expected to be the result of simple population expansion. No; it is going to be the result of our society's ever-increasing demand for machine power to replace human muscle, human time, human wear and tear. This is the mark of a technological society, after all; machines free men and women from drudgery, from dulling labor, and provide that glimpse of freedom called leisure. But energy for public consumption today comes basically in two forms: the conventional, fossil-fuel generator and the still exotic nuclear power plant.

How should we, whether voter or legislator, pick between the two? Certainly, there are rivers still undammed that could alleviate the problem—but at what expense to the picture we all have of free-flowing streams of clear water over clean rocks. And even if every creek and gully had a hydroelectric plant built in, we would still be far short of what we will need in the year 2000.

So we are going to have to make tradeoffs between the various bad things we will have to do to our environment just to be ourselves, a modern, science-based technological society. A nuclear power plant may be smog- and soot-free, but it sure can heat up the stream or lake it sits beside. What then happens to the plants and animals that, up to

now, have lived there in equilibrium? I'm not sure we know—or have readily at hand the means for knowing.

Take the other extreme: build coal-burning power plants throughout the land wherever the shortages demand; let the railroad drive its steel and gravel strips across the countryside to bring in fuel; let the mines work to produce the coal and despoil the countryside, whether in Pennsylvania or West Virginia or in Wales or Germany. Let the smoke of the power plant befoul the air—with what unknown, unmeasured consequences for the present, let alone the future, generations in this land.

Energy is a basic problem in the America of today and tomorrow, but only one. What about beer cans on the roadside—or bottles that have to be disposed of too? What is the economically viable equivalent to DDT—now being banned throughout the U.S.—that has realistic alternates to detergents, whose phospho subtle dangers of its own? What are the phosphate residues today kill our bass ponds and make our rivers foam where they should run sparkling clear? What really can be done about oil spills, inshore or off, without strangling the very commerce that provides us all a standard of living second to none and a quality of life envied by all?

I have touched, in broadcast fashion, on some of the many pollution elements that beset our fair land, air, and waters. There are others, however, to which we have become so accustomed that we care little about the search for action-oriented solutions. In agriculture alone, we lose some \$4 billion each year because of common weeds infesting our fields—a form of pollution all too common, all too normal, to become part of today's great debate.

So what are we trying to do? We are trying to find workable long-range answers to real, long-range problems. We are seeking only a part of the answers in technology, for the fundamental answers here lie in the field of social and political and legal process. Pollution, as a problem, is in itself only a symptom of a society grown a little too big for its britches. What we've got to deal with are the basics of civilization as we have come to know it: power, food, shelter, water, land use, transportation and communications, productivity, and conservation, management, or replenishment of natural resources.

Technology, and the science upon which it is based, have a great role to play here—but they are not the whole answer. Let me illustrate with a recent example. In August of 1969, the Gulf Coast was hit by a pretty bad storm, Hurricane Camille. We had winds hitting 200 miles per hour and tides flooding 20 feet above normal. We lost a major part of several towns along the Mississippi coast—but the death toll was surprisingly low in comparison to the severity of the storm. Don't forget, this is the storm that put ocean-going ships into the middle of downtown. The Weather Bureau says that 50,000 people would have died except for the early warning, the storm tracking, and the ability to get evacuation started before the hurricane hit. All of that comes down to technology—much of it space technology—harnessed in the service of mankind. It was the ESSA and NASA satellites that first saw and pinpointed the storm, and it was the computers and communications facilities that worked up the predictions early enough to give the authorities time to act, moving people out and making provision for their survival.

This is a real contrast to last week's disaster in the Bay of Bengal, where the storm was predicted all right but the system of information and action was inadequate to make use of the information in time.

Science and technology are not enough to avert disasters or solve environmental problems—there must be human action in an

organized way directed to a given, understood end. That kind of action is usually based on information, or understanding of the direct and indirect results of what is to be done.

Now it seems to me that this is the area most overlooked in the current press to do something about pollution. We are horrified by the symptoms of the disease, at it were, and try to treat piecemeal without stepping back and looking at the whole, at the interactions of all the pieces. Long-lasting, beneficial solutions are going to have to be pretty fundamental if they are not simply going to result in greater problems for the next generation to cope with. This, of course, is one of the characteristics of technology if not very thoughtfully applied: in solving one problem it creates another. The automobile gives us nearly total freedom of personal movement—but the cost is high, in atmospheric pollution, in concrete spreading over the landscape, in traffic deaths, in congestion. The answer is obviously *not* the immediate banning of the automobile; think of the social and economic consequences of such an action! There are many much more subtle interactions, however, whose full span we do not or cannot see and understand. As Dr. Phil Handler, President of the National Academy of Sciences, pointed out at Houston last month, the substitutes for DDT are turning out to be more dangerous to man directly than the chemical they replace—and we don't even know as much about the eventual impact on the ecology.

We must begin, I believe, by looking upon our environment as a whole, a whole that includes man and his works as a part thereof. We must learn to measure all the significant parameters of that environment, not just for the sake of science, but for the sake of understanding how the pieces fit together and how the change in our element affects all the others. We have to develop mathematical models that put together related phenomena and predict what is going to happen. Weather forecasting is just one example of this kind of modeling; if we measure what is going on throughout the atmosphere around the globe, if we combine properly the power of the computer with our global weather satellite capabilities, we will be able to predict accurately what will happen to the climate many days in advance.

Once a model of this kind exists, it can be used to measure not just what is going to happen if everything is left alone but what may happen if certain of the factors are altered or manipulated. This kind of simulation will let us see the effect of different strategies, will show us what the various tradeoffs are among a related family of decisions. As you know, this technique of tradeoff analysis is well-developed in the aerospace business in its application to hardware; it has been called the "systems approach" and is fundamental to the success of our major technological enterprises in civil and military programs. What we need to do is to expand that technique to encompass ourselves and our physical environment. Only when we begin to see beyond the ends of noses, only when we can balance the long and short-term effects of any given set of policies or decisions, will we be able to say we are managing the dynamics of our future.

Developing these kinds of environment models is difficult, to say the least. But it is being worked on today and makes up a significant part of the national space program right now. Let me cite a few examples. I have mentioned the weather satellites earlier: today, they are capable of measuring temperatures all the way from the surface of the ocean to the top of the atmosphere; they can trace the movement of clouds and derive therefrom the velocity of winds; they can measure the moisture content of the air.

We are beginning to be able to put these kinds of observations together with other space measurements of the sun and the heat balance of the world to understand this great energy mechanism we call weather. A long range international program, the Global Atmospheric Research Program, has as its goal the development of such a worldwide weather model—and it can only be done with the help of space systems.

There is another example, much closer to home, of the power of modeling the natural environment. Last year, Operation Foresight was put into effect to minimize the disastrous effects of spring floods in the upper midwest. This called for combining the resources of many different institutions and organizations—the Corps of Engineers, the Department of Agriculture, the Red Cross—but the key was the prediction of the snow pack melting and runoff. And these predictions were made possible by remote sensing from spacecraft and aircraft as well as direct on-the-ground measurements. Because we were able to begin defensive measures early enough, because we could predict the amount of water we would have to handle and the rate at which it would come, we were in pretty good shape when the spring came. More than \$200 million worth of damage was prevented by knowing what was likely to happen and being able to act intelligently in response to that knowledge.

Let me jump from the real and immediate examples to some of the potentials we have in the future. Take the so-called solid earth. In fact, we are learning that the earth is as dynamic in its own way as is the atmosphere around it. Continents are on the move, great sheets of rock are being pushed into each other as a result of the recently discovered sea floor spreading. Our geodetic satellite programs are mapping these movements and leading us to an understanding of what they mean and, quite literally, where will they take us. But in relation to the subject at hand, this kind of understanding has great importance. Today, we use the oceans as sewers, pouring in all matter of poisons, garbage, and junk ranking from left-over nuclear wastes to the familiar nitrogen and phosphate. We don't know the circulation patterns well enough to tell what happens to these now—or what may happen in the future. We haven't modeled our oceans well enough to know what their carrying capacities are, or what their biological balances should be. But we are beginning to do so—and again it is taking the global coverage capabilities of satellites to provide the information. One intriguing waste disposal mechanism has been recently suggested, based on our new knowledge of ocean floor spreading and moving continents. If we could model these motions accurately enough, we could find the places where the great sheets of slowly moving rock slipped one under another, diving down into the mantle of the earth. This would be the place to put our wastes, where they would be then carried into and incorporated with the molten materials on which the continents float. We do not yet know how to do this, but this may be a long-range answer to the kind of disposal problem we have just had with poison gases and which we will continue to have with radioactive materials. But before we can know whether or not it provides a solution, we must do much more research and develop a more complete understanding of the physics of our planet. The space program is working in this direction both in NASA and in other institutions, including the aerospace industry.

An interesting point came to light recently relative to ocean pollution from oil: A recent Gulf Coast oil well leak was looked at from a NASA earth resources airplane flying out of Houston to see what could be learned about measuring this kind of problem. By

using different kinds of sensors, it turned out that the thin layer of oil was easily distinguishable from the water even when, on the surface, there appeared to be no oil present. This technique was so successful I understand the Coast Guard is incorporating it into its operational oil spill monitoring program. Of course, today we are mostly limited to aircraft, with their short range and limited fields of view. Soon, however, we may be able to count on satellites that can monitor whole oceans, reporting on natural and man-made oil spills in time to permit remedial—or preventive—action. Again, the technology of aerospace here is only part of the solution—it permits detection and measurement and location of a problem, but it takes people to take the necessary action to contain or repair the damage.

These same techniques, first in aircraft and then in spacecraft, are being explored for application to a whole series of real, down-to-earth problems. NASA has brought together other Departments and agencies in their Earth Resources Program to see what can be done with remote sensing from space, using the various approaches of photography, radar, radiometry, and spectrometry. This field is still experimental, of course, but the promise for the future is already apparent.

It looks as though we can spot the onset of crop diseases from orbiting sensors even before the farmer on the ground can notice the change—and we can see the extent of damage much more clearly in the large overview we get from space than by piecing together little jigsaw puzzle elements from ground reports. Add to this capability rapid communications and long range agricultural planning and we have an ability to react quickly and effectively. Airborne and spaceborne sensors have already proven their useful ability to spot and monitor remote forest fires even though they are not yet visible; coupled with quick reaction firefighting systems, this capability can help reduce the half-billion dollar annual loss of lumber. Geological exploration from space has already been shown to be useful; the big picture lets us see and relate features too large to recognize on or near the surface of the ground. I have already mentioned one aspect of hydrology—flood predictions—but there are many others, such as mapping the flow of sediments from rivers, monitoring visible water pollution, charting currents, even distinguishing the boundaries between salt and fresh water where they meet in bays and estuaries. The important element here is that this can be done not just once but repetitively from space, so that we can get a picture of the changes that come with time, with the seasons, with the intrusion of human activities. We are beginning to experiment with the possibility of identifying and measuring air pollution constituents and sources from space; coupled with an understanding of the weather systems which transport airborne pollutants, this may lead to rapid, early pinpointing of problem areas on a global scale.

I believe it is in such areas as these that aerospace technology will have a major permanent role to play in combating the environmental crises over the next decade. The ingenuity and dedication already exhibited in the conduct of our national space programs leaves little doubt that, if the problem can be defined in technological terms, it can be successfully solved. I am personally convinced that our space program will lead the way in bringing these approaches to bear on the health of our environment. But I am likewise convinced that we must maintain the right perspective on both the problems we seek to solve and the means we look to for solutions.

We need a more profound and complete understanding of the phenomena we wish to manage or control; we must not overlook the

scientific research necessary to that understanding. We will certainly need space systems to measure, monitor, detect, and map the dynamics of our earth and seas. We must press to model our environment so as to know what we are doing to it and what can be done about it. Science and technology can provide the basis for rational, long range decisions taken for the long term benefit of all our citizens.

But this same perspective suggests we must be careful to distinguish between the tools we have to apply to a problem and the answer to the problem itself. I believe it is wrong to rely upon technology alone to combat the crisis of the environment, just as I am certain it would be wrong to ignore the tools technology can provide. The real test of our ability to continue to live upon the globe, upon Space Ship Earth, lies in ourselves. The crisis is more social than technical; it is more a question of balancing the many self-interests involved, and less one of finding breakthroughs or panaceas. Societal, economic, and political forces dominate in this battle for a better quality of life; we must work just as hard—if not harder—in these arenas as in the field of the hard sciences, of engineering, of systems approaches. And we must work these two together. Before selecting a technical solution, let us be sure we understand the impact it will have, both the benefits and the costs; let us be sure we know who will pay those costs, whether our generation or another, and whether they are warranted. And before selecting a legislative or social policy, let us be certain we haven't overlooked the powerful new tools that science and technology has placed in our hands.

Mr. Chairman, I am most encouraged by the work of this Subcommittee; I think it is a step we have to take and that properly guided it can take us in the right direction. I deeply appreciate the opportunity of sharing with you and the other distinguished members some of my own thoughts on the subject, some of my own enthusiasms as well as my own concerns. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

#### TRAGEDY NEED NOT HAVE HAPPENED

### HON. THOMAS G. ABERNETHY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 25, 1970

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, recently two young schoolchildren, a boy and a girl, lost their lives in a railroad crossing accident at Byhalia, Miss. Carolyn and Jimmy Grady died when the car in which they were riding was hit by a freight train at a grade crossing.

This accident prompted the writing of a column by a distinguished Mississippian, the Honorable Tom Ethridge, which appeared in the Clarion-Ledger, a Jackson, Miss., newspaper, under date of November 4, 1970. The column follows:

MISSISSIPPI NOTEBOOK

(By Tom Ethridge)

#### TRAGEDY NEED NOT HAVE HAPPENED

The tragic deaths of two upstate school children, in an automobile-train accident, was all the more tragic in that it might never have happened—if the little girl and boy had not been made to cross the railroad tracks by a federal court order.

Carolyn and Jimmy Grady, ages 13 and 10, died recently when the car in which they rode was hit by a freight train at a Byhalia Railroad crossing. Their mother who drove was seriously injured.

She had already taken two children to one school and was enroute with two others to another school across the tracks when the tragedy occurred.

"The children in this family used to attend the same school which did not require crossing the railroad tracks, but they were assigned by the courts to be divided up between two schools, thus bringing on this tragedy," said the weekly South Reporter at Holly Springs. . . .

In a front page editorial, "It Need Not Have Happened," the newspaper said that "federal judges, the District Court, the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals and the Supreme Court should look upon their handiwork and see the sorrows their orders have done."

Publisher George Yarborough, who has kindly sent us a copy of his editorial, went on to say: "In complete fairness to the railroad and federal judges, we make equal space available to them for any comment they might want to make concerning this editorial." At this writing, there does not seem to have been any comment.

These innocent little children have been sacrificed to the idols of "Racial Balance" and "Integration." How many more innocent victims and destroyed school systems will be required before the White House, the Department of Justice, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Congress return to reason and justice?

#### THE SENIORITY SYSTEM IN CONGRESS

### HON. JOHN G. SCHMITZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 25, 1970

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, the seniority system is a perennial focus of debate in Congress. As it now works, and has worked for many years, this is a procedure for the selection of committee chairmen according to length of service and party membership. Each party maintains the seniority system for its members on committees, and the senior member becomes the chairman, if his party has the majority in the House.

It is easy to criticize the seniority system, since age and length of service obviously do not guarantee superior ability. What is not so easy is to propose a better method, or one as good, to take its place.

If committee chairmen are not selected according to seniority, then some Members of Congress must be preferred over others for these vitally important positions on the basis of often subjective judgments by other Members. Nothing could be better calculated to produce destructive discord and strife. In view of the great influence and authority of the committee chairmen, competition for these positions would be intense. Since there is a substantial number of chairmanships of varying scope of authority, depending on the jurisdiction of the committee, the opportunities for "dealing" in votes among legislators are almost unlimited.

As the late Vice President Alben Barkley well stated in an address to the Senate some years ago, while he was still a Senator:

It has been suggested that chairmen of committee be elected by the committees. In that event the element of personalities and favoritism would come into play, and there would be log-rolling and electioneering for the votes of the committee members by those who wanted to be chairmen. If the Senate should adopt that method I doubt very much that it would adhere to it very long, because it would result in a very unsatisfactory situation. Jealousies, ambitions, and all the frailties of human nature would crop out in the electioneering methods of men who wanted to be chairmen of committees.

My experience during my last year and a half of service in the California State Senate, before my election to Congress, proved the truth of Mr. Barkley's words. The California Senate had once maintained a seniority system very similar to that of Congress, but is now in the process of abandoning it. This has led to a long drawn-out struggle over the office of president pro tempore, Rules Committee membership, and committee chairmanships, proceeding very much as Senator Barkley described in the above quotation, with no end in sight. Factions form and dissolve without regard either to party or to ideology, based almost entirely on the ambitions of individual members striving for one position or another. Men of good will, who want the business of this body to go forward, find it at times almost impossible to proceed due to these conditions.

By contrast, to quote Joe Evins in his book "Understanding Congress":

The seniority system also has the virtue of not being arbitrary. To a notable extent it is predictable and definite. Every member after a period of service knows where he stands and what should be his line of progression. He can devote energy and study to the field, secure in the knowledge that as long as he remains in Congress the time spent in developing his committee specialty will not be wasted by the arbitrary decision of some one person or group of persons.

It is argued that by the time one accrues the seniority necessary to become a committee chairman, he has often aged to the point of inflexibility. The voters of such a Congressman's district are the best judge of this. My present age of 40 places me in the younger class, relative to the average age of the Members of Congress. I do not consider that the gage of an effective Congress is the number of bills passed, but rather the quality of those bills, measured by the extent to which they protect the rights of the individual.

It is said that those who refuse to study history are doomed to repeat the errors of the past. This is especially true of legislators. There really is little that has not been thought of before, but merely variations of past ideas, some of which may or may not be improvements. By the time a man gets to be a committee chairman, he has heard thousands of ideas debated, he has seen thousands of measures enacted, and he has had the time to observe the results effected by them and is better equipped to know what will not work, and why.

Finally, the seniority system helps to maintain the integrity of Congress and prevent its domination by any other branch of government, foreign to the

basic principle of the check and balance of powers provided by our Constitution. The Washington Post—certainly no advocate of tradition for its own sake—stated on March 16 of this year:

The seniority system is the only way to prevent committees from becoming a rubber stamp for the Speaker and the White House. Congressional committees can be free to amend, refine and improve bills only if they are not made too responsive to strong leadership controls.

Unless someone can convince me, by more persuasive arguments than any I have yet heard, that the elimination of the seniority system would solve more problems than it would create, I will continue to support its retention.

#### COMING CRISIS IN ARMS

### HON. CHARLES H. WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 25, 1970

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, in a recent interview with the editors of U.S. News & World Report Dr. John S. Foster, Jr., Director of Defense Research and Engineering of the Department of Defense, expressed his concern over the consequences of the relative levels of effort by the Soviet Union and the United States in the areas of military and civilian space technology. If present trends continue Dr. Foster says we will lose our technological superiority to the Russians in the next several years.

Such a prospect is of vital interest to every American, and Dr. Foster's remarks deserve wide dissemination and careful consideration. With that in mind I include the interview in the RECORD: [From U.S. News & World Report Magazine, November 30, 1970]

#### RUSSIA VERSUS UNITED STATES—COMING CRISIS IN ARMS

(Interview With John S. Foster, Jr.)

Q. Dr. Foster, there has been a lot of talk by defense officials in recent weeks that the U.S. is in peril of falling behind Russia in military strength. Do you share that apprehension?

A. I do. I am concerned about the way events are moving. And I am not sure the public understands just why Secretary of Defense Laird and other officials are so concerned.

Q. What is it that causes the worry?

A. Several things. First, surprising as it may seem to Americans who are used to our technological superiority in defense, the U.S. will lose technological superiority to the Soviets in the next several years if present trends continue. It's a struggle that largely goes on in secret, but already we can see some of the things to come in new top-quality Soviet weapons. Further, if this loss of leadership occurs in three to four years, we will face certainly an extremely expensive, perhaps an impossible, task if we choose to attempt to regain our leadership even by 1985.

Another area of concern is the Soviet effort in strategic weapons. They have a continuing momentum both in development and deployment which we lack.

They have a similar momentum at sea where, over all, we're slipping back.

I'm concerned, too, about the significance of the increasing quality of the weapons they pass on to their client states. We have faced technologically advanced Soviet weapons in Korea and Southeast Asia, and our friends face them in other parts of the world. It is significant, too, that while the Soviets send first-class planes and missiles and ships to their clients, they have even better equipment coming along for their forces at home. And we can expect to see these improved systems going to their clients in the future.

Q. How are they able to do these things?

A. It's largely a matter of level of effort. They have been moving steadily upward in money and technical manpower. We've been declining. And now they are ahead of us in sheer equivalent effort. Our level is being reduced in almost every area of military technology and civilian space technology.

Q. How do the two countries compare today?

A. Right now, I'd say we still have a two to three-year lead over the Soviet Union generally across the board, in research and technology, based on our work over the last two decades. Of course, there are exceptions in certain areas. However, the Soviet effort has actually increased to a point where it is now larger than ours by perhaps 40 to 50 per cent. Next year their effort could be 60 to 70 per cent larger than ours.

If the present trends continue—with the U.S. cutting back while the Soviet Union continues to increase its efforts—the Soviet effort could be double that of the United States by 1975, and with that would come a rapid reversal of our technological positions. One basic factor contributing to recent past and future trends is that the technical-manpower base in the Soviet Union continues to grow while ours has leveled off.

We are used to being the nation that makes the leaps ahead in defense technology. In the future, the big surprises may well come from the other side. We tend to forget that this has happened before—the German missiles and jet aircraft in World War II and the Soviet sputnik in 1957. I think it is pertinent to know that just prior to sputnik, we had permitted the Soviet military and space effort to increase to the point where it was 50 to 70 per cent larger than ours.

Q. Is it possible to forecast future Soviet advances?

A. In any technical area where we are ahead, we can predict upcoming Soviet quality improvements rather accurately because we know what's possible. We can't predict the timing of a jump forward, though, because that depends on the amount of effort and the priority they choose to give it. In areas where we're behind, it's just very difficult to predict, because there we don't yet have a good understanding of what is possible out on the horizons of a technology which they can see and we can't.

#### U.S. COULD BE "NO. 2 BY '74"

Q. How much more are the Russians spending?

A. Right now, judging from their results, the Soviets are putting the equivalent of about 3 billion dollars more a year into defense-related technology than we are. If this is sustained, we not only will lose our lead, but we will lose much of our ability to predict their gains and much of our ability to counter them quickly and effectively.

By 1974 or '75, we would be No. 2 technologically in some critical areas. To prevent this, we would have to expand our present effort by a large amount immediately—which doesn't look practical in today's environment. If we wait longer, the expansion required is still greater. And then, even if we tried to spend the money, we wouldn't have

the technological base or the manpower to build on. The base is barely there now—in people, institutions and facilities. While they are building theirs, ours is eroding.

Let me indicate what 3 billion dollars a year for several years means. Like any group doing a job within budget limits, we have a list of major things which would be practical to develop if the money were available—in our case, a new strategic bomber, an improved ballistic-missile defense, a better air-defense system, several land-battle vehicles, improved attack submarines, two or three types of tactical fighter planes, a new missile submarine, better over-the-horizon radar and dozens of lesser systems. An extra 3 billion dollars would enable us to proceed with the development of all of these systems.

If the divergence between the U.S. and Soviet research-and-development efforts continues, they could, over the next five to seven years, turn these or similar systems into their "have" rather than "need" list. Of course, it would be their choice—I don't know what theirs would be.

Q. Is U.S. research and development being reduced more than other areas of defense?

A. No. It seems to me that the President and Secretary Laird and the Congress have a sort of equal-pain approach to defense-budget cuts. Research, development, production, deployment, operations—everything is absorbing reductions roughly equally. We in research and development are not alone in our concerns.

Q. Dr. Foster, does the danger that you see include the big Soviet effort to go ahead of the U.S. in nuclear missiles? Are they already ahead?

A. There are different ways to compare these forces in the two countries. In "throw weight"—the total usable payload on top of a missile—the Soviets have a capacity about twice that of the U.S., and they also surpass us in total megatonnage, which is a rough measure of total destructive power, but not in total number of warheads. However, their "throw weight" advantage could be converted into more warheads—in which case they would surpass us in both numbers of weapons and in total destructive power.

The Russians have more land-based missiles operational today—over 1,300 launchers, compared with our 1,054. We have more submarine-based ballistic-missile launchers operational today than they have—656, compared with 200 to 300. If you include all of the Soviet missiles completed and under construction we know about for land and sea-based, their total is larger than ours.

But we stopped adding numbers to both our land-based and submarine missile forces four to five years ago, and the Soviets are continuing their missile production. The Soviets have continued building up their already larger land-based strategic-missile forces at an impressive rate—an average of about 250 per year for the last four years. They are deploying sea-based ballistic missiles in Polaris-type submarines at the rate of about 130 missiles a year. By 1974, we can expect a Soviet submarine-launched ballistic-missile force also comparable in size to, or larger than, our own.

Q. Does the U.S. still maintain its superiority in nuclear-armed bombers?

A. Generally, yes, although it depends on how you measure it. We have 500-plus long-range bombers. The Russians have about 200 long-range bombers and another 700 medium bombers and refueling tankers. If half of these medium bombers were to be used as tankers to extend the range of the rest, then I'd say the two countries would be roughly equal in bombers. That situation is not likely to change much in the next five years.

There's possibly a more important factor: Our bombers would have to penetrate a Soviet air-defense system which is modern, dense and sophisticated. Their bombers un-

der present conditions would go against an American air-defense system which is thin, obsolescent and shrinking.

Q. How would you compare the two countries in total strategic nuclear power?

A. Looking at all aspects, I think you could say that there is rough parity between the two countries today. This rough parity will probably continue to exist for a few years in the future. However, I think that if the Soviets continue their momentum, in the absence of a SALT (Strategic Arms Limitation Treaty) agreement, the balance will shift more and more in their favor unless we take offsetting actions.

#### RUSSIA'S "INVISIBLE THREAT"

Q. How big a danger does Russia's momentum in missile deployment pose, assuming the U.S. doesn't react?

A. If the technological developments which are under way in the Soviet Union are completed and the resulting weapons are deployed, they will constitute a severe threat to our land-based strategic deterrent missiles. Their ICBM's would be able to take out almost all of our Minuteman force. Their submarine missiles could catch much of our bomber force on the ground—and also those Polaris boats which are in port. The surviving Minuteman missiles, bombers and Polaris/Poseidon missiles would then face much improved Soviet missile and air defenses. Those are the consequences of the improvements that we think we understand in Soviet weapons. In effect, that is their "no surprise" force of four to five years from now.

I'd like to point that one of our problems is that the Soviet strategic build-up is not easily discernible to either Congress or our people—it is a sort of invisible threat.

Q. Can anything be done to prevent the present balance from being upset?

A. One way is through negotiations on strategic-arms limitation. We hope that SALT, which has resumed, will result in an acceptable agreement which preserves the security of both sides. But, as Secretary Laird has noted repeatedly, we cannot afford an interminable wait for such an agreement, while Soviet momentum in deployment and development continues. Neither should we unilaterally stop those programs designated to preserve our security in the absence of an agreement. We may be faced with some difficult decisions in this area in the months ahead, and we should not let our hopes obscure the facts.

Q. What about antiballistic missiles—is there also rough parity with the Russians in that area?

A. No, but it's a little complicated. As you know, the Soviets long have believed in defense in depth. Today they have an operational ABM complex around Moscow, as well as about 10,000 surface-to-air missiles already deployed. We think this SAM force is largely for defense against aircraft. However, some of these interceptors may have ABM capabilities.

In any case, the Soviets have the technology to give much of this force an antiballistic-missile capability within the next few years. We, of course, have no ABM deployed. But, technologically, the situation is probably reversed. I believe the U.S. Safeguard is technologically ahead of the Soviet Union's Moscow ABM system.

Let me add a very important point: Of the major weapons which we can actually count—in land-based missiles deployed or attack submarines, for instance—we find more often than not that the Soviets are ahead in numbers. On quality, of the thing which we usually cannot accurately measure short of actual combat, we believe that we are—or have been—ahead. The trade-off of technological quality for quantity is highly judgmental and carries some risk as it is. This is why I become increasingly worried as

the Soviet effort devoted to technology continues to exceed ours.

Q. Are you saying the Soviets have developed a weapon complex that is inferior to the planned Safeguard ABM system?

A. Yes. But one has to be very careful in making a judgment here, because there are a lot of weapons that, while perhaps technologically inferior to others, still do the job—particularly if they are more numerous. And if an arms-control agreement does not stop further ABM deployment and development, we should expect additional, probably new-generation Soviet ABM missiles and radars to be deployed. The Soviets are already testing components in the Safeguard class.

It is particularly misleading to compare present U.S. and Soviet ABM systems. They have had components of their ABM deployed and have been able to shake down operational problems for the last several years. We will have our first site deployed and ready for shakedown four to five years from now. So it's not particularly useful to compare an existing Soviet defense with a future U.S. defense. We don't know what the Soviet system will look like, but at the rate the Soviets are going in development, it should be quite good.

#### "WE KNOW THE SOVIET ABM WORKS"

Q. Do you believe the present Soviet ABM really works?

A. We know it works, but we can't tell just how well it works. We do know that it can intercept many present ICBM warheads. So our job is to try to figure out how to defeat that system. Any defensive system, just as any offensive system, has some limitations, and we have to exploit those limitations.

Q. How can you defeat the Soviet defense system?

A. One simple way is to exhaust it simply by sending more warheads than the system can intercept. That is a primary reason why the Administration and the Congress decided to provide MRV's—multiple, independently targeted re-entry vehicles—for the U.S. missile force. MRV should enable us to saturate the Russian defenses. We plan to put more warheads on many of our missiles. Of course, with the same number of launch vehicles, the weight per warhead goes down. Thus, MRV, which increases the number of warheads, does not necessarily increase the total destructive capability of the force.

Q. Dr. Foster, the Russians seem to be putting great emphasis on their huge SS-9 missiles. Why?

A. We're not certain, but the most likely reason, which becomes more certain every day, is to knock out our Minuteman missiles. There are four clear indicators to support this conclusion. These relate to the payload, number, accuracy and multiple-warhead characteristics of the Soviet SS-9 missiles. The Soviets have over 300 of these missiles now operational or under construction. The SS-9 can carry a nuclear warhead with a yield of up to 25 megatons. That's many times larger than the largest yield we have on our Minuteman. Certainly it could be used against U.S. cities. However, the U.S. has only a dozen or so cities large enough to require a missile as large as the SS-9, and the Soviets have more than 1,000 other ICBM's to target against our cities.

So, the reason we conclude the SS-9s are being deployed to attack Minuteman is that the SS-9 has by far the best accuracy of any ballistic missile in the Soviet inventory. It is being tested with multiple warheads, and there are strong indications that each warhead will be able to attack a different Minuteman silo. With three warheads per SS-9, they would require a little over 400 SS-9s to knock out all but a small fraction of our Minutemen, and they are still building more SS-9s. With three re-entry vehicles per missile, they could have enough to target every Minuteman by 1974-75.

#### "SEVERAL WAYS" TO SURVIVE

Q. In the face of that Soviet power, is there any way the U.S. can provide for the survival of a retaliatory force?

A. Yes, there are several ways we can provide for the survival of a significant portion of our Minuteman and bomber force. But no one of these ways is cheap.

The first way for our ICBM's to survive is by active missile defense—an ABM system. The Safeguard system, deployed at four Minuteman base areas, would provide for the survival of a number of Minutemen. As the threat increases, however, more ABM defense will be needed, or fewer Minutemen will survive.

A second way would be to take some of the Minutemen out of their silos, put them on vehicles which upon alert could drive to any one of many hardened shelters—to gain the advantage of the "shell game."

Still another way would be to have the Minuteman placed on alert aircraft based at airfields away from our coasts, which could be airborne before Soviet missiles arrived.

Each of these measures—and others—are in various stages of examination or deployment. The best way for now is to preserve the Safeguard option. Safeguard would also help protect bomber bases that are in danger of surprise missile attack from Russian submarines near our coasts. The full 12-site Safeguard system would provide for the interception of the leading edge of an attack and give the bomber pilots the precious minutes they need to take off. Thus our deterrent would be maintained and credible, and the likelihood of all-out war is less. But the fastest and cheapest way to provide for our future security would be to have an equitable agreement emerge from our discussions with the Soviets.

Q. Some people say the Pentagon ought to move all its missiles out to sea. Do you agree?

A. I do not agree, and for two reasons. First, from time to time, we find potential weaknesses in each of our weapons systems. We have found them in each of three strategic systems—the land-based missile, the sea-based missile and the long-range bomber. For a period of months or even a year or two, one system or another in the past has had faults which would have made them vulnerable to an enemy had he been aware of them. We cannot guarantee this will not continue to occur again and again in the future.

Second, the Polaris submarines could have an Achilles heel, so to speak. While they are currently judged to be the least vulnerable of our strategic forces—because they are in a sense hidden in the vastness of the oceans—we can't be sure we know everything about what the Soviets are doing to counter their invulnerability.

Our Polaris submarines are quiet enough to be undetected by the Russians most of the time. But the Soviets have an increasing number of submarines, ships and planes "on the prowl." So I don't believe we should risk the security of our nation on any single system which rests on a rapidly changing science and technology and in which there are so many uncertainties.

Q. Can the Russians neutralize U.S. missile subs today?

A. No. Certainly not those at sea. But the Soviets are improving their attack capability, judging from their vigorous work in antisubmarine warfare. The Russians not only have the largest attack-submarine force in the world today, but they are increasing substantially the antisubmarine ability of that force. They've made recent additions, for instance several new classes of high-speed submarines, new cruiser-class surface ships with helicopters, and new equipment on anti-submarine-patrol aircraft.

Q. Are we planning to build newer missile subs?

A. Yes, we are now reviewing several design alternatives. Without a crash program, the earliest we could have a substantial number of the new-design, ballistic-missile submarines would be by the mid-1980s. By that time, our Polaris submarines will be 20 to 25 years old.

I believe we must design and be ready to deploy a new version like the concept now under study. We call this concept the ULMS—undersea long-range missile system. It would be very much like the Polaris submarine, but would carry larger missiles which would travel greater distances. The Soviets already are testing a long-range missile for submarines that is in the 3,000-mile range. Our ULMS might have an even longer range, so that it would not have to travel so close to the Soviet borders, making it potentially less vulnerable.

#### RED CHINA'S MISSILE PROGRESS

Q. Are the Red Chinese much of a threat yet?

A. No. However, two to three years after they make their first test of an intercontinental ballistic missile, the Red Chinese will be a strategic threat to the U.S.

Q. Has Peking tested an ICBM?

A. Not to our knowledge, but it could come at any time. The Communist Chinese have put a satellite into space with a capable rocket system. Continued development of such a system could give them an ICBM capability. Over all, Chinese missile progress toward an ICBM has been slower than we thought it would be.

Q. Turning to tactical weapons, Dr. Foster, how does the U.S. stand?

A. Well, I already mentioned our problems with conventional sea power. We have an over-age Navy. The Soviets, by contrast, are expanding from largely a coastal-defense force to a global Navy, extending Soviet power to oceans throughout the world. They can increasingly threaten our sea lifelines, particularly to Europe.

We have the same problem of obsolescence in equipment for the Army and Air Force. This is less dramatic because tanks and planes individually cost less than ships, but obsolescence is no less important. The Soviets are impressively active in these fields. For example, although present Allied and Communist manpower and aircraft are about equal to numbers in Europe, the Communists have more tanks and more than twice as many artillery pieces and rocket launchers. And they are rapidly increasing their tactical-aircraft strength and improving in quality.

Q. Is the U.S. behind the Soviet Union in tactical weapons, over all?

A. It's close. Up until two years ago there was no question that the momentum of the Soviet program was greater than ours. For example, Soviet fighter aircraft were increasing in quality while retaining over-all numerical superiority.

The Soviets fly a new-model fighter on an average of every 18 months as a result of their steady pace in research and development.

I feel, though, that with our new F-14 and F-15 jet-fighter programs, we will be in a much better position in this area.

Q. How do U.S. airplanes compare with Soviet fighters?

A. They are quite different. The U.S., with few exceptions, has emphasized design concepts which require good performance at lower and medium altitudes, and thus has concentrated on altitudes of below 40,000 to 50,000 feet. The Soviets, on the other hand, have employed design concepts for high altitudes, so we don't have strict comparability. The Soviets have tended to concentrate on relatively short-range fighters in the past. Because of our obligations abroad and our geography, we have tended to concentrate on longer-range aircraft.

The present trend in the Soviet Union, however, is toward larger and longer-range fighters. They have a very high-altitude, high-speed aircraft that we call the Foxbat. It is based on a level of technology that is equal to our best in many respects. We have nothing comparable to that, and don't plan one.

They also have a new improved MIG-21 that's been flying in Egypt which seems to have eliminated some of the serious deficiencies that we noted in the earlier versions flown over North Vietnam.

However, we think our F-14 and F-15—and their weapons—will be able to cope with both the Foxbat and the new versions of the MIG's.

#### TARGET DATES FOR NEW U.S. PLANES

Q. How soon will these newer American planes be ready?

A. We expect to have flights of the Navy's F-14 early next year, with inventory beginning in 1973.

The Air Force F-15 will have its first flights in the 1972-73 period, and inventory deliveries beginning two to three years later.

These planes will not necessarily be faster than ones we have today. But in battling other fighters, higher supersonic speed is not as important as being able to have high acceleration, hard maneuvering capabilities, and most important of all, weapons that work reliably, and more effectively. I expect the F-14 and F-15 to have those characteristics.

Q. Are there any weapons being developed for our ground forces to offset the enemy's superiority of numbers?

A. Yes. One of the most promising developments in Vietnam that might apply to Europe or elsewhere in the future is the use of sensors. In ground warfare the single most serious deficiency is in our ability to find out where the enemy is and to know whether or not we have been successful in attacking him. These sensors are small packages of electronics which tell the field commanders what is going on in their vicinity. The sensors can be put in place by hand or dropped from aircraft. They can report to our operators the sounds and seismic disturbance caused by people walking, or by trucks or tanks in the area, the presence of metal objects and so on.

Also, we are doing well in armed helicopters, guided air-to-air and air-to-ground ordnance and night-vision equipment.

Q. How do you destroy a tank when the sensors find one?

A. The sensor information is sent to an antitank force. We have gone heavily into the missile approach. The Tow and Shillelagh missiles—the first for use on the ground and the second from helicopters—have a first-class capability against tanks. These missiles can destroy tanks from 100 yards to a mile away.

Q. Are any new weapons being developed or produced for the individual soldier?

A. Yes, a number of important individual weapons are coming along. For instance, there is a surveillance radar and other sensors for the soldiers, better communications, grenade launchers and antitank weapons. The soldiers are getting light armor for their personal protection, and the wounded are getting faster, greatly improved care. Some of our techniques of quick medical care are being tried now by civilian agencies in the United States, in co-operation with the Department of Defense. Important to the soldier also is the fact that food at the battlefield is much improved.

#### "UNPLEASANT SURPRISES" FROM RUSSIA

Q. Dr. Foster, what is the outlook for the Pentagon's getting more money for defense research and development?

A. As Secretary Laird has said, we presented "a rock-bottom, bare-bones budget."

We are making every possible effort to persuade the Congress to restore as much as we can of the half-billion-dollar cut currently under consideration by the Congress, to our research-and-development program for fiscal year 1971. I believe that the Congress will restore at least a portion of the cut.

However, it seems to me that it is not likely that our level of defense research-and-development effort will increase significantly in the next few years if present trends in this country continue. It is more probable that the level will decrease. I believe that this fact, coupled with a larger and rising Soviet effort, will increase the risk to the security of the free world.

We are making a serious and conscientious effort to obtain an equitable settlement at the SALT, but this could take years. In the interim we must not neglect our developments and deployments.

We are doing the very best we can to improve our management of ongoing programs—to remove some of the reasons for congressional criticism.

I don't know whether or not we will receive increased funds in the future. Events and our ability to communicate the crucial need for congressional and public support will decide that. But to put it bluntly, the Soviets may force us to spend more. They are likely to go beyond their present capabilities and produce surprises that will be unpleasant for us, hopefully not disastrous—sputniks, not Pearl Harbors.

Our challenge is so to structure our research-and-development efforts for the '70s that the likelihood of sputniks or Pearl Harbors will be minimized.

### PRESIDENT RESPONDS PROMPTLY TO TRAGEDY IN EAST PAKISTAN

#### HON. E. ROSS ADAIR

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 25, 1970

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, it is deeply regrettable that some of our colleagues have seen fit to seize upon the terrible tragedy in East Pakistan as the vehicle for political attacks on the Nixon administration. It is outrageous that those who are maneuvering for the Democratic presidential nomination in 1972 are now implying that the horrible suffering in Pakistan is somehow the fault of this administration.

The record shows that President Nixon and his administration have responded promptly and completely to every request of the Pakistan Government. U.S. relief assistance began immediately after the disaster and is still going on, limited only by the geography of the region and the ability of the Pakistan authorities to distribute the food and other supplies which are being sent to that country.

However, the American public is being shocked each night by film clips on the evening news shows of the suffering and deprivation in Pakistan. Certain people are evidently trying to capitalize on this disaster by charging that the administration has not done enough to help the flood victims.

To paraphrase a much publicized line, I would challenge: "How dare they imply that President Nixon does not care about the lives of 1 million people."

## CLAUSEN DECENTRALIZATION PROGRAM

## HON. ROBERT B. (BOB) MATHIAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 25, 1970

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, recently my fellow Californian, the Honorable DON CLAUSEN, was interviewed by Mr. Ed Wimmer, vice president of the National Federation of Independent Business. The subject of the interview was Mr. CLAUSEN's program of fiscal and institutional decentralization, which is his innovative and dynamic program to revitalize rural America.

So that all of my colleagues may have the opportunity to read and explore this outstanding program of revitalization and diversification, I am including the full text of the interview at this point in the RECORD:

Ladies and gentlemen, it is my pleasure this week to be seated across the Washington desk of Congressman Don Clausen, First District of California, a man who has been keenly aware of what is happening to the structure of free enterprise in this nation, and the great risks we have been taking in getting farther and farther away from the representative form of government we profess to cherish but seldom defend.

Don Clausen is a man who has built his economic and political philosophy on an almost reverent belief in the Jeffersonian-Lincoln concept of economic and political liberty, convinced as we of the National Federation of Independent Business are convinced, that the only salvation left for America is to fight undue centralization of power wherever it exists, in agriculture, industry, labor, finance, or government.

An advocate of major reforms in our tax structure, Mr. Clausen views the family farm, small business and local financial institution not as mere entities in themselves, but as the basis of whatever social, economic and political headway we may hope for in the future.

In speeches on the floor of the House, the big Californian has pictured the American town of the future with boarded up store fronts, closed schools and churches, ill kept frame houses surrounded by weeds, and the absence of young people—if urban and rural America do not get together in their thinking, and in their concern for each other's way of life.

Congressman Clausen, why have you put so much emphasis on bringing about a decentralization program at all levels of society?

Congressman CLAUSEN. Well, Ed, one reason I believe this country desperately needs a positive program of fiscal and institutional decentralization can best be illustrated by reading the newspapers. Wherever you have an overdose of welfarism, an over-injection of funds into major metropolitan areas, you simply compound whatever problem you are treating. What we have had is migration from rural America into metropolitan America, and one of the consequences is a population pattern that is absolutely out of balance.

Only a limited number of dollars are available to build the kind of public sector institutions that leave the private entrepreneurs room to function and flourish and make their contribution. We simply cannot afford the luxury of spending so much money to keep building facilities in major metropolitan areas that could be built in the more sparsely populated areas, giving more people in America exposure to the country

living atmosphere we know has contributed the greatest to quality living conditions.

Mr. WIMMER. We have established a basis for what we want to talk about, but before we get any deeper into our subject, let us discuss your rural roads program, and I want your thinking on proposals before Congress that would provide a tax incentive for companies to locate in rural America with no provision that companies already so located will receive a similar incentive. In other words, the newcomers are to be subsidized by the taxes of those against whom they may compete.

Congressman CLAUSEN. I would like to answer the second question first. Under our EDA program (Economic Development Administration) that is a part of the public works committee jurisdiction, we have a specific provision in the law that says there shall be no piracy. We cannot revitalize one sector of the country by taking away from another, but if we use tax credits that will permit industry to decentralize, give business a reason to locate away from the big centers of population with their overcrowded conditions and undesirable living conditions that are associated with it, then I believe fully with you that we will be pursuing a course that will work.

Subsidizing one group at the expense of another is piracy in most cases, and I will oppose it, believe me.

Mr. WIMMER. Don, when you talk about saving the family farm because by doing so we keep those rural school buses filled, keep the churches filled, and Main Street stores busy, you are speaking our language. The language of Jefferson and Lincoln, and right here is where we should be building our resistance to any more out-migration from rural communities.

Congressman CLAUSEN. I couldn't agree with you more, and one of the leading examples of what you have reference to took place when we were in the State of Nebraska recently, holding hearings under the Interior Reclamation. It was interesting to note that Department's Committee on Irrigation and in those areas where they had on-going water projects, irrigation, reclamation of flood control, or municipal and industrial water supplies, there was either a stabilization of the population or some growth. Wherever there wasn't any water resource development, that's where you had the out-migration.

But, let's go back to the first question you asked me about more attention to the primary and secondary road systems in this country. I have some very good news to report to you since our last communications and the number of telephone calls you and I have had on this subject, as you have attempted to convey your thoughts to me, and I in turn have conveyed them to the Public Works Committee as well as the Interior Committee, and that is this:

The road Subcommittee and the full Public Works Committee accepted my amendment to increase the primary and secondary roads share of federal matching funds which will put a lot more money into improving country roads.

Up to this point there has been 50 percent of the money coming from the federal government, and then the states themselves match the other 50 percent. But to have the interstate highway program which, as you know, has been geared principally to link the capitals of the nation together (a program advanced under President Eisenhower in 1956), to stop here, would be a tragic mistake.

No greater public works project was ever launched in the history of the world. It moved people, goods and services on a scale that beggars description.

Now we must look down the road to the ultimate completion of the interstate highway system, and concentrate our attention on the primary roads—the secondary roads that connect our smaller towns with each

other and with the cities, which will be possible if my amendment is cleared by the Senate and enacted into law.

In other words, the 50-50 matching will be a 70-30 matching formula which means that instead of producing a share of up to 50 percent, the states will only have to come up with 30 percent, because, as we complete the interstate, the same funds that have heretofore been committed to the interstate will be channeled into rural road building, one of the best moves to advance this decentralization concept that has occurred since I have been in Congress.

Mr. WIMMER. What you are saying, Congressman, is there must be a free movement of goods and services all over America or the decentralization concept falls apart, but how many people are aware of this so obvious need?

How many members of Congress, one might ask, are really disturbed by our present migration from rural America? How many people in urban areas, where we have our biggest job of selling countryside economics, would connect their own prosperity and hopes with a country road, a rural church, Chamber of Commerce, or a boarded up store front?

Congressman CLAUSEN. Sadly true, I am afraid, and that is why our work in this field, the work your National Federation is doing in getting the decentralization concept to so many people, is so important at this time. We've just got to make the states a dominant center of this movement, too, for they are the natural hub of restoring control of government to the people as well as economic control.

It is going to take a fantastic effort to reverse existing philosophies, and I am so glad to be working with you because you are reaching so many, many people. When you compare Thomas Jefferson and Abraham Lincoln with the vision behind all decentralization movements today, the philosophy is the same, and the end products are people doing things for themselves. Creating their own communities and deciding their own destinies.

So, you and I, Ed, are pretty much on the same wave length, which brings me to this concluding thought.

What America desperately needs in order to carry out this decentralization theme, is a new R and D program. People think routinely when we say R & D, of research and development, but I am talking about revitalization and diversification of the sparsely populated areas in America, to be brought about through the adoption of what I refer to as a new doctrine of the three Rs—not reading, writing and arithmetic, but Rights, Responsibilities and Revenues.

Mr. WIMMER. Rights, Responsibilities and Revenues, I like that, and I also like your philosophy, Congressman Clausen of California, and your determination to help get this country on the road to a mighty celebration of our 200th Birthday Anniversary of a Republic, on July 4, 1976, when the world will either praise us for what we have done and won, or despise us for what we didn't do, and what we lost, not only to ourselves but to the world.

## CALIFORNIA STATE COLLEGES

## HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 25, 1970

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, during the summer, a study was released by the California State colleges entitled "Those Who Made It," indicat-

ing the true fulfillment of the mission of the California State colleges.

In our State there are 19 State colleges, one of which, San Jose State College, has the proud distinction of being the oldest public higher educational institution in California. It was founded in 1862, actually preceding the establishment of the University of California by some 10 years. The newest State college was just opened in September in Bakersfield. In the years in between, these great schools first served the needs of the many school districts in supplying teachers. As a matter of fact, most of them were called State normal schools and were basically so-called teachers' colleges. In 1962, the State legislature approved a so-called master plan for higher education which created a board of trustees to separately govern these colleges. The board of trustees reformed the mission of these colleges to transform them from basically teachers' colleges to become great liberal arts centers.

A study published this summer shows that these colleges are fulfilling the goals established by the trustees in 1962. The thousands of graduates from these institutions are choosing degree objectives in hundreds of disciplines preparing the graduates for any number of leadership roles in society in such fields as architecture, accounting, business administration, public administration, engineering, scientific research, social work, politics, public service, computer sciences, farming, foreign service, journalism, et cetera.

#### REVOLUTIONARY ANTIMILITARISM

### HON. JOHN G. SCHMITZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 25, 1970

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, Communist antimilitarism consists of a psychopolitical attack on the military strength of the United States. The Soviet theorists view our society and the military as interacting parts of a single whole. The army is an extension of the society insofar as the attitudes of the society find their way into the military forces and influence military preparedness. The society in turn is an extension of the military, since its survival depends on the military forces.

The Communist attack is aimed at both the weapons systems and the men who must use them. The Soviets understand that the man without a gun is useless for defense, and that a gun without a man willing to use it is simply a lump of useless matter.

Many people cannot understand the persistence of the Communist Party of the United States in concentrating so much of its efforts on the labor unions—an unpromising target for them, since the workers in general are quite well satisfied with their wages and standard of living. But because these workers are engaged in manufacturing the strategic weapons systems needed for defense, the Soviet bosses reiterate the necessity of work in this area, and this is parroted

by the local party bosses in our country. This is the reason for the Communist Party concentration at this point on black workers, where race rather than income can be used as an issue, and for the party's efforts to form a worker-student alliance—many students having already been influenced by Soviet propaganda.

So much for the industrial portion of the military-industrial complex, once known as the arsenal of democracy.

The military itself is always a prime target. Communist efforts to disintegrate the military forces of non-Communist nations have been historically quite successful. From the mutiny of the Russian fleet during the Russo-Japanese War in 1905 to the mutiny of American troops at Archangel in 1919, the mutiny in the French fleet during that same year in the Black Sea—in which, interestingly enough, Ho Chi Minh played a part, as a sailor in the French Navy recruited in what was then French Indo-China—the mutiny of the British fleet at Invergordon in 1931, and the riots of our own troops at Manila, Frankfurt, Shanghai, and Paris in 1946—and in numerous other instances—the Communists have shown great skill in agitating and demoralizing opposing armed forces.

According to experts in the field of military history, the fall of France to the Nazis in 40 days in 1940 was as much a result of Communist antimilitarist work among the troops as of the military superiority of the German Army. At that time, of course, Hitler and Stalin were allies through the Russo-German Pact. It is well worth remembering that the Germans sent Lenin back to Russia in 1917 to disintegrate the Russian forces through Bolshevik defeatist tactics. He did that job only too well.

Though these tactics have not always succeeded—as, for example, in Spain where General Franco defeated them with troops not infected with the germ of bolshevism—they have worked often enough to cause me to view current efforts at agitation in our own Armed Forces with grave concern.

It is essential that our military men be fully informed about the dangers facing our Nation, and particularly the danger from revolutionary antimilitarism, which Dr. Robert Beerstecher, civilian adviser to the Assistant Chief of Staff for Intelligence of the Air Force and the leading expert on the subject, testifying before the Senate Armed Services Committee, called "the foundation of Soviet strategy for achieving world domination."

The best defense against this strategy, as Dr. Beerstecher stated at this hearing in response to a question from Senator STROM THURMOND, is education—a fact of which I am well aware, having been an instructor in anticommunism courses during my period of active duty as a U.S. Marine Corps officer. The deemphasis on education of this kind among our troops, beginning with the appointment of Robert S. McNamara as Secretary of Defense, is almost certainly one of the primary causes for the recent upsurge of antimilitarist activity within the U.S. military today, which will be reviewed in next week's newsletter.

#### A NEW DIMENSION IN VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

### HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 25, 1970

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, a local high school in my congressional district has begun its second year of what, in my judgment, is a most promising experiment in secondary level education. The program, at Hermiston, Oreg., emphasizes the growing need for improved vocational education. Through a highly innovative curriculum, the school offers a real challenge to students who do not intend to pursue an academic college education, but who seek the best possible training for important careers in industry and business. The curriculum is proving ideal for preparing such students for further education in Oregon's successful community college programs.

A recent editorial in the Pendleton, Oreg., East Oregonian describes this laudable program, and I commend it to the attention of my colleagues:

#### EXCITING PROGRAM

Hermiston High School is into the second year of a program that will have far-reaching effects in the state of Oregon. It is a new approach to vocational education that emphasizes career training.

Hermiston High School administrators began thinking about the program about five years ago when congressional committees began to talk about the need for more vocational education in high schools. Consequently, they were ready when the Oregon Department of Education launched a pilot program in 1968. The state department chose Hermiston as one of the pilot schools for the program in 1969.

Hermiston's approach to career training in vocational education is described as the "cluster" approach. Teachable skills are combined with courses related to those skills through bloc scheduling. In the second year of this program about half of the Hermiston High School student body is enrolled in industrial science and business courses.

The premise upon which this is built has been recognized for a long time but until recently there was little more than talk about it. Many high school students want vocational training with a minimum of formal education courses. They do not intend to go to a four-year college. They want to be able to hold down jobs soon after graduation from high school in occupations that afford on-the-job training. Business and industry has great need for them.

According to Principal Jack Jenkins of Hermiston High School, this new vocational education program at his school is moving as rapidly as possible in the direction of preparing vocationally-oriented students so that they take further education in their chosen vocations after high school at Blue Mountain Community College.

Hermiston High School and BMCC are working closely together on this and both Mr. Jenkins and President Wallace McCrae of the college are encouraged by the progress they are making.

When that's put together the Hermiston High School graduate will be able to get a BMCC the additional training he finds he needs with full recognition of the preliminary training he has had at the high school.

What Hermiston High School is doing is creating interest throughout the state. Principal Jenkins reports that visitors are coming from many high schools. The state Department of Education continues, of course,

to follow closely and assist in every way possible with the Hermiston program. Oregon State University has a keen interest in it because OSU has launched a major program for preparing teachers of vocational education courses.

All of this is quite exciting. The importance of giving career training in vocational education in the high schools as much emphasis as college-oriented training has been talked about in many places for a long time. At last it is coming on and we are so fortunate that it is all falling into place here in Umatilla County through the pilot program at Hermiston High School and now with the cooperation of Blue Mountain Community College.

**EDWARD LEVI, PRESIDENT OF THE  
UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO**

**HON. ABNER J. MIKVA**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 25, 1970

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, President Edward Levi, of the University of Chicago is a man whose association with the university goes back to his childhood and whose devotion to academic and administrative excellence in the university and its community is unmatched.

The October issue of Chicago magazine contains an article entitled, "A President for All Seasons," which indeed is a tribute to the many outstanding facets of this man's unique character. He is one of the great resources of academia and I am proud to be his former student and continuing admirer.

The article follows:

**A PRESIDENT FOR ALL SEASONS**

(By Roger Black)

From Edward Levi's office in the administration building he can see most of the University of Chicago. Directly below is the main quadrangle, a surprising two blocks on the city's south side, spotted with grass and trees and flagstone paths. Walking across it throughout the day are students, loaded with books, moving rapidly, intent on some academic purpose. While it is still warm students sit and talk or lie in the sun. Their talk is serious, articulate and endless.

From his window Levi can see them there, talking and dozing in the sun; he can see professors walking in pairs toward the grey gothic buildings around the main quadrangle. Beyond the quadrangle and the new more expensive buildings surrounding it, he can see Hyde Park, a neighborhood that was falling apart twenty years ago, and which was made stable, a middle-class bulwark surrounded by slums, by the strenuous efforts of Levi and a few others who were determined that the University of Chicago should survive where it was.

He can see all this from his window. He thinks about these things almost all the time; the faculty and how hard it is to keep it; the students and how hard it is to get good ones; the buildings and how hard it is to get the money to build them; the community and how hard it is to keep it together. If he wanted to, Levi could look out and see also the house where he grew up fifty years ago, and where he began his climb through the University of Chicago.

Rabbi Emil Hirsch, Levi's grandfather, came to Hyde Park in 1892 to be on the first faculty of the new university that was springing up, full-grown, from the mind of William Rainey Harper and the pocket of

John D. Rockefeller. Hirsch became one of president Harper's advisers, and the family stayed. Levi's father was a Hyde Park rabbi, and as a boy Levi played in the shadow of the university's gothic buildings. When he was five, he entered the University Lab School, and continued on through the college (graduating in 1932) with honors, and the law school (receiving a J.D., with honors, in 1935). The next year he was appointed an assistant professor of law. With the exception of about ten years he has been there ever since, becoming a full professor in 1945, dean of the law school in 1950, University Provost in 1962, president in 1968.

Levi is not a tall man, about five foot seven. He tends to wear blue suits and he always wears bow ties. He now smokes pipes instead of cigars. On first meeting, his physical appearance is not impressive, unlike Robert Maynard Hutchins, the university's fifth president. Hutchins is tall and handsome, and when he enters a room he dominates it. Levi may not be noticed when he comes in but he endeavors to win the room over. Usually he succeeds.

Levi first came to national attention during the big sit-in in 1969. SDS took over the administration building, protesting the decision not to rehire a radical sociology teacher, Marlene Dixon. Levi's plan was to do nothing. He sat in his splendidly decorated house, received delegations of students and professors, and sent the demonstrators summonses to disciplinary hearings. The faculty was united behind Levi, happy to have him handle everything. The demonstrators couldn't rally the students, after two weeks the sit-in collapsed of its own ideological weight, and Levi was hailed as a master strategist.

The *Daily News* wrote that Levi had been "unflappable." That is accurate only in that Levi was not stampeded into any precipitous action, but he was considerably flapped by the whole thing. His house was in a state of turmoil for two weeks. One day I was there, working for the student newspaper. The scene was comical. A group of young professors were in the living room. The deans were assembled in the library. For some reason an assistant vice president was going upstairs with a bag of dry cleaning. I was sitting on a bench in the dining room and was approached by Ned Rosenheim, an English professor and at that time the spokesman for the committee of the council, the inner sanctum of the faculty honchos. Rosenheim offered me a can of beer and we sat watching the people coming and going. Levi was buzzing around, taking calls, moving from one group to the next. He was listening to everyone but he accepted no offers of negotiation. Rosenheim expressed his admiration for Levi and his principles. "There is no one better," he said.

From the beginning Levi did not intend to call the police. He had said that many times in private. He would rather see the university torn down first. A call for police help would be an invitation for violence. And in Levi's mind it would make him no better than the SDS.

As Levi is no Sam Hayakawa, neither is he a Kingman Brewster. He does not testify before Congressional committees or appear on television talk shows. He gives five speeches a year, holing up in his house for days to write them in his thoughtful, oracular style. He has not given the student paper an interview since 1967.

He is an intensely private man, jealous of what time he has for himself (much of it is now spent fund raising, something he doesn't like to do, but which he does very well). Students don't see much of him. There is an official student advisory committee that meets about once a month. He attends rather formal breakfasts with students in the dormitories. His reputation among them is a

mixture of the media image and hearsay. Radicals, of course, regard him as a pig.

Most students vaguely feel Levi's influence; they know that he accomplishes things, but they don't know exactly how. They think of him as crafty and aloof and slightly intimidating.

To the students who know him best, particularly his own students (Levi taught law classes until 1967), most of his reputation is myth. He can be intimidating in conversation, but in a particularly University of Chicago way; he chooses his words so carefully and so well that it is an intellectual effort to talk to him. He has the ability to say no more than what he means. His wit can be devastating.

There is a story that a decade ago he was lecturing about morality and the law and was describing some of the vagaries of sex laws when the only girl in the class raised her hand and asked if he would mind being a little less explicit. Levi frowned, but changed the subject to corporations and was starting to talk about a case involving the American Tobacco Company when he turned suddenly to the girl and said, "You do smoke, don't you?"

As for craftiness, that is the part of the myth least like the man. There is no doubt that Levi gets things done, but he is extraordinarily overhanded about it. He has a brilliant legal mind (his principal work, *Introduction to Legal Reasoning*, is considered a classic). Like all great lawyers, his approach in conversation is part reason and part charismatic dazzle. He is completely frank. The secret of his persuasiveness is his ability to impress listeners with the depth of his feelings for the university that has been his life.

"It is natural for this university to believe it believes in pioneering. After all, this university came into being as a pioneering first modern university, borrowing ideas from Germany and England, building upon the New England college, joining undergraduate instruction and a panoply of graduate research in what, some said, surely would be a monstrosity—all this done with Middle Western enthusiasm and a confidence the best could be obtained here if only it could be paid for. Much has been written of the financial arrangements of those days, the creative use of material resources generously given. But the basic faith was not in material resources. The faith was in the intellectual powers of the mind. It was considered important, more important than anything else in the world, to uncover and understand the cultures of the past, to appreciate the works of the mind, to penetrate the mysteries of the universe, to know more about the environment, the societies and the nature of man." From Levi's inaugural address, November 14, 1968.

**MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN—HOW  
LONG?**

**HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE**

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 25, 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?

## TIME TO GIVE THANKS

## HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 25, 1970

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow is Thanksgiving Day and each American family will celebrate in its own special way. The business of government too often becomes the solving and preventing of problems. Because of this it is much too easy for all of us to see the serious problems which at times seem to defy an acceptable solution which we are willing to support with the necessary tax dollars.

Because, also, of their closeness to the basis of most of the productivity we benefit from in the United States, our farmers seem to be better able to see and understand the bounty which as a nation we all enjoy.

The December issue of Farm Journal magazine does an outstanding job of causing all to stop and give thanks for the many blessings we have. This magazine goes to more farm homes in the Nation than any other and over the years has demonstrated beyond doubt that its writers have an accurate understanding of the attitudes of our farm families.

Farm Journal Editor Lane Palmer writes:

We don't deny that our nation has serious problems, but we remain convinced that the biggest problem of all lies "in the eye of the beholder." Too many of us—of all income levels—are so preoccupied with the things we don't have that we've forgotten our Pilgrim heritage of being thankful for the bounty that is ours.

What better way to celebrate the season of Peace on Earth (and we could add Thanksgiving) than by rejoicing in the selection of an agricultural scientist as winner of the Nobel Prize for Peace. If the plowshare is the opposite of the sword, farming is truly the profession of peace.

There's good news, too, that the USDA's expanded food programs are getting food to most of those here at home who have not shared in the bounty—the ones we used to "remember" once a year with a Christmas basket.

Call us a square, an ostrich or a Pollyanna, we think most Americans still see mankind, not in the angry countenance of a demonstrator, but in those smiling trustful eyes on this month's cover. (Which shows a young boy at Christmas)

Few people anywhere on earth will call you a square, Mr. Palmer, who would take the time to read the monthly editorial, An Award For You.

Sincere credit should go to Nobel Prizewinner Dr. Norman Borlaug, for his efforts which have staved off starvation for a major segment of the world's population and the editorial gives appropriate credit. It also cites a long list of items all of us in the United States need to understand and express thanks to our farmers for keeping us so well fed and clothed.

The editorial follows:

## AN AWARD FOR YOU

You and other American farmers can take pride in that Nobel Peace Prize that went to Dr. Norman E. Borlaug, former Iowa farm boy.

Borlaug received the award for developing

high-yielding wheats that have dramatically increased the food supply in countries such as Mexico, India and Pakistan. Due largely to his efforts, his Rockefeller team-mates and the native farmers themselves, India and other countries have been snatched from the brink of starvation.

This is a major contribution to peace—not just peace between countries—but to the peace within a country that comes from having adequate food. If the children and the poor have food, this adds immeasurably to the peaceful stability within a nation.

Borlaug credits his farm upbringing for his success and for having fired his personal mission to help other farmers around the world. "The thing that has meant the most to me is my early experience on a small farm of fewer than 100 acres in northeast Iowa," he tells Farm Journal.

We applaud the decision to give the world's most distinguished peace award to a representative of agriculture—and we're proud to claim Dr. Borlaug as a product of our American farming system and farm community.

We think, too, that all American farmers merit more recognition for what they have done. We believe that you, and every other American farmer and farm family, deserve an appropriate international Peace and Freedom award for these outstanding accomplishments:

For producing the wheat and other food that warded off starvation in India and Pakistan through two years of disastrous crop failures—thus holding the line until Borlaug's new wheats could fill the breach.

For coming to the aid of the free, democratic world in two World Wars and for supplying the food to help our erstwhile enemies regain their feet with dignity and independence, exacting neither territory nor compensation in return.

For taking to new farming ideas with a zeal that is a source of amazement to foreign farm representatives who come here to study the phenomenon and endeavor to transplant it to other lands.

For sharing your farming know-how with one another—and with the world—in an unselfish manner.

For contributing your sons and daughters, your own talents, money and spirit to the Peace Corps, CROP, People-to-People programs and numerous private volunteer groups that help farmers overseas.

For helping develop and run our Land-Grant Universities and Agricultural Extension Services—which are models worldwide for disseminating practical information and developing new agricultural techniques.

For contributing, through heavy exports of low-priced food, more than your share to the U.S. balance-of-payments; thus giving the dollar an integrity it could not otherwise achieve as a world-wide currency which expedites trade and peaceful inter-change between nations.

For demonstrating that private property, individual ownership and free markets are unequalled as a means of encouraging production for the satisfaction of man's needs and wants.

For "keeping your cool" when others, with no more provocation, have vowed to dismantle with force democratic institutions designed, through generations of experience, for peaceful change.

For burnishing the democratic reputation of this nation by continuing to make local government work in thousands of townships, counties, school districts and other local government institutions.

For living with Nature, respecting it, and preserving the environment now and for future generations in a manner that is becoming fashionable in other circles.

For increasing your productivity and output faster than any other major economic group—thus cooling the forces of inflation in

this nation and contributing to the economic stability of the world.

For supplying the rural countryside with a stabilizing bedrock of social values that has a steady, healthy influence on the nation during a period of wrenching social upheaval.

For participating in volunteer farm organizations, putting up your own money and running your organizations from the grass-roots in a strong demonstration of self-help.

For providing bountiful food at the lowest relative cost and smallest farm labor force anywhere, thus supplying the foundation that makes this nation a bastion of economic strength capable of aiding distressed people in other lands.

For being advocates of freedom for mankind and for upholding the dignity of man.

## POW'S—SEARCH AND RESCUE

## HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 25, 1970

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, all Americans are proud and happy that our Government has at last taken positive steps to recover our captured fighting men held prisoners by the Communists in Vietnam.

While the first raid was unsuccessful—as far as freeing any of our POW's—it has great significance. The Secretary of Defense assures us that there will be continued strikes to free our men and this new attitude should greatly bolster the morale of all of our POW's—some of whom have been imprisoned in excess of 5 years and are now given the first reassurance that they have not been forgotten by their Government nor their people at home.

The raid into Communist North Vietnam—territory heretofore regarded as a sanctuary—must have had a morale-shattering effect on the enemy who have been repeatedly propagandized that their forces were invincible.

Continued expeditions into North Vietnam for the humanitarian purpose of freeing our mistreated captured fighting men will also pressure the Communists to keep more troops at home if they intend to defend their own backyard from additional U.S. strikes to free our POW's.

Overall, there is nothing the Communists can now do except go to the peace table in good faith while they still have time to bargain.

I join with many in extending my congratulations to Col. Arthur D. "Bull" Simons and the volunteers of his command for their perfectly executed mission.

The statement by Secretary of Defense Melvin Laird, before the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations follows:

I appreciate the opportunity to appear today before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, and I am most grateful to the distinguished Chairman for his invitation to make this session possible.

I want to share with Members of this Committee and the American people the pertinent facts, consistent with security, regarding our limited-duration protective reaction air activities against military targets in North Vietnam south of the 19th Parallel.

Also, and separately, I want to report to the Committee on the heroic search and rescue (SAR) attempt which was made to recover some Americans held in captivity in North Vietnam.

As I speak to you today, we are checking recent reports received from unofficial sources that cause me additional deep anguish. These unofficial reports indicate that even more Americans, in addition to the six reported earlier this month, have died in captivity in North Vietnam.

Let me turn first to our limited-duration protective reaction strikes. They were conducted over a period of only seven hours and involved approximately 200 strike aircraft—less than half the number involved in reinforced protective reaction strikes over a four-day period last May.

These limited-duration protective reaction air strikes were launched after the other side again had attacked our unarmed reconnaissance aircraft, in violation of understandings which were reported to me when I assumed office as Secretary of Defense. On November 13, an unarmed RF-4C was shot down with the two-man crew lost.

The protective reaction strikes also followed indiscriminate rocket shellings of the cities of Saigon and Hue earlier this month. The understandings which marked the end of our bombing of North Vietnam on November 1, 1968, also included the fact that major population centers in South Vietnam were not to be shelled.

I am pleased to report that not a single American was lost in these protective reaction strikes.

Now let me turn briefly to the SAR—search and rescue—effort at Son Tay, approximately 20 nautical miles west of Hanoi.

I think you can understand the anguish which went into my final decision to recommend to the President that this search and rescue attempt be undertaken. Late this summer I received and reviewed carefully a detailed contingency search and rescue plan for Americans held in captivity. I approved preparations for perfecting this plan, but I delayed making any final recommendations.

I believe you would want to know, Mr. Chairman, that all of the men who participated in this operation were volunteers. They included highly trained specialists from the Air Force Special Operations Forces at Eglin Air Force Base, Florida, and from the John F. Kennedy Center at Fort Bragg, North Carolina. A large number of the men who performed this daring nighttime rescue attempt were members of the Green Berets.

Brigadier General Leroy J. Manor, USAF, a native of Morrisonville, New York, who holds a Bachelor of Science in Education from New York University, was chosen as overall commander. Another distinguished military officer, Colonel Arthur D. Simons, USA, of New York City, a journalism graduate from the University of Missouri, where he received an ROTC commission, led the team into the suspected prisoner of war compound. They and their dedicated and courageous men, soldiers and airmen, performed heroically. What they did, in my view, was demonstrate to all our citizens and to all the world that our prisoners of war are not forgotten.

My recommendation was made after discussions across a broad spectrum of POW interests, including conversations with Ambassadors Bruce and Habib in Paris.

It goes without saying that I took into deep and careful consideration the possible effects of such a rescue attempt on the status of other prisoners of war held in Southeast Asia.

At a time when Americans are dying in captivity, some have claimed that this search and rescue attempt might have jeopardized the lives of American prisoners. It is my firm belief that the lives of our American servicemen held captive are in danger every day

that Hanoi holds them and refuses to abide by the humanitarian provisions of the Geneva Convention. In the absence of inspections by the International Red Cross or another impartial organization, we can never be certain of the safety and well being of our men.

As it became clear to me that Hanoi, week after week, month after month, and year after year, was rebuffing our efforts at Paris for meaningful negotiations, particularly concerning the release of prisoners of war, I could not ignore the fact that our men were dying in captivity.

Mr. Chairman, I want this committee to know that I have not faced a more challenging decision since I became Secretary of Defense. I concluded that there was no acceptable alternative than to recommend that the volunteer force, now highly trained and well rehearsed for its humanitarian mission, should be authorized to make a valiant attempt to save their fellow Americans.

I have said and I want to repeat today that it is my firm belief that if there had been prisoners of war at Son Tay, they would be free men today.

I hope, Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, that as we pursue our efforts at Paris in accord with the President's peace initiative for Indochina, we may count on the influential bipartisan support and assistance of this Committee and the Congress in helping to realize success for President Nixon's proposal that there be an immediate exchange of all prisoners of war in Indochina.

The other side has referred to our prisoners and missing men as "just 1500 men." In America we value each individual. We particularly value the safety of these men who have sacrificed so much for our country.

As Secretary of Defense, I am proud that the men who entered, searched, and who returned from Son Tay included soldiers and airmen who volunteered for what was described to them as an extremely hazardous assignment deep into enemy territory. These are not men, Mr. Chairman, who despair; these are men who are prepared again to serve their Nation whenever and wherever called upon.

I cannot close without speaking in behalf of our men who cannot speak for themselves . . . I refer, of course, to our prisoners of war and missing servicemen. Those who are held in Southeast Asia and their families know that they are not forgotten, and we will not let them down.

#### DON RUMSFELD AND LEGAL SERVICES TO THE POOR

### HON. DONALD E. LUKENS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 25, 1970

Mr. LUKENS. Mr. Speaker, those of his former congressional colleagues who have carefully followed Don Rumsfeld's performance as Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity have been impressed at the way he has conducted himself in this truly awesome task of guiding this multifaceted antipoverty agency.

One of the many important antipoverty programs for which Don Rumsfeld is responsible is the legal services program. The function of this particular program is to provide legal assistance to the poor in civil matters. Since its inception this program has received high plaudits from the poor, the legal profession, and the news media.

It is not surprising that he should now come under fire by persons whom he was forced to release for incompetency. It is, however, surprising that he has received criticism elsewhere for his continued effort to improve the performance of the Office of Economic Opportunity.

Since Don Rumsfeld took control of OEO a year and a half ago, the impact on the legal services program has been truly significant. Don Rumsfeld personally and exhaustively has taken issues to over 200 Members of Congress in daily pilgrimages to Capitol Hill. Since his recent legal services program victory, Don Rumsfeld has continued to exercise great courage in protecting the program from political interference. Late last year he overrode strong gubernatorial opposition to the legal services program.

Moreover, he has refunded at a higher level his most controversial legal services programs—the North Mississippi Legal Services, the South Florida Migrant Legal Services, the California Rural Legal Services, and the D.N.A.—Navajo Legal Services. Despite intense local political opposition, Don Rumsfeld approved and caused the removal of the OEO-financed Chicago Legal Aid Bureau from the strangling control of its old sponsor, thereby increasing its effectiveness. All of the above-mentioned actions took place despite political pressure under which a less dedicated and courageous man might have weakened or compromised.

Under Director Rumsfeld's guidance, the legal services program has greatly increased in overall effectiveness. For instance, the percentage of need served has doubled from 14 percent in fiscal year 1969 to 28 percent in fiscal 1971. The number of OEO-funded legal services attorneys has increased from 1800 in fiscal 1969 to nearly 2000 today. The case load of legal services attorneys has virtually doubled from 610,000 in fiscal 1969 to a projected 1.2 million in fiscal 1971. Finally, under Don Rumsfeld, the operating budget for the legal services programs has increased 33 percent from \$46 million in fiscal 1969 to \$61 million requested for fiscal 1971.

Don has performed superbly in thoroughly reorganizing OEO—administratively and programmatically—into a more disciplined and more efficient organization in spite of incredible obstacles. It is difficult to understand how and why there is so much attention paid to former employees who apparently could not do their job while so little attention is directed toward OEO's real record of accomplishment.

#### SUPPORTS THE SCHWENDEL AMENDMENT

### HON. LOUIS STOKES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 25, 1970

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I rise in favor of the amendment. Section 129 of the bill represents a bold attempt to perpetrate legislative blackmail of the worst

kind upon the citizens of the District of Columbia, all of whom I might add are without a voice or a vote in this Chamber. If the amendment fails, these voiceless thousands of citizens will once again be trampled beneath the stampede of insensitivity which brought the bill to the floor in its present form. I therefore rise to speak for those whose voices cannot be heard.

The section under consideration is patently violative of rule 16 of the House of Representatives, as ably pointed out by the gentlemen from Iowa and New York. I will only add that as a representative of America's largest minority group, I find it both curious and tragic that the advice we are constantly given to obey the rules and work within the system is, in reality, adjustable to the particular needs of the givers.

Even more onerous is the history behind section 129. It is an excellent example of the kind of plantation politics which has characterized the Federal Government's relationship with the District for decades. Under the provisions of the Federal Highway Act, protection of State interests is afforded through planning and approval procedures which guarantee local participation in the interstate highway program. The landmark opinion of Judge J. Skelly Wright in the Three Sisters Bridge case, decided last April, correctly pointed out that District citizens could not constitutionally be deprived of those same guarantees by an act of Congress. Section 129 flies in the face of that important precedent. The Public Works Committee has held no hearings on the three sections of the Interstate Highway System covered by section 129. No official of the District of Columbia government has enthusiastically supported these economically and socially harmful roads. Rather, opposition has been silenced by the threat that no funds for mass transit will be released until they are constructed.

If this amendment fails, the District government stands to lose at least \$2 million a year in property taxes alone. Many parks, playgrounds, and other recreational facilities will be destroyed. In addition, almost 400 families and 150 businesses will be displaced. Where will they go? Who will provide for their relocation? Even if eligible, they have little chance to secure public housing because the list is long and the supply scarce. Further, it is well known that there is an acute housing shortage in the District, and a few provisions under the heading of "relocation assistance" in a public law will not change it. And all of this misery is going to cost us as much as \$27 million per mile of pavement. Even in these days of high prices, that is a bad bargain.

One might suggest that the number of people harmed by section 129 will be few and the benefits great. For those who live in the suburbs, perhaps this is true. For those who are willing to make this sacrifice at the altar of expediency in order to make mass transit in the District a reality, perhaps this is true. But the truly tragic thing, Mr. Speaker, is the fact that the bill in its present form actually reached the floor of the House of Representatives—the body which is sup-

posed to be closest to the people of this Nation.

I submit that this bill deliberately ignores the interests of the people in this city.

The District government has been told to govern. It is often criticized by some of my colleagues for not doing so. But the government and citizens of the District have had no say in this matter and that is unfair. As Dr. Martin Luther King once said:

It is a cruel thing to tell a man to lift himself up by his bootstraps when he has no feet.

I urge that the amendment be adopted.

JUDGE MAX M. MELTZER

### HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 25, 1970

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, the late Judge Max M. Meltzer of New York was recently the subject of an editorial written by Mr. Abe E. Eisenstein in the East Side News. This weekly publication is widely circulated in the district which I have the honor to represent in the Congress. It affords me great pleasure to bring this article to the attention of my colleagues:

NEIGHBORS—THEN AND NOW: JUDGE MAX M. MELTZER

(By Abe E. Eisenstein)

Everyone has special memories. The late famed beloved East Sider New Yorker Judge Max M. Meltzer causes to flash back through one's mind the unforgettable images and doings which become a part of us and of our East Side-New York history. He was a friend of youth and adults, an outstanding lawyer, a noted civic-educational-community leader, a great humane being, industrious, able and respected jurist.

Son of the late Israel and Rose (Hollander) Meltzer, beloved brother of Anna, Abe, Lillian, Phyllis, Max M. Meltzer was born on August 29, 1908, in an old tenement building (Eldridge Street) on the lower East Side. His early life was far from easy and this developed in him an inner strength and courage reflected in his entire life.

Famed old P.S. 20 (member of its Hall of Fame), De Witt Clinton High School, St. John's University, New York University, and University Settlement (board director) alumnus—Judge Meltzer was a past president and charter member Forton Club-Lodge, Inc., organizer and secretary of the HIP for the New York City Civil Service employees, honorary member University Amigos, a director of the P.S. 20 Alumni Association, member Alfred E. Smith Democratic Club, New York Lodge No. 1 Elks, Knights of Pythias, Samuel Dickstein Lodge, B'nai B'rith, New York County Lawyers Association, The Community Synagogue Center, University Settlement Alumni, East Side Chamber of Commerce, Manhattan Democratic Club, Lower East Side Housing Conference (recipient of a plaque for his housing work on July 23, 1948) Grand Street Boys Association, Civic Center Synagogue (a plaque unveiled in his memory on April 2, 1962), etc., Judge Meltzer was loyal to the traditions of his beloved East Side and devoted to American ideals. His dreams, no less than his desires and talents, were always at the disposal of the greatest possible good.

As an outstanding lawyer, he was pain-

staking in the preparation of his briefs and opinions. He was noted for his courteous and gentlemanly demeanor. He was a valuable member of The Bar, respected by lawyers, judges, and laymen for his ability, his honesty, and his integrity.

As a judge, his career was a credit to the judiciary and to The East Side-New York community which gave him its respect. He was sympathetic, kind, unselfish, and was always helping someone. He administered justice equally and intelligently for all alike. He never mentioned his deeds in a conversation or ever claimed credit for his many achievements. The judicial branch was much richer by having this young man don its robes.

Judge Meltzer was a devoted active citizen who kept in close touch with the personal, social, education, and economic problems of its residents. He was the champion of the people of his community, and fought continuously and successfully for new housing (early advocate and supporter of The National Public Housing Act), slum clearance, new schools, veteran unsubsidized public housing programs, and other problems concerned with the welfare of the people of the East Side and New York. He gave of his wide knowledge freely, without pretense of ostentation. He was a well informed, active, useful citizen and judge. He died on January 30, 1962 (Shevat 25), and was buried in Beth David Cemetery, Elmont, New York.

Judge Max M. Meltzer was married to the former Miss Eva Paskin. They were the parents of three children: Mrs. Arlene Ochberg (grandchild Ricky), Miriam and Charlie.

East Siders, New Yorkers, friends everywhere Salute the Memory of Judge Max M. Meltzer, who made an impressive record and was a strong ally and a great influence for good in our midst.

### SOYBEAN PRICES TUMBLE WITH TRADE ACT THREAT

### HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 25, 1970

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, yesterday's soybean futures market decline of 10 cents per bushel, which is the maximum permitted under trading rules for any 1 day, shows clearly that American farmers will pay dearly with reduced incomes if the Trade Act of 1970 becomes law.

With slightly more than 1 billion bushels of soybeans being produced this year, according to the USDA November crop production report, the Nation's soybean producing farmers yesterday lost more than \$100 million. A flurry of export sales, which took place overnight, may partially reverse that heavy loss, but the pattern is clear—soybeans will be one of the first crops against which overseas governments will retaliate.

Discussions this morning with grain trade people on the Chicago Board of Trade indicate that the Trade Act consideration pending in the Senate, following approval last week by the House, without question was the major factor in the \$100 million loss to farmers yesterday.

I am preparing for each Member of the U.S. Senate the amount of losses the farmers of his State thereby suffered. In my State of Illinois, the loss is \$18.5 million. It illustrates more graphically than

any statements made up to now by overseas buyers that they will retaliate if the import quota bill is approved.

Faced with the serious threat of the loss of markets overseas, soybean handlers opened Tuesday's trading with heavy liquidation of stocks on hand which touched off the serious declines in sales price.

From this single item, it should be crystal clear that the Trade Act of 1970 should be rejected by the Senate or, if it reaches President Nixon's desk, it should be vetoed.

#### THANKSGIVING DAY AND MILLIONS STILL HUNGRY

### HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 25, 1970

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, as millions are counting their blessings around their full dinner table tomorrow, no one should forget that there are many others in this country who will go hungry because we have let America's bounty pass them by; on this day of feasts, they will have nothing but promises to eat. Last year hunger was used by some leaders as a political issue; this year they have moved on to law and order as a rallying point, leaving the poor with empty wallets and unfilled grocery bags. Yet the echoes of last year's unkept promises reverberate in this year's problems. When a man has not eaten, law and order becomes a cruel and ridiculous slogan. In May of 1969, President Nixon pledged that "the moment is at hand to put an end to hunger in America itself for all time." Last December he promised that by this Thanksgiving every hungry child would be served a free or reduced-price lunch in his school. I am watching what this administration does as well as listening to what it says and I see little if any of this promised progress. We discover that of almost 9 million needy schoolchildren, over 4 million of them still go hungry under school lunch programs. But even worse, we find that of this Nation's 25 million hungry citizens, 13 million are without any governmental food assistance at home and must struggle on in unbelievable circumstances of deprivation. How can some people accuse this Government of doing too much for the poor? What kind of country is it that can find the resources to put soldiers in Vietnam, nuclear submarines in the sea, oil wells in the Arctic, TV transmitters in the sky, and men on the moon, and yet cannot find the compassion to put nourishment in the stomachs of its hungry people?

This callous insensitivity of our policymakers only serves to underscore the corruption of our national priorities. Rev. Jesse Jackson, of SCLC's Operation Breadbasket in Chicago, is mounting a massive hunger crusade trying to obtain food to combat the terrible conditions in his city. But the situation has become so critical that a welfare council in Michigan composed of hungry

people from around the State is planning to appeal to foreign countries such as Sweden, Germany, and Russia to come to their aid with badly needed commodities.

Lack of congressional action on the food stamp program is a prime example of this callous disregard. The Senate passed a new bill September 14, 1969, and the press heralded it in the headlines as "Free Food Stamps for the Poor," but this has proved an empty dream. Although the Senate measure was a good one, appropriating \$1.75 billion, the House has not acted at all even on a heavily restrictive bill reported by the Agriculture Committee. There are a great many of my colleagues vitally concerned with improving this antihunger program, but it will expire December 31 if not reauthorized. The Rules Committee, under the leadership of Mr. COLMER of Mississippi, has had the bill for over 3 months without bringing it to the floor for consideration by the whole House. This exhibits, in my mind, the kind of resolute obstructionism that has plagued us throughout the 91st Congress.

I consider it extremely important that all citizens take a moment tomorrow on Thanksgiving Day to stop and think what this country must do in the coming year to erase the horrors of hunger and poverty from the map of America. Remember that the common bond we seek for our society will never be realized as long as malnutrition remains an unsolved problem.

#### VALUE OF LIFE COMMITTEE SPEAKS ON ABORTION

### HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 25, 1970

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, one of the issues that is being discussed across the entire Nation and an issue that deeply concerns a great many Americans is that of abortion.

Dr. Joseph Stanton, a member of the Tufts Medical School and a member of the Value of Life Committee has sent me a letter that he and 17 others have sent to President Nixon regarding abortion and the Constitution. I believe the letter is very well written, and I include it now for the benefit of my colleagues:

NOVEMBER 15, 1970.

HON. RICHARD M. NIXON,  
President of the United States,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR PRESIDENT NIXON: We write to you about a matter of deepest concern. We believe that a fundamental provision of our Constitution is being abrogated by governmental decision and presidential commission all in the name of personal freedom, the individual pursuit of happiness, and the public good—to the disparagement of the right of life of the so-called "unwanted" unborn child.

The Constitution states in the Preamble its purpose to "secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity". In a subsequent paragraph it states: "Nor shall any state deprive any person of life, liberty or property without due process of law, nor deny any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws" (14th Amendment).

No word in the Constitution as amended qualifies life as having to be of any specific age, state of dependency, or degree of genetic perfection or acceptability in order to share in the promise, pledge, and protection of the Republic. The invisibility of this human life and the fact that its dwelling place is the nurturing body of another dare not obscure its claims as a person or proto-person to the protection of laws.

To remove an unborn human being at any stage from the mother's life-sustaining womb because it is merely "unwanted" is incompatible with the legal tradition of equal protection and due process fundamental to American Constitutional law. For generations our society and those older societies out of which our civilization has emerged have been evolving a refined, sensitive, and highly moral construct concerning the innate value of human life and have expressed this awareness in laws and professional safeguards against willful abortion.

Doctors should not now be encouraged by changes in the laws and professional codes to violate for one sector of human life the venerable Hippocratic Oath, nor lawyers and legislators be beguiled into thinking that while defending the new rights of liberated women, they may overlook the slowly and painfully accumulated legal insights into the rights of the weak, the unrepresented, the outcast before the bar of impartial justice.

The evil of any legalization of abortion on demand is that it allows one person to make an enforceable judgment about the right of another to continued life. Our Federal law does not yet know and may it never establish, by practice and precedent, such a power!

Item I. Where, Mr. President, are the rights of the unborn child to continued life being secured in the recent Department of Defense promulgation? We refer to that document which euphemistically refers to abortion of dependents as "termination of pregnancy", and allows abortion on demand in Department of Defense installations in the several states. Indeed, this is allowed regardless of the state law where the installation is geographically located.

Item II. Where, Mr. President, is the Constitution to be allowed to protect human unborn life in the report of your task force on the mentally handicapped dated September, 1970, which calls for increased government participation in "voluntary sterilizations and abortion"?

Item III. We reject as sociologically unsound the commission's gratuitous assumption: "Today's unwanted children are likely to be tomorrow's alienated, violent, mentally disabled or criminal." The suburbs with their family planning have produced as much alienation from American society as the ghettos. We find your commission short on reason, fact, moral sensitivity, and an awareness of the long history in many cultures and legal traditions in which societies have come to safeguard the rights of the fetus.

For us, Mr. President, and for tens of millions of your fellow citizens, abortion on demand, whether to check the population explosion or to insure domestic tranquility, is not an idea whose time has come, but only an old idea being propagandized to appear as if its time had come. The sexual revolution, the women's liberation movement, the ecological crisis have all come upon us at the same time; and many conscientious citizens concerned with social justice and civil liberties, have in our view obscured the moral issue of abortion against this tumultuous background. We are shocked that also your administration seems in the instances cited to have confused abortion and family planning however responsibly sought, as though they were medical issues on the same level of ethical magnitude and public policy. Abortion must not be confused with contraception, as though the former were but a backstop for the latter.

We find bone-chilling similarities in the anti-life stance of sectors of American society and the Nazi propaganda and practice but a third of a century ago. Yesterday it was "unwanted" Jews, Gypsies, political and religious dissenters, and the mentally or physically handicapped. Today in America for the moment it is only our "unwanted" unborn. But tomorrow it may be our "unwanted" aged or defectives and those who have outlived their usefulness. We face the specter of the manipulation of human beings from their genes to the life-goals.

Mr. President, it will cause us anguish if further moral polarization of this nation alienates us from our government. We submit that the proper fulfillment of a vow to uphold the Constitution's most basic promise should cause an immediate halt in government-sponsored and government-paid abortions in Federal installations on the grounds of due process and of the embryonic person's right to life and liberty.

Most sincerely,

Joseph R. Stanton, M.D., F.A.C.P., Associate Clinical Professor of Medicine, Tufts Medical School, Member, Value of Life Committee; Joyce Dwyer, Associate Professor of Maternal and Child Nursing, Boston College, President, Value of Life Committee; Charles L. Sullivan, M.D., F.A.C.S., Board of Directors, Value of Life Committee; Paul Ramsey, Harrington Spear Paule Professor of Religion, Princeton University; and George H. Williams, Hollis Professor of Divinity, Harvard University.

Charles P. Kindregan, Associate Professor of Law, Suffolk University, Secretary, Value of Life Committee; Maurice Fremont-Smith, Director of Development, Deaconess Hospital, Board of Directors, Value of Life Committee; Barbara A. P. Rockett, M.D., Board of Directors, Value of Life Committee; Rabbi Dr. Samuel J. Fox, Massachusetts; Robert E. Gross, William Ladd Professor of Children's Surgery, Harvard Medical School.

James M. Gustafson, Professor of Christian Ethics, Yale University; Leo Alexander, M.D., Assistant Clinical Professor of Psychiatry, Tufts Medical School Governing Board, Value of Life Committee; Arthur J. Dyck, Mary B. Saltonstall Professor of Population Ethics, Harvard University; Henry G. Armitage Jr., M.D., F.A.C.S., North Andover, Massachusetts, Board of Directors, Value of Life Committee; J. Robert Nelson, Professor of Systematic Theology, Boston University; Daniel Sargent, South Natick, Massachusetts; Walter G. Muelder, Professor of Social Ethics, Boston University; William F. Bernhard, M.D., Associate Clinical Professor of Surgery, Harvard Medical School.

This Letter was prepared by the Value of Life Committee, 637 Cambridge Street, Boston, Massachusetts 02135.

The eight members of the Value of Life Committee who are signatories are so identified.

The other signatories are distinguished personages who were invited to join with the Value of Life Committee in this statement.

### LONG ISLAND SOUND: OUR BACKYARD SEA

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 25, 1970

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, recently WNBC-TV in New York presented a 30-

minute show on the Long Island Sound. In this time of great concern for ecology and conservation I believe this show was an excellent example of how responsible journalism can help focus public attention on matters of the environment.

Roger Shupe, a constituent whom I am fortunate enough to know personally, produced and directed this superb documentary film. Mr. Shupe's own interest in the Long Island Sound, as a valuable resource for fishing and recreation, is reflected in this sensitive film he has produced.

While I cannot share the actual film with the Members, I would like to include in the RECORD the script of this important film. I think we can all benefit from the understanding and concern for our environment that comes through this script.

I, therefore, include the script of "Long Island Sound: Our Backyard Sea" in the RECORD at this point:

#### LONG ISLAND SOUND: OUR BACKYARD SEA

(Produced and directed by Roger Shupe; film editors: Vince Sarubbi, Don Orrico; Photography: Doug Downs)

#### ACT I

FRANK FIELD, V/O. Long Island Sound, a gigantic, pulsating tidal pool, more than 1200 square miles of water between Hell Gate and Fisher's Island to the east. The early Dutch settlers along its shores called it "The Devil's Belt." From its waters men harvest shellfish and the finny variety, or use it as a protected seaway for commerce, for relaxation, yachting, fishing, swimming, a place to commune. Too, the Sound is used in other ways. We've bulldozed and paved its shores, utilized it as a cesspool for human and industrial wastes, seeping and pouring into its embayments and estuaries by the millions of gallons. What about the Sound? Natural scientist and historian Robert Coles:

ROBERT COLES, SOF. The wide valley now containing the waters of Long Island Sound was once a river valley, formed millions upon millions of years ago back in the days of the dinosaur. Millions of years later it began growing cold all throughout the northern part of our continent, and huge continental glaciers pushed down out of the north, carrying tremendous quantities of sand and gravel . . . eating these harbors out and eating out the great valley, and to build up the upper strata of Long Island. The huge quantities of water that had been frozen into the glacier, melted, filled the oceans, raised the sea level. And so Long Island Sound became a reality at the end of the Ice Age. The shores of Long Island Sound have been to me almost like a university, a place where since childhood I've been able to wander on the shore and see nature not as you would in a museum where they have prepared exhibits . . . where you become a part of the world that you are exploring.

FRANK FIELD, V/O. Long Island Sound has been world famous for its shellfish industry, but polluted water has all but destroyed the natural set of oyster, clam, and mussel, or made inedible the shellfish that do survive. At Bayville, Long Island, in clean water, a flourishing shellfish business continues, owned and operated by Mr. Butler Flower:

BUTLER FLOWER, V/O. Our business started back in 1887. My grandfather started it and developed it, with a rowboat and a pair of tongs.

FRANK FIELD, V/O. Butler Flower calls himself a clamdigger, but as head of this three generation old clam and oyster business, he's a combination seafarer, businessman, biologist, and marine farmer.

BUTLER FLOWER, SOF. I've been in it since 1916. I left school when I was 14 years old, and I've been at it ever since. I thought I

knew more than they did at school, but I found out I don't—(laughs) I still don't. I'm on the water every day of the week and sometimes Saturdays and Sundays. It's a good, healthy life. It doesn't get monotonous. Every time you look at the water it's changed. We call our land that we use underwater oyster beds. We lease these oyster beds from the town or from the city, or from the state, according to what jurisdiction they're under. Most of our good fattening grounds are leased from the town of Oyster Bay. We also lease land in Connecticut. Those lands over there were originally for the raising of seed, small oysters; but since the ecology has changed, there haven't been any set on our beds over there for 15 years. The natural set is the set that the oysters spawn out naturally in the saltwater of Long Island Sound or the bays, and are fertilized and develop and grow, and then settle down on the bottom in the natural waters. If there's a great possibility that the rivers in Connecticut or any of the areas that feed Long Island Sound were cleaned up, it would change the ecology so there might be another setting period. There are some sections of Long Island Sound free from pollution; some sections in some of the bays are polluted. The pollution that worries me most is the industrial wastes and the pollution from the hard pesticides, the detergents and the refuse discharged from the sewage disposal plants, or fertilizer—they have phosphates and nitrates and things like that. Fertilizers—the microscopic plants and things in the water, and they just grow too prolifically, and in some cases where conditions are right, the temperature is right, and there's not enough wind, you'll have an overabundant supply of plankton, algae, which causes red tide. Actually they are food for the animals, especially the large animals. But when it gets oversupplied, it has a tendency to do the same to the shellfish and the animals and things in the water . . . it happens to us if we get dunked in the water, and we just can't breathe the water. They can't breathe this heavy growth of plankton; it causes them to suffocate. So if we don't take care of the Sound, generations to come will not have the use of it or be able to raise this food that is possible. And it's up to us to see that it's properly taken care of, and not destroy our natural heritage.

FRANK FIELD, V/O. Seafaring is part of our national heritage. The traditions of our maritime past are kept alive aboard large sailing yachts, such as Paul Hoffman's cutter, *Thunderhead*, just one of the estimated quarter-million pleasure boats on Long Island Sound. Her home port is Larchmont. With other large sailing vessels, she races the width and breadth of the Sound on overnight long-distance hauls, or offshore events . . . the Bermuda Race, or to Halifax, Nova Scotia. One design yacht racing is an equally important scene in the weekend use of Long Island Sound waters. Advertising executive, Ed Kropke:

ED KROPKE, V/O. The Sound has to be one of the most beautiful bodies of water available to a sailor in the world. Even on days when there isn't any wind, just being out on the water, looking at the clouds and the glassy sea, there's an attraction that the Sound has for sailors who will wait, without turning engines on, for the wind to come up. Even drifting has its moments, of solitude, and pleasure, of being away from these highways and the crowded streets. These regattas attract as many as 300 boats on a given afternoon, which involve upwards of a thousand people for crews and skippers, beside the spectators who come out who enjoy the starts and finishes of some of these regattas. There's racing along both shores, so racing is a way of life to an awful lot of people on a weekend. The Sound's attraction, I guess, is the fact it's a beautiful, large lake of seawater that provides an opportunity to make small voyages between your harbor or your port in comparative

safety. A youngster's involvement in competitive sailing gives him experiences that he wouldn't get in any other sport.

**FRANK FIELD, V/O.** Whaling ships once were built in Milford, Connecticut, centrally located on the north shore of the Sound. To the east and west of its beachfront it's hemmed in by heavy industrialized harbors . . . terminals for oil to be used as a source of heat, power, and transportation. The mayor of Milford, Edward Kozlowski, is properly concerned.

**EDWARD KOZLOWSKI, V/O.** I have called a meeting of all the mayors and first selectmen, town managers, whose communities border the Sound, to study a very serious problem, the possibility of a major oil spillage, of a tanker perhaps splitting in half. It's happening on the West Coast, it's happening in Florida, it's happened in England. And it would be too late should a tanker split at the seams—too late to call for a meeting at that time. We must be prepared, we must have a plan of action. Another thing would be to investigate new methods of waste disposal. The easiest way to dispose of wastes has been to deposit it in the Sound, and also some of the rivers. This is what we must correct. Local villages and cities have a jurisdiction over what is discharged in the Sound, and we can do something about it or we can look the other way. The population is increasing on both sides of the Sound, and the sooner we learn how to dispose of our—all wastes, the better off we'll all be without destroying the natural resources of the Sound.

**FRANK FIELD, V/O.** Turbidity is checked by a Federal Water Quality Control Administration member, who also collects samples to determine the dissolved oxygen content of the seawater, and the coliform count, a fecal indicator of pollution. Lab director Dick Dewling:

**DICK DEWLING, V/O.** The primary reason for the federal government's concern about Long Island Sound is that we do not want Long Island Sound to become another Lake Erie. There are indications that the water quality is deteriorating in Long Island Sound . . . the fact that certain beaches have been closed, certain shellfish areas have been closed. People are primarily concerned about pollution when they lose a part of the environment that they're used to working in, or playing in, whatever the case might be. When they can no longer swim in a body of water that they used to swim in, then they get upset. If they used to catch fish in a certain area and they no longer catch fish, then they're concerned. We must protect the waters that we have now to prevent them from becoming any worse, and also improve the poor water quality conditions that exist around the peripheral areas of the Sound.

#### ACT II

**FRANK FIELD, V/O.** Long Island Sound is fed by many rivers as well as being replenished by the ocean. The Nissequogue, which flows into the Sound by Smithtown, Long Island, is one of the purest. Trout spawn in its upper reaches, its banks harbor fur-bearing animals such as mink, muskrat, raccoon. It's a favorite place for wildlife biologist Tony Taormina:

**TONY TAORMINA, V/O.** I often get on the Nissequogue River with my son Lee, take canoe trips. And each time I do them, I enjoy them, I think, even more. The river rises in the glacial moraine on the north shore of Long Island, about halfway between Orient Point and Hell Gate, and is the largest river that we have on the north shore of Long Island. The Nissequogue is an excellent mixture of clear freshwater coming in from the uplands, mixing with saltwater coming in from Long Island Sound. The rich soup that we find in our estuaries, feeds the microscopic life which breeds here, and starts it on its way becoming the clams we eat, or the striped bass that we eat, and even the geese and waterfowl that the hunters pursue every fall. The future of Long Island Sound is

probably the same as the future of all other environments that we live on. If we can maintain a semblance of population control, and don't try to crowd every inch of shoreline, every acre of land with people, or people artifacts, we can probably continue to have a quality environment. However, if we continue to treat land as nothing more as a substrate for man and his developments, if we continually add increasing numbers of power stations and marinas and ports and terminals, and bring in more freight with the encompassing oil spills, the Sound will have to degrade in quality . . . again, a reflection of man's activities: his sewage wastes, his boat wastes, his industrial wastes. And certainly the water quality is directly proportional to the numbers of people who live along the shoreline. Technology can do so much for us, but we as individuals have very definitely got to learn that we will probably have to be inconvenienced, that we will undoubtedly have to take greater responsibility, each and every one of us, to help mitigate the impact that we all have on our environment. Let's keep in mind some very fundamental truth, and that is that the most marvelous machine man ever devised can't compare in complexity with a functional oyster, let alone a functional bluefish or blue-winged teal.

(Noise of boat.)

**FRANK FIELD, V/O.** Off the Eaton's Neck Coast Guard Station, a 40-footer is a familiar sight. Booming down the Sound, they're the workhorse of the Service in this protected seaway. A buoy-tender, too, is a common sight. The crew and craft check and maintain close to a thousand navigational aids on the Sound. These buoys are the road signs of the Sound, marking a particular spot, either a channel, an obstruction to navigation, or some other hidden danger. And they're continually checked to make sure they're on station where they're supposed to be. The Chief of Staff, 3rd Coast Guard District, is Captain Albert Frost.

**Capt. ALBERT FROST, V/O.** Coast Guard was started in 1790. Actually it was first called the U.S. Revenue Marine. Alexander Hamilton requested Congress to provide 10 cutters to insure the collection of the customs. And in 1915 we consolidated with the Life Saving Service, to form what is now the U.S. Coast Guard. Main purposes of the Coast Guard are law enforcement, and search and rescue. We maintain patrols particularly for motor-boat safety law violations, as well as for pollution prevention and control, and generally to enforce the laws of the United States on navigable waters in the area. We have seven helicopters at Brooklyn Air Station which at various times you'll find flying over the Sound. They are used for pollution patrol, for search and rescue missions, and for logistics on occasion. At regular intervals Eaton's Neck would work with Brooklyn Air Station in hoisting operations, and in the control and direction of a search involving boats and helicopters. The Coast Guard maintains regular oil pollution flights over Long Island Sound also. All of our pilots, as are our boat cockswains, are trained and directed to report all pollution sighted, at any time when they are operating over the Sound. And the boats from the Station have patrols daily in which they observe and report pollution that they may find in the area. With the increased emphasis on pollution prevention, I have hopes that the situation in the Sound may be reversed and that the Sound itself may again be considered a clean, healthy body of water.

**FRANK FIELD, V/O.** Thousands of fish died during periods of flat and oily calmness on the Sound this summer, a natural phenomenon complicated by man's disposal of his wastes. A concerned official who investigated, looking for solution to Long Island Sound's ecological problems and its trends, Congressman Lester Wolf:

**LESTER WOLFF, V/O.** One of the basic prob-

lems with Long Island Sound is the fact there is no real overall master plan for the Sound, and therefore individual localities will be doing their own thing. And as a result of which, there is this so-called piecemeal destruction. They're planning to put bridges over the Sound now, which will disturb the whole ecology of the Sound and contribute not only to the problems of the water but the air pollution as well. The Sound is thought to be somewhat of a bottomless pit, and it is not. It can only accommodate a certain amount of pollution in the way of solid wastes, it can only accommodate a certain amount of thermal pollution, before it is a dead sea. In some areas of the Sound it is a sewer for New York City and certain areas of Connecticut. The people along the shores of Long Island Sound came to live along its shores for perhaps one of the greatest recreation areas that we have in the entire nation. It almost is like the redwood forest, or the Grand Canyon, as a natural resource. I think it is important that people write their local officials and write their congressmen, so that they understand the great concern that the people have who inhabit this area. Just look out over the Sound—you can't look at it and see it and then say, "We're just going to write this off."

**FRANK FIELD, V/O.** Congressman Wolf co-sponsored a bill with Connecticut Senator Abraham Ribicoff, to enable the New England River Basin Commission to undertake a thorough three-year study of Long Island Sound, to produce a master plan for its future. At hearings on the bill held in Norwalk, Connecticut, radio announcer Phil Cutting was an outstanding witness:

**PHIL CUTTING, SOP.** As kids we used to swim around with our eyes open under water, as I'm sure many people have done. And I tried it recently, and you just can't see the same distance. Now, these aren't figures with test tubes and coliform counts, but these are basic observations.

**FRANK FIELD, V/O.** Phil Cutting broadcasts from his boat every summer weekend, giving mid-Sound weather reports, fishing and sailing news. He calls the Sound his neighborhood.

Every morning that I head out on the Sound, I see something entirely different from the last morning that I headed out. And in the day that I spend on the Sound, traveling as far as I do, I have an opportunity to enjoy sights and sounds that are just available nowhere else. The Thimble Islands are one of the most beautiful spots on the Sound. It's a good protected area for an overnight stay if you know where to anchor, and it is one of the prettiest of the colonies existing along the shore, a way of life all to itself. The Thimbles are unique in that they are rock-ribbed, practically devoid of any topsoil. They make an ideal place for a vacation cabin, and practically nothing else. Connecticut shoreline is the low edge or shore edge of New England, and therefore sustains large cities and is delta area for many major rivers coming into the Sound. And it's accessible to transportation from New England and New York in a way that Long Island, dead-ending as it does, is not. The Sound is being, and has been, polluted for a long time, at an increasing concentration in some areas, but in general we've begun to reverse the course of destruction of natural resources through the growing voice of conservationists and greater attention of those in political responsibility. There are exceptions to that in harbor areas or in new industrial areas where you'll find terrible problems of intense pollution; and with the increase in oil shipments on the Sound, occasional major spills such as we've seen this last summer. The problem is that some of the things that are lost on the Sound are irrevocably lost. These are beach and marshland areas that have been filled in and paved over, and there is just no restoring those. And the quality of life in terms

of marine life suffers for that loss. I compare the wetlands to the lung tissue of the human body, that they provide the source of nutrition, source of energy, in this case oxygen. They are very much a breathing apparatus for the Sound; within the protection and the nutrition of the marshland areas. Minute organisms exist that can exist nowhere else in the Sound. There is a growing concern to protect our environment, and I think it's not very far away. We'll be able to refine our legislation in a very practical way that will allow the realities of the necessity of dumping treated sewage, harmless effluent into the Sound, and at the same time we will be able to flatly rule out and prevent blatant misuse of the resources that are available to us on the Sound. I wonder why it is in taking as objective a look as I can at legislation affecting pollution, why it is that a clammer is made to be an outlaw, rather than the polluter who's made the situation unsafe.

FRANK FIELD, V/O. The Devil's Belt is getting tighter. Use of the Sound is limited only by its ecological ability to absorb our wastes. These waters are a mirror of our complex and changing environment, reflecting man's concern or lack of concern.

#### WORLD LAW DAY

### HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 25, 1970

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, today is World Law Day. In a proclamation signed on October 30, President Nixon designated November 25 as World Law Day and called for appropriate ceremonies to recognize the essential role that law plays in domestic affairs and must play in international affairs if we are to have the means to secure freedom, equal justice, and lasting peace among all peoples.

I commend the unstinting efforts over many years of Charles S. Rhyne, Esq., of this city, to mobilize the talents of the legal profession and harness them to the achievement of world peace through law. Mr. Rhyne is president of the World Peace Through Law Center in Geneva, an international nongovernmental organization of judges, lawyers, legal scholars, and other jurists with members in 128 countries and territories working together to build legal rules and legal institutions for world peace through law. The Center is largely responsible for the promotion of a World Law Day each year.

Mr. Rhyne is also an adviser to the International Law Committee of Members of Congress for Peace Through Law, of which I am chairman. He generously serves voluntarily on our advisory board with Dr. Arthur Larson, its chairman, Dean Adrian S. Fisher, Judge Philip C. Jessup, Prof. Covey T. Oliver, and Stephen M. Schwebel.

World Law Day, Mr. Speaker, is an appropriate occasion for Members of Congress to express their own deep convictions about the role of law domestically and internationally. I have long felt deeply that disputes between nations should far more frequently be taken to the International Court of Justice for adjudication or at least an advisory

opinion. Over the years, I have urged that numerous disputes to which the United States was a party be taken to the Court.

Today, on this fifth World Law Day, I want to share briefly with my colleagues my own convictions regarding the role of law and government and the road to a peaceful world.

President Eisenhower once said "there can be no peace, nor freedom or justice, without law." His words are manifestly true. And this truth is not limited to relations among the citizens within each nation, but applies with equal force to relations among all peoples and all nations.

It follows, therefore, that the pursuit of freedom, justice, and peace in this world means the pursuit of law and legal institutions and their acceptance and regular use.

To a tragic degree, many in this country have come to equate national power with peace. In the most fundamental sense, the use and threat of force by any nation is no more conducive to real peace than is the use and threat of force by an individual citizen.

What keeps peace within a nation is the compact among its citizens to accept and support rules of law and their adjudication and enforcement. They agree to be governed by their form of government. Their agreement stems not from theory or some ideal blueprint, but from their basic self-interest in order as opposed to anarchy.

To achieve peace and justice and true freedom for all nations and all peoples, we must strive consciously and persistently to eliminate anarchy and create order. This requires us to become more and more aware of our mutual self-interest as human beings on this spaceship called earth. It requires us to seek consciously and persistently to create, support, and utilize those rules of law and their adjudication and enforcement which alone can give us lasting peace, equal justice, and secure freedom.

Only as we employ this as our primary frame of reference and use this as our yardstick for measuring progress, can we be secure in the knowledge that we are truly moving toward peace and fulfilling human needs and away from war and misery.

On this World Law Day, 1970, I recommit my own efforts to this task and invite my colleagues in the Congress to do likewise.

Mr. Speaker, to this end, I insert in the RECORD at this point, a remarkably clear, instructive, and helpful article by the Honorable Philip C. Jessup, the distinguished former judge from this country on the International Court of Justice:

#### MEMORANDUM ON THE INCLUSION IN TREATIES OF CLAUSES FOR THE OBLIGATORY SUBMISSION TO INTERNATIONAL ADJUDICATION OF DISPUTES CONCERNING APPLICATION OR INTERPRETATION

(By Philip C. Jessup)

The practice of inserting in treaties a clause or provision by which the Parties agreed to submit to an international tribunal any dispute concerning the application or interpretation of the treaty, is well established. Judge Manley O. Hudson, in his standard treatise, *The Permanent Court of*

*International Justice 1920-1942*, gives the background:

"#443. *Compromissory Clauses in Treaties and Conventions.* The establishment of a permanent judicial agency greatly facilitated the inclusion in international instruments of clauses concerning the settlement of disputes which might arise with reference to the interpretation or application of their provisions,<sup>1</sup> and it became a general practice to include such clauses in multipartite instruments drawn up at conferences held under the auspices of the League of Nations. They were frequently included in bipartite instruments also, and even in instruments concerning arbitration and judicial settlement. In the course of time standard clauses were developed. They usually applied to disputes as to (a) interpretation, or (b) application, or (c) interpretation and application, or (d) interpretation or application of the provisions of the particular treaties. Resort to various agencies for the settlement of such disputes was provided for, the Court being the agency most frequently mentioned: in some cases, the Court was named only as one of several alternative agencies. Most of the clauses provided only generally for the reference of the dispute, but in some cases it was expressly stated that reference was to be possible by the unilateral application of any party.

"Several interesting examples of such compromissory clauses may be mentioned. Article 41 of the Geneva General Act of September 26, 1928, provided for submission to the Court of "disputes relating to the interpretation or application of the present General Act, including those concerning the classification of disputes and the scope of reservations."<sup>2</sup> On March 27, 1931, a Protocol was opened for signature at The Hague, by which the signatories recognized the competence of the Court to deal with (Fr. *pour connaitre*) all disputes concerning the interpretation of the conventions on private international law drawn up by the Hague Conferences on Private International Law.<sup>3</sup> The standard compromissory clauses inserted in later multipartite instruments tended to follow the form used on Article 25 of the Geneva Convention on the Manufacture and Distribution of Narcotic Drugs of July 13, 1931, which provided:<sup>4</sup>

"If there should arise between the High Contracting Parties a dispute of any kind relating to the interpretation or application

<sup>1</sup> In the *Chorzów* Case, the Court referred to "the so-called *clause compromissaire* (arbitration clause) introduced into commercial and other treaties during the last twenty-five years of the XIXth century and subsequently, by which the contracting Parties agreed to submit to arbitration any differences as to the interpretation or application of the particular treaties." Series A, No. 9, p. 21.

<sup>2</sup> Hudson, *International Legislation*, p. 2529.

<sup>3</sup> Hudson, *International Legislation*, p. 933.

<sup>4</sup> Hudson, *International Legislation*, p. 1048. The same text *mutatis mutandis* constitutes Article 4 of the Convention on Traffic in Women of Full Age, of October 11, 1933; Article 9 of the Convention on Contagious Diseases of Animals of February 20, 1935; Article 16 of the Convention of Transit of Animals of February 20, 1935; and Article 17 of the Convention on Traffic in Dangerous Drugs of June 26, 1936. See also Article 21 of the Convention on Conflict of Nationality Laws of April 12, 1930, and Article 7 of the Convention on Broadcasting in the Cause of Peace, of September 23, 1936.

The mention in such clauses of a forum other than the Court was originally due to insistence by representatives of the United States of America.

of the present Convention and if such dispute cannot be satisfactorily settled by diplomacy, it shall be settled in accordance with any applicable agreements in force between the Parties providing for the settlement of international disputes.

"In case there is no such agreement in force between the Parties, the dispute shall be referred to arbitration or judicial settlement. In the absence of agreement on the choice of another tribunal the dispute shall, at the request of any one of the Parties, be referred to the Permanent Court of International Justice, if all the Parties to the dispute are Parties to the Protocol of December 16th, 1920, relating to the Statute of that Court, and, if any of the Parties to the dispute is not a Party to the Protocol of December 16th, 1920, to an arbitral tribunal constituted in accordance with the Hague Convention of October 18th, 1907, for the Pacific Settlement of International Disputes."

"The compromissory clause in Article 23 of the Geneva Upper Silesia Convention of May 15, 1922, was relied upon by Germany in its two applications in the case relating to *German Interests in Upper Silesia* in 1925; Article 23 provided that 'should differences of opinion respecting the construction and application of Articles 6 to 22 arise between the German and Polish Governments, they shall be submitted' to the Court. Poland advanced a preliminary objection contending that the Court lacked jurisdiction on the grounds that no difference of opinion had arisen between the parties before the application was filed, and that the dispute did not fall under Article 23; the Court dismissed the objection, holding that under Article 23 recourse could be had to the Court as soon as one of the parties considered that a difference of opinion arising out of the construction and application of Articles 6 to 22 exists."

The practice was nearly uniform during the life of the League of Nations but since the United States was not a Member of the League and refused separate acceptance of the Permanent Court of International Justice, the United States did not support the practice widely until after the establishment of the United Nations in 1945. The United States had, however, become a Member of the ILO (International Labour Organisation) by a Joint Resolution of the Congress in 1934, and thereby accepted the Court's jurisdiction provided for in Articles 29-33 and 37 of the ILO Constitution.

A typical article is in Article XVII of the Statute of the International Atomic Energy Agency which reads:

"Settlement of disputes.

"(A) Any question or dispute concerning the interpretation or application of this statute which is not settled by negotiation shall be referred to the International Court of Justice in conformity with the statute of the court, unless the parties concerned agree on another mode of settlement."

In a memorandum of December 1, 1969, the Department of State listed multilateral agreements to which the United States is a party and which contained the so-called compromissory clause. The memorandum also listed bilateral treaties of the United States with the same provision. There are more than twenty treaties in each group. A copy of this memorandum with explanatory material is annexed hereto. Attention is called especially to the letter from Acting Assistant Legal Adviser Sylvia E. Nilsen to Lionel M. Summers in November 1964, also attached.

The interpretation of written texts by municipal courts constitutes a standard and substantial part of their task. From the interpretation of contracts, deeds and wills up

through the interpretation of laws and of the Constitution, the task is universally recognized as a judicial one. Except in countries like England, where there is no written Constitution, all this judicial activity is common to practically all countries of the world. Throughout the modern period of international adjudications—that is from the Jay Treaty of 1794 down to the present—international tribunals have time and again been called upon to interpret written texts, usually of treaties. There has been hardly a case before the International Court of Justice which has not involved an issue of treaty interpretation.

The utility and acceptability of interpretation of treaties by an international court, is shown by the European experience in establishing the European Economic Community under the Rome Treaty of 1957. As part of the organization of the Community, the Court of Justice of the European Communities has been established. If in a litigation in one of the six countries, members of the Community, a question is raised as to the interpretation of the treaty establishing the Community, the lower court may, at its option, request the Community Court to give a "preliminary decision" concerning the interpretation of the treaty. If the question of treaty interpretation arises in a national court of last resort from which no national appeal lies, the national court is obligated to refer the question to the Community Court. Although the basic treaty does not so provide, it has been accepted in practice that the interpretation by the Community Court will be considered authoritative and will be acted upon by the national court which then proceeds to decide the case before it, utilizing that interpretation of the treaty.

It has sometimes been argued that there is or may be disagreement about the international law rules governing treaties and their interpretation. This is true in international courts and has been true when various national courts have been called upon to interpret treaties. No judicial system would work if it were a prerequisite of jurisdiction that all the judges on the bench must agree upon the rules of law to be applied. Now, however, international courts would be assisted by the Vienna Convention on Treaties which was elaborated on the basis of the studies made over a period of years by the International Law Commission. Secretary of State Rogers has called it "a treaty of major importance". Even for States which have not yet ratified the treaty, it affords a valuable source of applicable international law, and in regard to interpretation, it is doubtful whether there would be important disagreements with its text.

It is often the case that a question of treaty interpretation is merely one element in a dispute or controversy. Thus in the situations in the European Community Court, as just mentioned, it is the national court which proceeds to decide the case on the merits after the Community Court gives the interpretation required. In like manner, it would be possible for the United States, if it were disputing a question of interpretation with another party to a treaty containing the compromissory clause, to leave open the merits of the dispute which might be more easily resolved when an authoritative interpretation was received from the International Court of Justice. Historically we have found it advantageous to terminate irritating controversies with our neighbors Canada and Mexico by asking international tribunals to interpret provisions of boundary treaties. The removal of even minor frictions with friendly countries is advantageous since if not settled, they may become magnified.

The long practice of inserting in our treaties the clause providing for judicial in-

terpretation is evidence that a succession of Administrations have consistently found that the practice is a useful one. The list mentioned above shows that the Senate has not hesitated to advise and consent to ratification of treaties containing such clauses.

It is unfortunate that at recent conferences for the conclusion of great multipartite treaties on the law of the sea, on diplomatic and consular rights and privileges, and on the law of treaties, the Soviet Union has succeeded in blocking the inclusion of the customary clause conferring jurisdiction on the International Court of Justice on questions involving the interpretation or application of the conventions. The United States Delegation at the Conferences where those treaties have been negotiated have opposed this Soviet position. The unsatisfactory compromise has been to adopt an "optional protocol" which States may ratify separately if they wish to submit possible future disputes to the International Court of Justice. The Senate has approved such optional protocols accompanying the conventions on diplomatic and consular rights and privileges.

On May 1, 1970, a letter signed by 17 Senators and 53 Representatives was sent to the President urging the use of international legal procedures and institutions for the settlement of international disputes. The letter contained the following paragraphs:

"It would be a highly significant contribution to the purposes of the United Nations during this 25th Anniversary Year and a tangible demonstration of America's willingness to resolve international disputes peacefully if the following specific steps could be taken this year: . . . Third, the instructing of U.S. negotiators to seek inclusion of a provision in future treaties and agreements which provide for the World Court's adjudication of disputes arising under those treaties and agreements."

#### TRADE BILL VOTE EXPLAINED

### HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 25, 1970

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I voted against the Trade Act of 1970 because I felt it would lead to higher consumer prices, worsening inflation, decreased farm exports, and a chain reaction of retaliatory measures by our trading partners around the world.

This bill alters a pattern of trade that for the past 35 years has served us well. Since enactment of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act of 1934, the value of American trade has steadily increased until it has become a major factor in the wealth and diversity of the American economy. Since 1960, the value of U.S. foreign trade has risen at a faster rate than the growth of the gross national product—a 111-percent increase compared to a 91-percent increase.

This expanding pattern of trade has reduced prices, increased opportunities for American business to export, and improved the efficiency and competitive strength of American industry. It has meant a higher rate of economic growth.

We must move with exceedingly great caution in reversing a pattern of trade that has brought us so many benefits.

My concern is that this trade bill, in-

<sup>5</sup> Series A, No. 6; Series C, No. 9-I, p. 24; *idem*, No. 11, p. 340.

tentionally or not, signals to all the world that the United States is abandoning its historic trade policy, and a contraction of world trade is likely to result.

This bill sets complicated and confusing procedures to restrict imports which will be difficult to administer equitably.

The retaliation in the form of reduced imports by foreign countries of American farm and manufactured goods will be serious. The six governments of the European Common Market, the world's largest trading bloc, and Britain have made clear they will be unable to resist pressures to retaliate against U.S. exports should this trade bill become law. All of these nations send sizable percentages of their own exports to the United States.

Retaliation could be especially serious for Indiana. Thirty-five percent of Indiana's manufacturing exports go to Europe and Europe is one of the biggest markets for Indiana soybeans, and one of the most likely areas to react adversely to the House trade bill.

In the area of manufactured goods, from 1958 to 1967, textiles and leather products created 1,480 new jobs in Indiana in 113 new firms. Exports for these two classifications increased by \$100,000 from 1967 to 1969, reaching a level of \$1.2 million. Over 400,000 manufacturing workers in Indiana are employed in exporting firms. In 1960, Indiana exports totaled \$305 million; in 1969, \$960 million—up to 370 percent. These growing markets should not be jeopardized by restrictive trade legislation.

Other reasons strengthened my opposition to the Trade Act of 1970. The bill provides a new tax loophole for export-oriented businesses, which will cost the Treasury up to \$650 million per year in lost revenues.

The bill freezes the oil import quota system, which costs the consumers of American \$5 to \$7 billion annually in increased prices for oil.

The bill will have an inflationary impact, since it will result in fewer low-priced imported goods and less competition from abroad for domestic goods. The informed estimate is that the higher cost of items resulting from the trade restrictions contained in the bill will boost the consumer price index by almost 1 percent.

The bill will blunt incentives for American industry to modernize, cut costs, and increase productivity and output by erecting shields of Government protection. And it will jeopardize the jobs of American workers employed in export trade.

There are better ways of aiding American firms affected by import competition. Present law can be effective in protecting our manufacturers against dumping and other unfair trade practices; adjustment assistance for affected industries and employees can be liberalized.

We must consider alternative courses of action in foreign trade that will not rebound to the detriment of American farmers and manufacturers, as the Trade Act of 1970 is apt to do. There are defects in our present trade laws, but this bill goes too far.

## COMPREHENSIVE MANPOWER ACT

### HON. LOWELL P. WEICKER, JR.

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 25, 1970

Mr. WEICKER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to present the following statement by the executive director, William R. Hutton, of the National Council of Senior Citizens as an extension of remarks to the Comprehensive Manpower Act. This statement is in reference to the "senior aides," a highly successful U.S. Department of Labor community service employment program for older people which is operating in my district in Bridgeport, Conn. Your attention is directed to the affect the Comprehensive Manpower Act will have on it.

The program should be commended as it has been greeted by enthusiasm from both the employers of these senior aides for their youthful and useful contributions to these organizations and from the senior citizen participants for the feeling of well-being it has engendered.

The statement follows:

#### SENIOR AIDES

To provide meaningful part-time employment for needy older Americans in this country, I support continuance and expansion of the Community Service Employment Programs, through passage of the Manpower Bill. I know about the excellent work of these programs through my contact with the National Council of Senior Citizens Aides Program in Bridgeport, Connecticut.

Sponsored by the Bridgeport Commission on Senior Citizens, the Senior Aides Project has sixty low-income Senior Aides, age fifty-five and over, placed in 14 community service agencies throughout Bridgeport. These agencies include the American Red Cross, North End Girls Club, three hospitals, the public library, and the American Cancer Society.

Ten Senior Aides with the City's Parks and Recreation Department recently received Presidential commendation and kudos in the Bridgeport newspaper through their supervision of 200 youths in an anti-litter campaign for the city.

When I wrote to President Nixon about the clean-up project and asked for his endorsement of an anti-litter and beautification slogan contest, he did not reply to me, but instead sent a letter of commendation directly to Andrew Guyer, youth coordinator for the Parks and Recreation Department.

"I want to commend you and all those who assisted in the anti-litter campaign," wrote the clean-up project and asked for his example for all of our fellow citizens."

Guyer extended congratulations for the work of the Senior Aides to Mrs. Gertrude Kutno, the Project Director. The Parks official commented, "I feel that the work your Aides have done in abetting our beautification program is in great measure responsible for its success. The Aides work directly with the youngsters and this proves that age is not a barrier to pride in our community, but rather, an asset."

Other Senior Aides serve the community as instructors, maintenance aides, kitchen aides, hospital service aides, and clerical assistants.

Furthermore, their participation in the program is contributing to research on the elderly being conducted by the University of Bridgeport. Five Senior Aides, on a voluntary basis, are participating in scientific endeavors concerning older adult behavior.

I was very much involved in getting the initial funds for the program in Bridgeport, so I know how effective the Senior Aides Program has been in both supplementing senior citizens' incomes and in giving them a useful place in society. One of my chief concerns has been that of the Senior Citizen. I strongly urge the continuance and expansion of Community Service Employment Programs such as the fine Senior Aides Program conducted in Bridgeport.

## NIXON'S DILEMMA ON THE TRADE BILL

### HON. JOSEPH E. KARTH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 24, 1970

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Speaker, last week the House passed the trade bill in spite of the warnings, clearly sounded, that the consequences of its enactment into law will be to disrupt the world economy and imperil world peace.

What has not been emphasized sufficiently, I think, is the economic disaster which will befall the American farmers, workers, and businessmen as the result of the retaliatory measures which surely will be taken by other trading countries should the bill, as passed, become law.

An eminent observer, Milton Vorst, has written in the Washington Evening Star of some of the effects which can be anticipated. I commend the attention of my colleagues to this important article, which follows:

#### NIXON'S DILEMMA ON THE TRADE BILL

(By Milton Vorst)

The most important piece of legislation to come up during the entire Nixon administration is currently before Congress. And, amazingly, we don't have a clue to whether the President approves of it or not.

This bill, which imposes a stringent new set of restrictions on imports, can damage our relations with every trading country in the world. It can profoundly impair the development of our national economy.

But because of its domestic political implications, the President has remained silent about it.

We know his opinions on street crime and student violence, on which he can take pious moral positions but which elude easy legislative solutions.

In contrast, he says nothing about the trade bill, where a moral position requires courage but whose disastrous consequences can be averted by a simple congressional majority.

Admittedly, the President is in a dilemma. He committed himself in 1968 to repay the Southern textile tycoons who made possible his election. He also has some major debts to the big spenders in the oil industry. He'll need both of these groups again in 1972. This legislation was originally written for them. But he knows this bill is intrinsically inflationary. It will raise oil prices immediately and textile prices shortly. Over the long run, it could increase the price of every product that now has foreign competition. By 1972, the inflation in this bill could generate a lot of anti-Nixon votes.

The President also knows that, before long, the nation's exporters will begin to feel the backlash of economic reprisal. The European Common Market, our biggest customer, has warned explicitly that it will retaliate vigorously if this bill is passed.

Hardest hit will surely be agriculture,

which last year had \$6.6 billion in exports. Currently, American farmers export 50 percent of their soybean crop, 41 percent of wheat, 36 percent of tobacco, 58 percent of rice, 29 percent of cotton. Naturally, the farm lobbies are outraged by the bill.

As Denver's Rocky Mountain News put it: "Protection for a North Carolina textile plant will be at the expense of, say, an Indiana soybean grower (or) a Colorado wheat farmer."

There is no doubt, furthermore, that the bill will trigger the kind of action-reaction sequence (called a trade war) that can lead only to a grievous decline in international commerce as the Smoot-Hawley protective tariff act did in 1930.

Paradoxically, the loser would necessarily be the United States. This year, despite all the complaining about unfair competition from abroad, we will have a \$3 billion trade surplus. This surplus is vital to maintain our overseas commitments, our balance of payments and the stability of the dollar.

Mr. Nixon, perhaps, can still save the situation. He understands the importance of international trade. He is not, at heart, a protectionist. He can go on television to explain to the country exactly what is at stake.

He will have no problem showing that a congressman who votes for fatter profits for textiles and oil takes dollars out of the pockets of farmers, industrial workers and, ultimately, every American consumer.

Yet Mr. Nixon risks going down in history as the first protectionist President since Herbert Hoover, and the chief antagonist to the international trend toward freer trade.

By his acquiescing in the trade bill, he is asking the country to pay a heavy price for his personal political debts.

#### WHY SO MANY BLACKS ARE DYING IN VIETNAM

#### HON. WILLIAM (BILL) CLAY

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 25, 1970

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, many citizens are asking why the percentage of blacks in the armed services is far greater than their percentage of the national population? There are various reasons advanced for the fact that blacks are fighting and dying in Southeast Asia in far greater percentage than their numbers here in America. But the most logical one is that held by black militants: "the white man has decided that blacks will fight this illegal, unjust, and immoral war."

When the composition of draft boards are analyzed on a national basis, it tends to prove the charge that blacks are not fairly represented on the commissions that determine who will be inducted into the armed forces.

The following article from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch appearing November 19, 1970, substantiates the hypocritical positions of most Americans that "neighborhood schools" are important, but the "neighborhood draft boards" are not.

#### NEIGHBORS IN THE DRAFT

Gov. Hearnes ought to have a quiet chat soon with Lt. Col. Ralph E. McCain, acting director of Selective Service in Missouri. The Colonel is responsible for remedying an unfortunate defect that has developed in the Selective Service machinery here under which ghetto blacks are in large measure being drafted not by their black neighbors, as the

system contemplates, but by white suburbanites who are strangers to them. This is hardly a procedure likely to instill confidence in the fairness of the system.

As disclosed in this newspaper by Ted Gest, almost half of the members of the 11 Selective Service boards with jurisdiction over areas of St. Louis live in St. Louis County, a clear violation of the spirit of federal regulations that say any members of local boards "shall be residents of a county in which their local board has jurisdiction." Col. McCain's argument that the nonresidency practice is permissible because St. Louis is no "county" is legal hair-splitting. We imagine both he and Gov. Hearnes would act quickly enough if the shoe were on the other foot—if black Republican politicians from North St. Louis were drafting young whites in Florissant, Clayton and South County.

To take one example of many: Robert Grant Walsh of Glencoe in southwest St. Louis County is chairman of Selective Service Board 103 in North St. Louis, some 25 miles as the crow flies from his home in outer suburbia. He is white, a former Democratic Committeeman from the First Ward and still active in Democratic politics, although now his political interests of necessity are centered in the county. If he wants to volunteer for draft board duty it should be for Board 220 which runs no farther east than Lindberg Boulevard, or else he could move back to the First Ward.

The idea of having local boards in the first place, as articulated by former Selective Service Director Lewis B. Hershey, is that they should be composed of "little groups of neighbors on whom is placed the responsibility to determine who is to serve the nation in the armed forces and who is to serve in industry, agriculture and other deferred classifications." Gov. Hearnes should insist that Col. McCain carry out this philosophy.

#### UGLY DUCKLING?

#### HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 25, 1970

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, on a number of occasions in the past I have requested permission to insert in the RECORD newstories and other material that I have considered helpful in furthering the true picture of the F-111.

Certain of my cause, I intend to continue to follow this course, and insert a newstory dated November 20, 1970, from the Omaha World-Herald in the RECORD.

Briefly, the story says one simple but extremely important thing: At McCoy Air Force Base, Fla., a few days ago two "swing-wing SAC planes competed against 27 SAC B-52's and two Vulcan bombers of the British Royal Air Force in a test of precision bombing that was scored by radar."

The two-man FB-111 crew of Lt. Col. Robert S. Russell and Maj. Arben R. Ely scored the highest point total.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the article from the Omaha World-Herald. It follows:

#### UGLY DUCKLING PACES SAC BOMBERS

(By Howard Silber)

ORLANDO, FLA.—An ugly duckling was transformed Thursday into the beautiful bird of the Air Force.

The transformation began Sunday when two FB111 bombers were entered in the

Strategic Air Command combat competition which was flown from McCoy Air Force Base here.

It ended with an announcement Thursday that the controversial plane had won an important part of the contest.

The FB111, which closely resembles and has shared many of the problems of the trouble-plagued F111 fighter-bomber, was declared the winner of the SAC bombing trophy.

The two swing-wing SAC planes competed against 27 SAC B52s and two Vulcan bombers of the British Royal Air Force in a test of precision bombing that was scored by radar.

#### FB111 VICTORY

The two-man F-111 crew of Lt. Col. Robert S. Russell, Paterson, N.J., and Maj. Arben R. Ely, Portland, Ore., scored the highest point total.

SAC's FB111 unit, the Ft. Worth-based 340th Bomb Wing, could not compete for the big prize, the Fairchild Trophy, because it does not yet have tanker aircraft, and an exercise in tanker navigation is one of the requirements.

In fact, the FB111 will not officially become part of the deterrent force until the middle of next year. The current mission of the 340th is testing the new bomber and training crews to fly it.

#### UNPRECEDENTED

The entry of the FB111 in the competition was unprecedented in that the contest which began in the 1950s had never before been opened to aircraft which were not available for tactical use.

SAC did not deny that the FB111 was entered in the hope that it would win at least part of the competition and, thus, begin to overcome a serious image handicap.

The bombing trophy victory was a big plus for an aircraft which has encountered many minuses, including the grounding of the entire fleet of more than 400 F111s and FB111s for the most rigid testing program ever undertaken by the Air Force.

The planes were grounded after a series of crashes.

#### OVER THE HUMP

Gen. John D. Ryan, Air Force chief of staff and defender of the plane, arrived here shortly after the announcement was made. "We are over the hump," he said. "This is going to be a real fine airplane for us."

Gen. Bruce K. Holloway, SAC commander-in-chief, was equally enthusiastic. "The FB111 is working very well," he said. "It represents significant technical advances in electronics and bombing and navigation systems."

The SAC chief was an early project officer for the TFX, which became the F111 and the SAC variant, the FB111.

#### HAPPY CREW

Perhaps the greatest enthusiasm was demonstrated by the two 35-year-old members of the winning crew. Russell and Ely were assigned to fly an airplane which is regarded by some persons and, they said, even their wives—as unsafe and unreliable.

But they insisted that the plane has been maligned.

"It is simply magnificent," said Russell. "It does just about everything for you. It is the only plane that SAC has that can do the job."

Russell said that by "the job" he meant the penetration of Soviet air defenses.

"Structurally it is small. It isn't seen easily on radar. It flies very low and very fast," Russell explained.

The FB111 can move in on a target at a level of 200 feet above the terrain—too low to be readily tracked by radar, the pilot said.

Ely, the navigator-bombardier, described the plane as "the finest there is from the standpoint of being capable of doing what it was designed to do."

Present plans call for SAC to receive 70 operational planes along with a few spares and training aircraft.

### MOORHEAD LEGISLATION RESPONDS URGENT HOUSING NEEDS OF SRO'S

#### HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 25, 1970

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, the House Rules Committee yesterday granted a rule for House Resolution 19436, the 1970 Housing Act.

This legislation contains housing subcommittee's response to many of this Nation's critical housing dilemmas.

One of the lesser known but innovative measures is a provision I authored to provide dormitory-type housing for single individuals who have been forced to leave their homes because of public action.

Often these single men and women do not qualify for other forms of housing assistance and cannot find the unique type of abode that best suits their living style. Many times they expend their meager incomes on inappropriate housing, that offers few of the conveniences that they have come to rely on.

The man and woman I am speaking of is usually elderly and a loner. He or she is a person who prefers not to have a house or a complete apartment but feels quite at home in a clean sleeping room.

Too often these accommodations are found in the many residential hotels that dot the downtown area of many of our large cities. And it is these hotels that increasingly are the target of the wrecker's ball.

Ralph Miller, writing in the Pittsburgh Press of Sunday, November 22, has poignantly recorded the fate of one of these hotels in Pittsburgh and the men who now are living there.

I would like to introduce Mr. Miller's excellent article into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this time:

DOOMED HOTEL, OLD-TIMERS SIT 'N' WAIT  
(By Ralph Miller)

Carpeted heavily with the dust of decades, the lobby of the New Merchants Hotel is a sneezingly nostalgic setting.

The late fall sun, its rays slicing through the grime and grit on the front window, was warming the sagging shoulders of three old-timers sitting contentedly on the long, shiny, splintered benches.

They weren't saying too much—an occasional grunt somehow understood to mean something between cronies—but they were thinking thoughts about as long as their memories.

A dim light dangling listlessly from a lengthy cord softened the shadows that were eerily etched into the scene.

Someone apologized: "Most of the fixtures just don't have no more bulbs . . . aw, we don't really need 'em just for settin' around like this."

LOOKING FOR "BIG BALL"

A ruddy-faced Irishman with the twin gifts of gab and wit explained:

### EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

"Every morning we get up and look out the window to see if the big ball is coming down on us yet."

That's the way James J. Dougherty, 70, a resident at the hotel "for a long time," facetiously expressed the anguished sentiments of the roomers.

They're trying to keep the thought of the hotel's closing out of their minds until the last couple of days, as one old-timer put it.

They've all been notified the historic place is closing Monday, Nov. 30.

A spokesman for the Herman Investment Co. said, "We're going to start razing the property on the first of December."

In the immediate future the plans for the site are "indefinite . . . but it will most likely be used for parking, at least temporarily."

#### "OUTLIVED USEFULNESS"

The hotel at 415 Fort Pitt Blvd., near Smithfield Street, "has simply outlived its usefulness," the investment company spokesman added.

Well, to the old-timers that's a matter of opinion.

"It may not be the Waldorf, you know, but it's been home to a lot of us for a long time, and it ain't easy leaving, especially at our age," said Joseph H. Hensler, 88.

Hensler, who laid pipelines before his retirement, recalled that in living 21 years at Merchants he had seen "a lot of fellows come and go . . . made an awful pile of friends . . . but a good many of them have gone now . . . died off."

Hensler plans to "stay in this neighborhood . . . I wouldn't want to go anywhere else . . . it's my home digs."

Hyman Miller, 65, "just a kid around the place," recently retired as newsboy at Fifth and Wood, downtown. He, too, prefers to stay in the same area.

#### CROSSING THE BRIDGE

"I'm going across the Smithfield Bridge, to a place that's kind of like this, not fancy but sort of homey," he said.

He said, "After the years—like, I been here 17 years—you get a feeling for a place and no matter what somebody else might think, why it's just home, that's all, just home."

Bill Craig, 66, the day clerk, nodded.

"I'll sure miss this place," he said, softly. Seated in a rickety chair facing rows of empty mall slots, Bill sighed, "We only have about 25 men left . . . rest all took off soon as they heard about the closing."

Bill fumbled with some registration cards. "No use for these . . . we're not taking anybody else now," he explained, wiping a cobweb from a dust-crusted inkwell.

Bill looked up when a guest walked quietly over the chipped squares on the lobby floor and headed toward the door—for the last time.

Carrying a paper bag in one hand, with some old newspapers scrunched under his arm, he paused to wave to Bill.

"See you around." Bill could only say, sincerely, "Take care of yourself."

Craig and the lobby sitters agreed that it "kind of gets to you the way we have to fold up our stuff and hit the road," as Miller put it.

Hensler took a deep drag on his stogie, looked wistfully out toward the Smithfield Street Bridge, and concluded:

"So that's how it goes . . . everything comes to an end."

And when the big steel ball slams against the Merchants about the first of December, historians may wince. More than 100 years old, Merchants has been a landmark along the Monongahela River, dating back to when it was a riverboaters' hangout.

Now, a parking lot. That's how it goes.

November 25, 1970

TONY GRANATA, "EXEMPLARY CITIZEN, 1970"

#### HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 25, 1970

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, Friday evening, December 4, the Greater Cleveland community will honor one of its truly outstanding citizens, Anthony A. Granata, president of the Cleveland Federation of Musicians.

Tony will be receiving the Heights Lions' Annual Book and Scroll Award which confers the title of "Exemplary Citizen, 1970."

In announcing the award, the Honors Committee Chairman Judge John T. Patton said:

The award is presented each year to an individual who provides varied and important community services, thereby inspiring emulation and multiplying the good effects of those services. Mr. Granata's record of services merits the award.

Indeed, his record proves that he does deserve the reward and thanks of all Cleveland area residents. His career in music in the Cleveland area has spanned nearly 40 years. As early as 1932 he was a bass-playing bandleader. He traveled with many of the great orchestras of the time and led the Cleveland Indians "big band" at the stadium for all the ball games. He has long been active in the Cleveland Federation of Musicians, where he was first elected to the executive board of local 4 in 1941, and since that time was served as area-delegate and assistant secretary-treasurer. He has been president since December of 1965.

As a musician he has led in returning live music to the city's parks and shopping centers. Working with the Cleveland Chamber of Commerce he has just presented a series of free music-on-the-mall concerts.

Some small feeling for the dimension of Tony's contribution to the Cleveland community can be seen from the following list of community activities in which he participates and the past awards he has received:

- Board of Directors, Health Fund;
- Board of Directors, Cleveland Growth Association;
- Board of Directors, Police Athletic League;
- Alternate Board of Directors, Ohio Arts Council;
- Board of Directors, Tri-State Musicians Conference;
- Legislative Director, Ohio State, American Federation of Musicians;
- Chairman, Special Events for Downtown Cleveland;
- Advisory Committee, Foster Grandparents Program; and
- Music Coordinator, City of Cleveland.

Tony's awards are also numerous:

- Press Club Award, 1969;
- Meritorious Service Award, Cleveland AFL-CIO Union Counselor Association, 1969;
- El Hasa Shrine, 1967;
- As well as awards from the Veterans' Administration hospitals at Brecksville

and East Boulevard, the city of University Heights; and the Severance Shopping Center.

Tony is a man who has brought the light of music into the lives of thousands upon thousands of people. As he himself has said:

Music is an international language which reaches the heart and mind of everyone who can hear and appreciate the gift of music. My entire life has been music, and I want to share it with everyone, especially those who rarely have the privilege of seeing and hearing a live band perform.

This coming Friday's banquet and award dinner is well deserved and it will be my privilege to be present, along with Tony's many other friends, on this special evening. As Daniel L. Mausser, Heights Lions' president summed up:

Tony's unselfish generosity, his sincere love of people, and his driving energy, have made many friends and admirers through the years. We will try to have them all presented at the presentation. It will be their night—Tony's and his friends'.

#### CAMPUS FUTURE QUESTIONED

### HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 25, 1970

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, the California State colleges are now 9 years old as a system, but in reality the history of these great institutions dates back to 1862 when the Weekly Normal School established by the San Francisco Board of Education in 1857 became the first institution of higher education established by the State.

These colleges have had to weather many storms in their history. There are now 19 State colleges; the 19th was opened in September at Bakersfield, Calif. They serve over 200,000 students. This past spring, these colleges were not spared the attempt by a few to turn the colleges and universities into centers for political action to protest a national problem of the moment. Needless to say, higher education has never received such a serious challenge to its very existence than this attempt to distort the true meaning of the education process and academic freedom.

Last July, the Christian Science Monitor had a special article on the California State colleges and the leadership of Chancellor Glenn Dumke in defending academic freedom from the many onslaughts facing it today. I am pleased to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the referenced article as it indicates the firm resolve of one of the largest educational systems in the world to meet the need of our young people to acquire the knowledge necessary for societal leadership.

I am very proud to compliment the California State colleges on their achievements and their distinction, with over 200,000 students, of being the largest educational institution in the Western World and contributing much to the future greatness of the State of California.

The article follows:

#### CAMPUS FUTURE QUESTIONED: FREEDOM VERSUS "POLITICAL ACTIVISM"

(By Curtis J. Sitomer)

Los Angeles.—The man who rides herd on one of the largest complexes of higher education in the world warns that increasing campus trends toward political activism may eventually knock the props out from under "academic freedom."

Dr. Glenn S. Dumke, chancellor of California's 19 state colleges, says: "Society has only one institution devoted to the scholarly study of problems—the university. And because this institution offers the benefit of objectivity, society allows it special liberties. But if it stops performing, society no longer has the responsibility to provide academic freedom."

In an interview, the chief of this 227,000-student educational network emphasized that the role of the scholar is incompatible with political activism in an academic community.

#### "ACTION ROLE" REJECTED

"The function of the scholar is a 'critical' one. He must objectively study the problem of society," Chancellor Dumke explains. "The action role is not fitting."

"The social revolution in America today should be kept in its proper place—off-campus and in the social agencies in society," he adds.

Chancellor Dumke feels strongly that college campuses must not lend themselves to becoming political agencies. And he says that if they do, the academic operation will lose its integrity.

He opposes the so-called "Princeton plan," which would allow students two weeks' leave from their studies prior to the November elections to engage in partisan political activity.

"Even though the work of these two weeks would be made up," he says, "the very idea is paradoxical."

#### "FOLLY" CHARGED

"What we need more than anything else when we go to the polls is an educated citizenry. For the institution to underwrite political action as a substitute for academics—particularly when our younger generation now constitutes such a large and important part of our total population and an increasing part of our electorate—is the capstone of folly," he adds.

"Certain universities in Latin America have gone this route. And they are no longer valid institutions of higher education."

Chancellor Dumke's views on the impropriety of political activism on campus draw sharp fire from more "liberal" academic colleagues.

His critics say they are compatible with some of his recent administrative decisions overriding faculty authority.

#### MURRAY OUSTER DIVISIVE

The chancellor's firing of Black Panther George Murray as an instructor at strifetorn San Francisco State College last fall triggered sharp reaction on that campus. And his later dismissal of Prof. Eldred Rutherford at San Jose State College, contrary to a recommendation for reappointment by the school's faculty, further embittered many academic personnel toward him.

In his eight-year tenure as head of the state college system here, Dr. Dumke has been accused "by-passing traditional academic processes" and "selling out" to conservative California Gov. Ronald Reagan—a leading exponent of taking a "hard line" with student and faculty disrupters and malcontents.

A statewide faculty committee has periodically called for his resignation or firing. And several militant student groups have made the same call.

Dr. Dumke defends his intervention in local campus controversies in terms of the times.

"Higher education could be governed in calmer days by consensus," he says. "But this system of wide-spread diffusion of responsibility is no longer workable."

#### PERSONAL DECISIONS DEFENDED

"Academic justice used to be leisurely and deliberate. Perhaps a disciplinary committee heard three cases a year. Today, with the advent of social action, they are often faced with 30 cases in one day."

"I can't wait for some slow process of academic justice," Dr. Dumke says. "In some cases, I must act swiftly."

Despite these stances, Dr. Dumke insists that he doesn't oppose student concern with public policy or even student use of "existing machinery" to make their opinions known.

"On the contrary, I favor student interest and concern. When properly exercised, it is certainly more appropriate than the apathy which afflicted our student generations of a decade ago," he says.

However, he insists that students, like lawyers, businessmen, and other workers, must not close down their shop for political purposes.

"We in education are responsible for an institution which is particularly unsuitable for partisan purposes," he says. "And we must not rob society of the only agency it has for an unbiased, objective, scholarly study of its problems and future."

#### THE POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT'S UNEQUAL TREATMENT OF PHOTOGRAPHERS

### HON. ABNER J. MIKVA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 25, 1970

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, it has come to my attention that for years the Post Office Department has been following a policy that in effect, refuses to recognize the photographer, as compared to the painter, as a true artist. Since as early as 1856, the Post Office has used photographs as the basis for many commemorative stamps. Yet, it seems, little acknowledgment and no pay are given photographers whose pictures are transformed into "artist's renderings," while it is Post Office policy to byline and pay \$1,000 to men who provide the finished product.

I am inserting an article, "Writer With a Camera," by Rus Arnold, a distinguished photographer in the Midwest which appeared in the November 1970 issue of Writer's Digest, explaining this unfair treatment of photographers. I recommend it as aptly describing patent unfairness.

The article follows:

#### WRITER WITH A CAMERA

(By Rus Arnold)

(Note.—Rus Arnold is a professional magazine and advertising photojournalist. He is the author of five books on photography; he writes a monthly feature in Travel and Camera and teaches visual communication.)

#### PHOTOS ON STAMPS

The first time a photograph was ever used as the basis of a United States postage stamp was way back in 1866—the 15-cent Lincoln. That was not the earliest photograph, though; the Post Office used an 1856-daguerrotype as the basis of the Thoreau stamp in 1967.

But lest you immediately concentrate your efforts on getting one of your photographs used on a stamp, take note that the Post Office offers the photographer neither of the two rewards for which we strive: fame or fortune . . . neither byline nor money. Here is an example of society's neglect of the photographer, compared to its respect for the practitioners of other graphic arts, the people designated as "artists" as distinct from "photographers".

Consider the two stamps mentioned. The Post Office made no effort to learn who produced the Lincoln photograph or the Thoreau daguerrotype. And the latter was not used as a photograph; it was given an "artist's rendering" by Leonard Baskin. That has been a standard practice with the Post Office. Joe Rosenthal's Iwo Jima flag-raising picture and NASA's photograph of the "moon landing" made during a dry run on earth were among the photographs the Post Office accepted for use as stamps only after an "artist's rendering" had been prepared.

You might say the processes involved in producing stamps require conversion of photographs to line drawings or the addition of color. Yet the most recent important photographic stamp, the Eisenhower 6c issue, was successfully reproduced from a photographic print.

To compound the Post Office's indifferent treatment of photographers, they have never, as far as I can determine, paid for the use of a photograph on a stamp. "Since the

photos we use usually are in the public domain or are owned by publications," a spokesman for the Division of Philately has written to me, "it is not policy to pay for them. We obtain permission and give credit in publicity."

That would be easier to take if the Post Office had the same attitude to "artists" as it has to "photographers". But in that same paragraph just quoted, I am told that "The present fee to artists is \$1,000." I assume this refers to the man who converts the photograph to "art work" though it may also apply to original drawings.

Several well-known photographers have had their work used for stamps. The 1965 Churchill stamp was a Karsh portrait, the Herbert Hoover of the same year was by Fabian Bachrach Sr., and the 1967 Kennedy by Jacques Lowe. Philippe Halsman contributed to two stamps, the 1965 Adlai Stevenson and the 1966 Albert Einstein. If you think a photographer should be willing to let his photograph be used free on a stamp because of the prestige, consider Philippe Halsman, who has attained the ultimate mathematical accumulation in one of the most-sought-after prestige spots in photojournalism, the cover of *Life*. The January 23, 1970 Johnny Carson cover was Philippe's one hundredth. Greater prestige than his hath no photographer attained—yet he was paid for every one of those covers, in money, and at prevailing rates.

As further illustration of the Post Office's

disregard for the photographers who created its pictures, it tends to give the "credit in publicity" that it substitutes for money, not to the photographer, but to the publication or news service. Thus the Post Office credits World Wide Photos for the 1966 Roosevelt stamp, *Life* for the 1967 George Marshall, the *New York Times* for the 1967 Eugene O'Neill and the 1967 Kennedy, the *Los Angeles Times* for the 1964 Kennedy, and the *New York Herald-Tribune* for the 1966 Savings Bond stamp. In only one case have I found credit given to both the photographer and his employer. The Eisenhower stamp is credited to Bernie Noble, photographer, and to the *Cleveland Press*, for which he made the picture, but which did not carry it.

Note that it is the Division of Philately that concerns itself with the pictorial aspect of postage stamps. For strictly functional purposes nothing more is needed on a stamp than the information provided by postage meters. But who enjoys receiving a letter with a dull, meter-imprinted stamp? The purpose of the art work is decorative. It forms the basis of stamp-collecting. And, frankly, it sells a lot of stamps. Commemorative stamps, particularly, are looked to by many governments as a profitable source of postal revenue. I would like to see more photographs, particularly color photographs, used for such purposes. But I would also like to see our Post Office recognize that the photographer, like the mail carrier and the mail sorter, is worthy of his hire.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Monday, November 30, 1970

The House met at 12 o'clock noon. The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

*Thou, Lord, art good, and ready to forgive; and plenteous in mercy unto all them that call upon Thee.—Psalms 86: 5.*

O Thou whose love passes understanding, whose wisdom is beyond our highest thought, and whose power strengthens us for every noble endeavor, open our eyes that we may see the leading of Thy spirit across the years and in the present time may we trust Thy patient power and Thy gentle goodness to bring us out of the strife between men and out of the bitterness that blights the brotherhood of man. Confirm us in that greatness of spirit which will make us united in purpose, elevated in our sympathies, global in our outreach, and eager to minister to the needs of men.

In the work of this day may we be attentive to Thy voice and responsive to Thy call that we may walk the way of truth and love for the sake of our country and the peace of the world. In the spirit of Jesus Christ, our Lord, Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, November 25, 1970, was read and approved.

### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 3540. An act for the relief of George K. Liu;

S. 3870. An act for the relief of Dr. Dionisio Teng Libi and Dr. Bernadette Libi;

S. 4029. An act for the relief of Soon Ae Kwak; and

S. 4536. An act to amend the Small Business Act.

### TEMPORARY EXTENSION OF FEDERAL HOUSING ADMINISTRATION INSURANCE AUTHORITY

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency be discharged from the further consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 1403) to provide an additional temporary extension of the Federal Housing Administration's insurance authority, and ask for immediate consideration of the joint resolution.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I should like to ask the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency one or two questions.

The present authority expires when?

Mr. PATMAN. It expires tomorrow.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. And this new authority would go until when?

Mr. PATMAN. Thirty days. One month.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Is it to December 31?

Mr. PATMAN. To January 1.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. January 1. As the gentleman from Texas knows, I would have preferred and I think it would have been far more desirable to have the extension until March 1 or

March 31. Under the current circumstances that is not possible as a practical matter because of the chairman's attitude. It is important to get an extension in view of these circumstances.

Mr. PATMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman discussed it with me, but our committee decided that we had better move in this direction of a 30-day extension, because the housing bill will be up the day after tomorrow, on Wednesday, and that involves this more permanent extension.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Will all of the programs for which an extension is sought at the present time be extended on a permanent basis in the proposed new housing legislation?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. For how long would the new extensions be in the overall comprehensive housing bill?

Mr. PATMAN. I do not recall the exact time, but it would vary by program from 2 to 4 years.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution as follows:

H.J. RES. 1403

*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) section 2(a) of the National Housing Act is amended by striking out "December 1, 1970" in the first sentence and inserting in lieu thereof "January 1, 1971".*